

Summary of Public Comments on the Independent External Consultant’s Final Report on the TLG Review

This document provides an overview of the public comments¹ received in response to the [Final Report](#), issued by the independent external consultant JAS Communications LLC, which features 3 final recommendations, suggests a number of “alternative considerations” and offers extensive analysis. The comments are grouped per recommendation addressed and responses without such references are summarized under "General Comments". The summary does in no way substitute for the original contributions, which should be consulted for complete information. The number of comments submitted on this paper tallies up to one. This comment is hyperlinked below for easy access and available at: <http://icann.org/en/public-comment/#tlg-final-report>

Contributions provided by:

[European Telecommunications Standards Institute](#)

ETSI

RECOMMENDATION/CONCLUSION	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
General comments	ETSI: ‘This version of the Report is much improved compared to the first draft.’
5.5 ICANN governance participation privileges are not reciprocated by TLG organizations JAS found it surprising and atypical that none of the TLG organizations have reciprocated the governance participation privilege that ICANN has granted through the TLG mechanism. We believe this too is an artifact of the past when ICANN was a very different organization. We strongly believe governance participation privileges at the highest level – participation on the Board – should and must be reciprocated to form effective peer relationships. <u>ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERATION II</u> : If the TLG is not dismantled, consider making reciprocity a condition of participation for TLG organizations.	ETSI: ‘Section 5.5 still misses the point about reciprocity where it states "... We strongly believe governance participation privileges at the highest level - participation on the Board - should and must be reciprocated to form effective peer relationships..."’ ETSI ‘Reciprocity has to be targeted at the appropriate level in the structure of the peer TLG member body. Giving ICANN access to the ETSI Board would probably be pointless for both sides. In ETSI, it may be more appropriate to give ICANN access to the ETSI GA (as we do at the moment) and/or OCG and/or directly to the related Technical Committees as we do with the mapping annexes to our Partnership Agreements with other bodies. In any case, it should be a bilateral peer-peer arrangement at the highest most appropriate level, not necessarily Board-level (... in ETSI the Board is not the highest level of governance!).’

¹ The public comment period ran from 10 December 2010 to 24 January 2011.