

# Registries Stakeholder Group Statement



## Issue: Process Proposal for Streamlining Organizational Reviews

Date statement submitted: **15 July 2019**

Reference url: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/streamlining-org-reviews-proposal-2019-04-30-en>

### Background<sup>1</sup>

There are 7 Organizational Reviews mandated by [Bylaws art. 4.4](#).

The second round of organizational reviews is about to be completed. Areas subject to streamlining:

- Purpose and scope of organizational reviews;
- Limited pool of suitable independent examiners, and selection of independent examiners;
- Whether or not recommendations issued by independent examiner should be binding or non-binding;
- Length of the entire review process including implementation.

Earlier RySG comments on the subject:

- Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews (31 July 2018)  
[https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/ec8e4c\\_c6f71ee98747446eb821724163a03d9e.pdf](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/ec8e4c_c6f71ee98747446eb821724163a03d9e.pdf)
- Next Steps on Reviews (5 October 2018)  
[https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/ec8e4c\\_cac7f9877ad849b0b7e014d411ee6b0e.pdf](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/ec8e4c_cac7f9877ad849b0b7e014d411ee6b0e.pdf)

---

### Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) comment:

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the [proposed Process for Streamlining Organizational Reviews](#) and provide feedback on the questions:

#### **1. Do you/your organization agree with the proposed list of issues that should form the focus of the streamlining process? If not, with which do you disagree and what would you like to add?**

- The RySG generally agrees with list of areas subject to streamlining.
- However, item (ii) (“Limited pool of suitable independent examiners, and selection of independent examiners”) seems more like a foundational issue that needs to be addressed rather than an area for streamlining, per se.
- Item (iv) references the duration of each individual review, but it may also be prudent to consider the timing of each review relative to the other reviews – e.g., should organizational reviews occur concurrently, or would it create less strain on community resources to sequence the reviews?

---

<sup>1</sup> *Background: intended to give a brief context for the comment and to highlight what is most relevant for RO’s in the subject document – it is not a summary of the subject document.*

- Per item (iii), the RySG believes that the recommendations issued by the independent examiner should not be made binding. The goal of the review is to determine whether the SO/AC has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness, and whether the SO/AC is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders. These are fundamental issues and no independent organization should be able to dictate change based on a ‘drop-in’ review without Board approval at a super-majority level.

**2. Do you/your organization agree with the proposed underlying principles that should guide the solutions? If not, with which do you disagree and what would you like to add?**

- Again, we generally agree with the principles outlined.
- Item (ii) regarding Timing is somewhat vague. It recommends ensuring that the impact of one review can be adequately assessed before the next one starts, but it is unclear how much time is actually required for that assessment to take place.
- It should also be made clear in item (i) regarding Accountability that in ‘adhering’ to these practices in effectuating procedural changes to the organizational review process, nothing will be done to undercut the fact that such practices are not meant to be mandatory on SOs/ACs as a consequence of the ‘assessments’ undertaken in organizational reviews.

**3. Do you/your organization agree with the community role in the streamlining process? If not, what would you propose?**

- The RySG suggests that, in addition to the community consultation process proposed in the discussion paper, ICANN also solicit specific feedback from individuals who have direct, first-hand experience with organizational reviews, such as past SO/AC leaders who served during a review or were tasked with implementing the recommendations that resulted from a review.

**4. Do you/your organization agree with the proposed high-level timeline? If not, what would you propose?**

- The paper lacks any details on the time each step would take, which makes it difficult to provide feedback on the timeline as a whole. The RySG suggests ICANN put together a plan that at least features some estimates for each step.
- It makes sense to complete the streamlining process before commencing future organizational reviews. However, all reviews are critical accountability mechanisms for ICANN and as such, this streamlining process should not be dragged out in a way that results in significant undue delays to the commencement of the next round of reviews.