

Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: **Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of Reviews**

Date statement submitted: **31 July 2018**

Reference URL: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/reviews-long-term-timeline-2018-05-14-en>

Background¹

There are seven Organizational Reviews and four Specific Reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws. All reviews (other than the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review) are triggered by an action related to the prior review cycle.

The high number of reviews taking place at the same time has strained volunteer and ICANN resources. The proposed [Long-Term Options](#) offer various ways to address the mandates from the Bylaws that have resulted in multiple simultaneous reviews, and address the inability to modify the mandated review cycles in order to address unforeseen developments.

Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) comment:

The RySG welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Long Term Options to Adjust the Timeline of the Reviews.

The RySG understands that the purpose of this options paper is to seek support to stagger the Specific and Organisational Reviews in order to overcome the burden placed on ICANN's budget, staff and community resources caused by a number of these reviews occurring concurrently. From a practical perspective, the RySG supports providing a mechanism that would allow the flexibility to stagger the reviews in order to reduce the impact on community volunteer and ICANN resources; however, we do believe it is important to recognize that the resources required and the processes for the Specific Reviews are considerably different to those required for Organisational Reviews and for this reason we believe that distinction should be maintained in considering the long term options to adjust the timeline of reviews.

To that end, the RySG provide the following responses to the principles suggested in the Options paper only as they apply to Specific Reviews.

The RySG supports the following Principles:

A. Specific Reviews:

- **Staggering the Specific Reviews to avoid the possibility that more than one Specific Review is being conducted at any one point in time.**
 - It will be important to specify what 'conducted' means, for example does this include the planning/preparation phase and all other phases of a Specific Review

¹ *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.*

cycle that can take from 2.5 to 5 years, or is it from the first meeting of the Review Team to the finalization of the Final Report.

- **Adding a timing criteria to allow time for the recommendations from a previous review to be fully implemented and operational for a minimum of 12 months before the next review is initiated.**
 - We agree that this makes sense, but believe that further investigation is required to understand if 12 months is a reasonable amount of time, or whether a longer period of time would be more valuable in terms of experience with the improvements.
- **Adding a requirement that Specific Review teams complete their work within 12 months of their first meeting.**
 - We strongly support this principle, but believe the difficulty will be ‘enforcing’ the 12-month provision and getting community agreement as to how this will be done.
- **Adding scheduling flexibility for Specific Reviews to the Bylaws, with appropriate checks and balances.**
 - We agree that scheduling flexibility should remove the likelihood of Specific Reviews being conducted at the same time: however, we strongly emphasize the importance of checks and balances to ensure that these important accountability tools are not weakened.

The RySG does not support the following principle:

- **Focusing Specific Review team’s work on topics of highest priority to the community.**
 - We consider this principle to be outside the scope of this effort. There is no value in pre-determining what the focus of any Specific Review in a few years should be.

B. Organisational Reviews

A quick analysis of the time taken to conduct an organisational review suggests that on average it takes about four years, followed by approximately two and a half years before the cycle starts again. This seems to suggest that the process is both complex and bureaucratic. Given there are a number of reviews in various stages of completion now would seem the opportune time to conduct the ‘subsequent conversation’ that was referred to in the options paper, particularly as the next cycle for the reviews is some three years away.
