

Report of Public Comments

Title:	Draft criteria and process for selection of Multistakeholder Ethos Award Pilot Program											
Publication Date:	21 February 2014											
Prepared By:	Lynn Lipinski											
Comment Period:		Important Information Links										
Comment Open Date:	6 January 2014	Announcement										
Comment Close Date:	27 January 2014	Public Comment Box										
Reply Close Date:	17 February 2014	View Comments Submitted										
Time (UTC):	23:59	Report of Public Comments										
Staff Contact:	Lynn Lipinski	Email:	Lynn.lipinski@icann.org									
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps												
<p>At ICANN 48, ICANN announced the creation of the Multistakeholder Ethos Award Pilot Program and prepared a short proposal for the program. Staff put the proposal up for Public Comment on 6 January 2014. Staff will now consider the comments received and decide on next steps, which may result in a revision of the draft Plan.</p>												
Section II: Contributors												
<p><i>At the time this report was prepared, a total of two community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.</i></p>												
<u>Organizations and Groups:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Name</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Submitted by</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Initials</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>At-Large Advisory Committee</td> <td>ICANN Staff</td> <td>ALAC</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Name	Submitted by	Initials	At-Large Advisory Committee	ICANN Staff	ALAC			
Name	Submitted by	Initials										
At-Large Advisory Committee	ICANN Staff	ALAC										
<u>Individuals:</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Name</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Affiliation (if provided)</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Initials</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Alejandro Pisanty</td> <td> </td> <td>AP</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials	Alejandro Pisanty		AP			
Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials										
Alejandro Pisanty		AP										
Section III: Summary of Comments												
<p><i>General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full</i></p>												

context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

Two comments were submitted. Alejandro Pisanty urged ICANN to strengthen the criteria but incorporating evaluation of a candidate’s effectiveness, avoidance of conflict of interest, and their service to the higher interests of the organization and its community. ALAC affirmed their support with the suggested list of criteria but with the recommendation to add a factor of time spent (devotional factor) by the candidates in achieving their goal of facilitating multistakeholder dialogue. ALAC notes “discussion and dialogue are one thing - doing the hard lifting to keep the system going is another.” ALAC also made note that it supported the creation of the award in that “it is vital to recognize people at all levels of the multistakeholder system in any of ICANN's many communities.”

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

Both comments raise important points about how the criteria can be improved. Staff will revise the proposal based on these comments to include a component of time spent as well as overall effectiveness within the organization. We will stress that the award recognize service of higher interests of the organization and its community.