

# Summary Report of Public Comment Proceeding

## Address Supporting Organization (ASO) Review Final Report

**Publication Date:**

**Prepared By:** Angie Graves

### Public Comment Proceeding

Open Date:	09 August 2017
Close Date:	06 September 2017
Staff Report Due Date:	20 September 2017

### Important Information Links

<a href="#">Announcement</a>
<a href="#">Public Comment Proceeding</a>
<a href="#">View Comments Submitted</a>

**Staff Contact:** Lars Hoffmann

**Email:** [lars.hoffmann@gmail.com](mailto:lars.hoffmann@gmail.com)

## Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

### ICANN AND ASO

ICANN's relationship with the [Address Supporting Organization](#) (ASO), as defined in their 21 October 2004 [Memorandum of Understanding](#), includes periodic review of the ASO in accordance with Section 4.4 of the [ICANN ByLaws](#), and specifies that the Number Resource Organization (NRO) shall provide the ASO review mechanisms.

[Section 4.4](#) of the ICANN Bylaws addresses 'periodic review of ICANN structure and operations' with the intention of reinforcing accountability. It specifies that organizations subject to review are to conduct reviews every five years.

The ICANN ASO Memorandum of Understanding details the ASO's responsibilities, which include the following:

- \* Undertaking a role in the global policy development process.
- \* Defining procedures for the selection of individuals to serve on other ICANN bodies, in particular on the ICANN Board, and implementing any roles assigned to the AC in such procedures.
- \* Providing advice to the ICANN Board on number resource allocation policy, in conjunction with the RIRs.

### THE REVIEW

The Number Resource Organization Executive Council (NRO EC), in communication with the ICANN Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC), [commissioned the independent review of the ASO](#) in accordance with ICANN Bylaws Section 4.4, to determine:

- whether the ASO has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, and if so,
- whether any change in the structure or operations of the ASO is desirable to improve its effectiveness, and

(iii) whether the ASO is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders.

The review was conducted over a period of six months, from February to July 2017.

Following the review, the [independent examiner's report](#) was submitted to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) of the ICANN Board and was [published for public comment](#) on 9 August 2017. The [public comment period](#) closed on 6 September 2017.

## NEXT STEPS

Each Regional Internet Registry (RIR) will conduct regional consultations to consider the report's recommendations and the ASO will draft a report of its response to the recommendations, with consideration for the input provided by the RIR's and public comments. The ASO's report will be submitted along with the Report of Public Comments and the independent examiner's final report to the OEC.

## Section II: Contributors

*A total of one (1) community submission was posted to the forum. The contributor is listed below with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.*

### Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
--	--	--

### Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Greg Skinner		GS

## Section III: Summary of Comments

*General Disclaimer: This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).*

Greg Skinner commented on the recommendation for new election procedures for seats 9 and 10 on the ICANN Board. The independent examiner's recommendation is for implementing a 'Schulze method' of ranked voting.

In response, Mr. Skinner submitted links to two information sources for explaining and comparing ranking methods, one of which can be used to run elections as well as to analyze election results:

Condorcet Internet Voting Service (Cornell University)

<http://civs.cs.cornell.edu>

Comparison of electoral systems (Wikipedia)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison\\_of\\_electoral\\_systems](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_electoral_systems)

#### **Section IV: Analysis of Comments**

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

One comment was submitted during the public comment period. In response to the final report's recommendation 7.3.3. - New election procedures for seats 9 and 10, the comment included links to two information sources and a recommendation for using them in implementing this recommendation:

Condorcet Internet Voting Service (Cornell University)

<http://civs.cs.cornell.edu>

Comparison of electoral systems (Wikipedia)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison\\_of\\_electoral\\_systems](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_electoral_systems)