

Comment on Long-Term options to adjust the timeline of reviews

The ISPCP constituency respectfully submits the following comments:

General

The ISPCP constituency welcomes the discussion initiated to optimize review timelines. We agree to the concerns raised within the ICANN community that the current situation leads to consume too much volunteer (and staff) resources better to be used for ICANN's core business, the policy development. Our assessment is mainly based on the active participation of constituency members in ATRT, GNSO and NomCom reviews.

The ISPCP considers that the timing of this consultation, particularly as it follows transitional changes that facilitate ICANN's new accountability mechanism's, should also take account of the need to take a holistic review of ICANN the organisation. Concentrating on reviewing and improving processes that focus on an organisational structure that has never been reviewed holistically since its creation more than 20 years ago, is simply looking to treat the symptoms, rather than the cause of some of the issues we struggle with today.

Across the past 20 years as a multi-stakeholder organisation ICANN has learnt many lessons with regard to its processes and ways of working, that could greatly improve its efficacy and thereby its ability to tackle its ever increasing workload. By standing back and taking a holistic view of its current structural elements and assessing their effectiveness, rather than just reviewing each ICANN function in a stovepipe manner could result in structural changes that deliver benefits individual reviews would never be able to achieve.

One significant finding from the document is the cost difference re Specific vs Organizational Reviews (\$500,000-700,000 vs \$250,000). This is hard to explain and should be decreased. We understand and accept that review costs shall be an item of a separate public comment period in the near future.

Principles to rationalize the Review schedule

- The recognized duration of an Organizational Review of 5 years (3 for reviewing, 2 for implementation) should not be accepted as given. We see time saving potential for both phases. Therefore strict and shortened deadlines should be set, in particular with respect to the work of the Independent Examiner. Implementation should be done to the largest extent by ICANN staff with the exception of cases where the community concerned is affected directly. Examples are membership and structure related issues. Saving time can facilitate the decision for **Staggering the Reviews**.

- **Adding timing criteria to initiate the next cycle of a Specific or Organizational Review**

Waiting to kick off a new review until the previous review has fully been implemented seems not to be optimal. Rather setting strict timelines is a good trigger for the community to prioritize the work. In particular the implementation of review recommendations can be prioritized.

- **Adding requirements that Specific Reviews complete their work within 12 months**

This would significantly reduce costs and volunteer time requirements. As said before it is usually a valuable trigger for the team to prioritize its work. In justified cases the community as leader of the process could consider exceptions.

- **Focusing Specific Review teams' work on topics of highest priority to the community**

Prioritization is needed for both review types. It may be a hard community process to go through to finding compromise solutions. But in the end prioritization is a helpful working guideline.

- **Adding scheduling flexibility for Specific Reviews to the Bylaws**

We would welcome having tools available in a balanced way for appropriate scheduling flexibility. If necessary it should be reflected in the bylaws, and checks and balances should be worked out together with the community.

Thank you for your consideration.