

SHORT-TERM OPTIONS TO ADJUST THE TIMELINE FOR SPECIFIC REVIEWS

OVERVIEW

Purpose: Over the years, and over the past months, there have been discussions in the community on the number of concurrent reviews, including the demand these place on community and ICANN resources and budgets. The community expressed an interest in considering possible approaches to streamline reviews, to reduce the number of concurrent reviews and demands on the volunteer community, while not diminishing ICANN's accountability responsibilities. ICANN is posting two documents for input, discussion, and additional thoughts on both short-term and long-term approaches to solve this important challenge. Principles to inform these approaches are to aim for no more than three to four reviews per year, recognize limited community resources, ensure adequate funding for reviews, and ensure efficiency and effectiveness of the reviews.

This document and consultation is proposing **short-term options** to address the workload of the volunteer community and impact on ICANN resources. We invite feedback on whether and how to adjust the timeline for two Specific Reviews to ease the strain on volunteer and ICANN resources. The two reviews are: the third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) and the second Registration Directory Service Review (RDS-WHIOS2).

Status: The timing of Specific and Organizational Reviews, mandated by the Bylaws, has resulted in multiple reviews occurring at the same time. Currently, there are eleven (11) Organizational and Specific Reviews, in various phases of the review process. This is in addition to policy development work and other work across ICANN's community. This high level of activity strains community and ICANN resources.

Next Steps: After this Public Comment closes, ICANN organization will summarize and analyze the comments received and share those with the community and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board (OEC) in identifying recommendations to the Board on paths forward.

Long-term options for streamlining the review schedule: In addition to the short-term options pertaining to two Specific Reviews, ICANN is also presenting potential long-term solutions to streamline the review schedule in the future (see [public comment proceeding setting out these long-term options](#)). The proposed long-term options include ways to achieve scheduling flexibility for future reviews (with appropriate checks and balances by the community and the Board) and meeting ICANN's accountability and transparency obligations in a more practical and sustainable manner. Similar to the principles that inform short-term options, the principles applicable to the long-term options aim to have a manageable number of reviews taking place concurrently, recognize limited community resources, ensure adequate timing for reviews, and explore options for improving efficiency and effectiveness of Specific and Organizational Reviews.

For more information, please see the Public Comment proceedings: "[Long-term Options for Streamlining of Reviews and Potential Bylaws Changes](#)".

DESCRIPTION AND EXPLANATION

From the discussions over the past months with the community, including at ICANN61, there are several options available in the short-term to lessen the strain on the volunteers and to normalize the usage of ICANN resources across years. Of the eleven reviews underway there are two that are the most likely to have the greatest cross-community impact on volunteer participation and resources if their scope or schedule are modified. These are two Specific Reviews: (1) the ATRT3 (status: the Review Team has not yet been selected by the SO/AC chairs); and (2) the RDS-WHOIS2 (status: the Review Team, appointed in June 2017, has identified the need to separate their work into multiple tracks because of the ongoing related work on the impact of the General

Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on WHOIS); the work of the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team can be followed [here](https://community.icann.org/display/WHO/RDS-WHOIS2+Review) [<https://community.icann.org/display/WHO/RDS-WHOIS2+Review>]).

Options for each review range from maintaining the current path of the review, to limiting scope, or in the case of ATRT3 considering a postponement of no more than one year. Each option carries with it advantages and disadvantages, and some options will result in potential cost savings. The options are explained in the sections below and also are summarized in the table at the end of this document.

You can provide your comments by using a fillable form - click [here](#) [<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/specific-reviews-short-term-timeline-14may18-en.pdf>]. If you have additional ideas or options, please use the “Comment” section of the fillable form or submit a comment using the “[Submit Comment](#)” [comments-specific-reviews-short-term-timeline-14may18@icann.org] button on the Public Comment page.

THIRD ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY REVIEW (ATRT3)

Review Purpose and Scope

The ATRT is an important demonstration of how ICANN fulfills its commitment to accountability. ICANN initiated ATRT3 with the [Call for Volunteers in January 2017](https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2017-01-31-en) [<https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2017-01-31-en>]. At the time of the opening of this comment forum, some SO/ACs have yet to complete their nomination procedure; therefore, no review activity has occurred to date. According to the Bylaws, the Review Team should issue its final report within one year of convening its first meeting.

While the full scope of ATRT3 work is understood as a matter for the team itself to set, the issues that the ATRT3 may consider include assessments of:

- Board governance issues, such as performance, selection, and appeal mechanisms from Board decisions;

- Effectiveness of the GAC interaction with the Board and broader ICANN community;
- Processes by which ICANN receives public input;
- The extent to which ICANN decisions are supported and accepted by the Internet community;
- The facilitation of cross-community deliberations in the policy development process;
- The Independent Review Process;
- Implementation of recommendations from prior ATRTs and whether the intended effects were achieved; and
- Creation of new or termination/amendment of existing Specific Reviews.

Connection to Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG-WS2) on Enhancing ICANN Accountability

Some ongoing work related to the scope of the ATRT3 includes the Work Stream 2 efforts of the Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG-WS2) on Enhancing ICANN Accountability. CCWG-WS2 is also focused on enhancements to ICANN accountability and transparency, including recommendations on a variety of topics including: the office of the ombudsman; transparency (including board deliberations and other documentation); the accountability of SOs and ACs; diversity across ICANN; and the accountability of ICANN organization staff members. Some of the CCWG-WS2 items are themselves tied to recommendations from ATRT2 (such as enhancements to the office of the ombudsman, or transparency of material related to Board deliberations). The CCWG-WS2 noted that there was overlap between the potential topics for ATRT3 and the topics reserved to the CCWG-WS2. See [\[https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-December/013432.html\]](https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-December/013432.html).

The CCWG-Accountability WS2 Final Report is available [here](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-acct-ws2-final-2018-03-30-en) [\[https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-acct-ws2-final-2018-03-30-en\]](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ccwg-acct-ws2-final-2018-03-30-en). The recommendations will be presented to the Board in June 2018, with decision on

approval and implementation expected to happen within a matter of months after the delivery of the final report. There also is ongoing work to update the Supplemental Rules for the Independent Review Process and to consider modifications to the Cooperative Engagement Process, a precursor to filing an Independent Review Proceeding (IRP).

Proposed ATRT3 Options

ICANN organization outlines three (3) short-term options below relating to ATRT3, ranging from: not making any changes to the schedule or scope; to moving forward with some aspects of the review (such as a focus only on the evaluation of prior ATRT recommendations); to deferring the start of ATRT3 for approximately one year. Please refer to the tables below for an overview of the proposed options.

ATRT3 | A “No change” option proposes that the review move forward as scheduled, with no further delay. The scope would focus on evaluation of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations, and other items identified in the Bylaws, though limited so as to avoid duplication of/overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics.

Advantage: The advantage of this option would be to avoid any further delay in beginning the ATRT3 work.

Disadvantages: The disadvantages include additional strain on volunteer and ICANN resources in conducting ATRT3 at this time. In addition, the effort for the Review Team to agree on how to meaningfully limit the scope while avoiding overlap with CCWG-WS2 implementation could be difficult and time-consuming.

Execution Needs: To move forward with this option, the SO/AC chairs would need to complete the review team selection, the ICANN Board would need to select a review team member, and some form of coordination between CCWG-WS2 and ATRT3 should be put in place.

Cost Savings: There would be no cost savings associated with this option.

ATRT3 | B “Limit review to implementation of prior recommendations” would see the ATRT3 scope focus only on evaluation of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations.

Advantage: The review work would begin without any further delay. With a limited review, the time and effort expected from the review team members would be reduced when compared to option A (above). The same would apply to ICANN resources, also.

Disadvantage: There would still be some difficulty in limiting the potential for overlap with/duplication of CCWG-WS2 topics, as discussed in Option A.

Execution Needs: To move forward with this option, the SO/AC chairs would need to complete the review team selection, the ICANN Board would need to select a review team member, and ATRT3 members would need to reach an agreement to limit the scope, potentially with support from the ICANN community.

Cost Savings: Estimated potential cost savings would be approximately \$250,000 in FY19, based on the assumption that expert resources would not be needed because of limited scope.

ATRT3 | C “Commence RT work upon Board action on CCWG-WS2

recommendations” option would defer the start of the review until Board action on CCWG-WS2 recommendations, with the work of the Review Team to start no later than 30 June 2019 and conclude within twelve months, as prescribed in the Bylaws. CCWG-WS2 recommendations are expected to be delivered to the Board in June 2018, and decisions on approval and implementation are expected to happen within a matter of months after the delivery of the final report. This option would see the ATRT3’s scope focus on the evaluation of implementation of ATRT2 recommendations and other topics limited to avoid duplication or overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics.

Advantages: Other areas of work across the ICANN community are expected to end prior to a delayed start of the ATRT3. Specifically, the CCWG-WS2 effort, the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review (CCT), and the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) work are all expected to conclude in 2018, potentially freeing-up community and ICANN organization bandwidth for ATRT3. Also,

as this option is a short-term delay, the start date of ATRT3 can be reasonably estimated.

Disadvantages: Some might consider that ICANN organization is delaying its accountability commitments by deferring the review. Also, if there is no long-term change identified in the scheduling of Specific Reviews, the next ATRT will still need to commence in January 2022, leaving little time for implementation.

Execution Needs: The community would need to agree to defer ATRT3, and determine an appropriate course of action for volunteers who applied to serve in response to the call in January 2017, including, potentially, a re-initiation of the call for volunteers.

Cost Savings: Estimated potential cost savings would be approximately \$30,000 in FY18 and \$320,000 in FY19.

ATRT3 SHORT-TERM OPTIONS

Review Option	Potential Topics	Advantages	Disadvantages	Execution Needs	\$ Savings in FY19
ATRT3 A “No change” Begin as soon as feasible ¹ (estimate: July 2018).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Evaluation of implementation of prior review (ATRT2) recommendations; o Other topics, limited to avoid duplication /overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No further delay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strain on volunteer and ICANN resources (work of ATRT3 must be completed in 12 months from seating of team); o Difficulties in limiting/containing scope; o Potential for duplication/overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Completion of Review Team appointment process by SO/AC chairs; o Selection of ICANN Board member to serve on the Review Team; o Coordination between CCWG-WS2 and ATRT3. 	None
ATRT3 B “Limit Review to Implementation of Prior Recommendations” Begin as soon as feasible (estimate: July 2018).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Evaluation of implementation of prior review (ATRT2) recommendations². 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No further delay; o Lesser strain on volunteer and ICANN resources than Option A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strain on volunteer and ICANN resources (work of ATRT3 must be completed in 12 months from seating of team); o Difficulties in limiting/containing scope; o Potential for duplication/overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Completion of Review Team appointment process by SO/AC chairs; o Agreement by ATRT3 to limit the scope; o Selection of ICANN Board member to serve on the Review Team. 	\$250,000 ³

¹ To date, two organizations have not completed their nominations – the SSAC, and the ASO ([see status of the selection process \[https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=74586688\]](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=74586688) and the list of [nominated applicants \[https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/Applications+Received\]](https://community.icann.org/display/atrt/Applications+Received)). Given that the call for volunteers commenced in January 2017, ample time has been given to the community to complete its selection process.

² The only topic required for the ATRT3 is the assessment of prior ATRT recommendation implications. Bylaws Section 4.6(b)(iii).

³ Based on adherence to scope limitations and assumption that expert resources will not need to be identified (pursuant to Section 4.6(a)(iv)) because of the limited scope.

ATRT3 SHORT-TERM OPTIONS

Review Option	Potential Topics	Advantages	Disadvantages	Execution Needs	\$ Savings in FY19
<p>ATRT3 C “Commence RT work upon Board action on CCWG-WS2 recommendations”⁴ (with the work of the Review Team to start no later than 30 June 2019 and conclude within twelve months, as prescribed in the Bylaws⁵).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Evaluation of implementation of prior review recommendations; o Other topics, limited to avoid duplication or overlap with CCWG-WS2 topics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lessened strain on volunteer and ICANN resources; o Short-term deferral – date can be reasonably estimated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Potentially critical reaction that ICANN is delaying its accountability commitments by deferring the review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Community agreement to defer; o Community to determine appropriate course of action for volunteers who applied to serve in response to the call in January 2017; potential re-initiation of call. 	<p>\$320,000⁶+ \$30,000 in FY18</p>

⁴ The CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 recommendations are expected to be delivered to the Board in June 2018, and decisions on approval and implementation are expected to happen within a matter of months after the delivery of the final report.

⁵ [Bylaws Section 4.6\(b\)\(v\)](#) states “The Accountability and Transparency Review Team should issue its final report within one year of convening its first meeting.”

⁶ Based on assumption that a limited number of face-to-face meetings would occur in FY19

SECOND REGISTRATION DIRECTORY SERVICE REVIEW (RDS-WHOIS2)

Review Scope and Status

As stated in the [Bylaws Section 4.6\(e\)\(v\)](#)

[\[https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4.6\]](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#article4.6) “The Directory Service Review shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, measured from the date the previous Directory Service Review Team was convened, except that the first Directory Service Review to be conducted after 1 October 2016 shall be deemed to be timely if the applicable Directory Service Review Team is convened on or before 31 October 2016.”

ICANN initiated the RDS-WHOIS2 with a [Call for Volunteers](#)

[\[https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2016-10-28-en\]](https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2016-10-28-en) on 28 October 2016. The Review Team was announced in June 2017 and began its work in July 2017. The

Review Team adopted its [Terms of Reference](#)

[\[https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64084100/RDS-WHOIS2%20-%20Terms%20of%20Reference.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1519054677000&api=v2\]](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/64084100/RDS-WHOIS2%20-%20Terms%20of%20Reference.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1519054677000&api=v2) in February 2018.

In recognition of the changing WHOIS landscape, in part due to the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), the Review Team planned to defer some of its work as noted in their Terms of Reference: “in relation to the scope items on Law Enforcement Needs, Consumer Trust and Safeguarding Registrant Data until it is more clear what path ICANN will be following [in relation to the GDPR]. Should any work be deferred, individual timelines may slip. However, it is the intent of the review team that the overall schedule calling for the final report to be delivered by the end of December 2018 not change appreciably.” The Review Team agreed to defer these work items until more information becomes available after GDPR goes into effect in May 2018. The RDS-WHOIS2 has completed a significant amount work toward evaluation of implementation of prior review recommendations.

One group decided to abstain from the RDS-WHOIS2 review because of the pendency of the GDPR and uncertain impact on RDS-WHOIS2 review work. The Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) had initially decided to defer participation of the ccNSO in the RDS-WHOIS2 review until the scope of the review is defined, citing a concern that GDPR and its required implementation will have a major impact on the RDS related discussions and its scope - see [correspondence \[https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/sataki-to-crocker-15may17-en.pdf\]](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/sataki-to-crocker-15may17-en.pdf). Subsequently, the ccNSO decided not to participate in this review. The RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team is comprised of ten members appointed by three of ICANN's seven Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and one member appointed by the ICANN Board (see [composition of RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team \[https://community.icann.org/display/WHO/Review+Team+Composition\]](https://community.icann.org/display/WHO/Review+Team+Composition)). The RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team has fewer members than other typical review teams.

Proposed RDS-WHOIS2 Options

ICANN organization outlines three (3) options for the RDS-WHOIS2 review ranging from continuing the review work underway as is, to limiting the work to only the evaluation of prior review recommendations, or pausing the work as soon as practical. The summary overview of the options in this section should be read together with the tables, further below in the document, that detail the proposed options.

RDS-WHOIS2 | A “No change” option proposes to follow the phased approach that the Review Team has outlined in its [Terms of Reference \[https://community.icann.org/display/WHO/Terms+of+Reference\]](https://community.icann.org/display/WHO/Terms+of+Reference). All topics that the Review Team has agreed to consider, based on those identified within the Bylaws Section 4.6(c)(ii), would be included.

Advantages: The Review Team would continue work as planned. This option leverages the community resources already committed to this review and takes into consideration the significant amount of work that the Review Team has accomplished, particularly in the area of evaluating the implementation of the recommendations of the prior review (WHOIS1).

Disadvantages: Given the complexity of issues associated with GDPR, there is uncertainty about the timing and the extent of implications that would emerge, potentially leading to a review that is longer than planned and using more volunteer time and resources than currently anticipated. Also, the longer the duration of the review, the more difficult it may become to maintain the Review Team members' focus and participation. The Review Team is not as diverse as anticipated, with their work not having the full benefit of broader views, with three of the seven Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees represented, while concerns about the impact of the GDPR precluded the ccNSO from participation. There is a concern about setting a precedent for phased and/or longer (and more costly) reviews in the future. The Review Team's indication that they may defer some of their work until it is more clear what path ICANN will be following in relation to GDPR would result in a phased approach. A phased approach is one where the work of the review is done in stages. Depending on how long each stage or phase takes, the review might result in multiple final reports. A phased approach is not covered in the Bylaws which anticipates a single report to be delivered by the Review Team. Therefore, there would need to be additional clarity on how a phased approach would work.

Execution Needs: To execute this "No change" option, it may be prudent to gain community agreement on the Review Team's phased approach. Depending on the timing of the phased approach, the current mandated five-year cycle for Specific Reviews would pose a challenge, in that by the time that the current review has been completed, there would not be sufficient time to implement recommendations and evaluate their effectiveness before the next review would be due to start. This issue is discussed further in the [Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Reviews](#) Public Comment for community consideration and input.

Cost Savings: This option would not result in any cost savings in FY19 and depending on the length of time and amount of work associated with the phased approach, there is a possibility of exceeding the current budget allocation.

RDS-WHOIS2 | B *"Implementation of prior recommendations"* option would limit the scope of work to include only the evaluation of the implementation of prior review

recommendations. Based on the progress of the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team, most of this work could be completed in FY18.

Advantages: This option would remove the dependency on the GDPR work for the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team, resulting in a lessened strain on the Review Team as well as the ICANN community (in terms of time and attention required for public consultations). There also would be less demand on ICANN organization support and funding required for this review since much of the expected work has already been completed. When the next full RDS review is initiated, it is feasible that there will be sufficient experience with the interplay between the GDPR, WHOIS, and ICANN's policy development to more fully evaluate these issues. Also, the ccNSO may be able to participate in the next review, when the scope would include more substantive issues, thus enabling broader participation and diversity of views.

Disadvantages: Adhering to a limited scope of work could be difficult for the Review Team that has been working for over nine months under a different scope understanding.

Execution Needs: The Review Team would need to agree to limit their scope of work, which is within their ability based on the Bylaws, and for the community to consent to this limitation.

Cost Savings: Assuming that the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team would complete a substantial amount of work on the evaluation of prior review recommendations in the current FY18 fiscal year, the budget allocation for FY19 would not be needed, resulting in a potential estimated cost savings of approximately \$460,000.

RDS-WHOIS2 | C “Pause” option proposes that all RDS-WHOIS2 review work be paused.

Advantages: This means that no further work would proceed on the RDS-WHOIS2, immediately releasing the use of volunteer and ICANN resources. The pause could be lifted when the implications of GDPR on the RDS-WHOIS2 become clear. At that stage, other groups may wish to participate in the review - for example, the ccNSO - thus improving the diversity in representation on the Review Team, and including the perspective of ccTLDs.

Disadvantages: Significant community resources and effort already devoted to this review could be wasted and the momentum of work would be interrupted if the Review Team's work would be paused at this stage. Because of the uncertainty about the timing and the extent of understanding implications of the GDPR, there would be similar uncertainty about when the RDS-WHOIS2 could be unpaused. Once unpaused, there could be considerable ramp up time needed to reconvene the Review Team. Since current Review Team members may not be available once the review is unpaused, the SO/ACs would need to analyze available skills as compared to needed skills, and possibly add new Review Team members, potentially requiring a new call for volunteers and appointment procedure.

Execution Needs: The Review Team and community would need to agree on this course of action, and it would be important to also agree on the conditions needed to unpause the review as well as on the suitable timing for the pause. The current mandated five-year cycle for Specific Reviews would pose a challenge in the long-term, in that by the time the current review has been completed, once unpaused, there would not be sufficient time to implement recommendations and evaluate their effectiveness before the next review would be due to start. This issue is discussed further in the [Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Reviews](#) Public Comment for community consideration and input.

Cost Savings: The potential estimated cost savings would be approximately \$460,000, the amount of budget allocated for FY19, as well as an additional \$130,000 cost savings in FY18 (since no additional travel or professional services would be required in the current fiscal year).

RDS-WHOIS2 SHORT-TERM OPTIONS

Review Option	Potential Topics	Advantages	Disadvantages	Execution Needs	\$ Savings in FY19
<p>RDS-WHOIS2 A “No Change” Phased approach outlined in the Terms of Reference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All topics identified within Bylaws Section 4.6(c)(ii) that the RT has agreed to consider. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Allows Review Team to continue their work as planned; o Leverages community resources already committed to review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Uncertainty about timing and extent of GDPR implications; o Exceedingly long review putting a strain on volunteer and ICANN resources; o Review Team lack of focus and diminished participation; o The Review Team is not as diverse as anticipated; o Setting precedent for staged, and potentially longer and more costly reviews; o Staged approach not covered in Bylaws, which anticipates single report; need to define and provide clarity on how it would operate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o RDS-WHOIS2 and community agreement on phased approach. 	<p>None or potentially exceeding existing budget allocation</p>
<p>RDS-WHOIS2 B “Implementation of Prior Recommendations” Limit the scope of work to include only evaluation of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Review work focused only on evaluation of implementation of prior review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lessened strain on volunteer and ICANN resources; o Allow time for the implications of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Difficulties in limiting/containing scope. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Agreement by RDS-WHOIS2 RT to limit the scope; o Community support for limited scope. 	<p>\$460,000⁷</p>

⁷ Cost savings assume that RDS-WHOIS2 RT will complete substantial amount of work on the evaluation of prior review recommendations, in the current fiscal year and will not need most of the FY19 budget.

RDS-WHOIS2 SHORT-TERM OPTIONS

Review Option	Potential Topics	Advantages	Disadvantages	Execution Needs	\$ Savings in FY19
implementation of prior review recommendations (estimated completion: July 2018 - TBC); Address all other RDS topics in the next review.	recommendations.	GDPR to become clear before the next RDS review; o Broader participation and diversity of views.			
RDS-WHOIS2 C “Pause” Pause all review work after the April meeting.	o None.	o Immediate relief - lessened strain on volunteer and ICANN resources; o Allow time for the implications of GDPR to become clear; o Other groups may wish to participate in the review after the pause - for example, the ccNSO - thus improving the diversity in representation on the Review Team, and including the perspective of ccTLDs.	o Community resources already devoted to RDS-WHOIS2, and momentum could be lost; o Uncertainty about timing and extent of GDPR implications; o Ramp up time to reconvene RT once review is unpaused - current RT members may not be available once unpaused, requiring SO/ACs to analyze available vs. needed skills and possibly add new RT members.	o Review Team and community agreement on the pause; o Agreement on conditions to unpaused and timing.	\$460,000 + \$130,000 additional cost savings in FY18

Background Information

The timing of Specific and Organizational Reviews mandated by the Bylaws has resulted in multiple reviews occurring at the same time. Currently, eleven Organizational and Specific Reviews are underway in different phases of work (more information [here](https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews) [https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews]). The work associated with these reviews is extensive and has a direct impact on many parts of the ICANN community. Of the eleven reviews, there are two that are likely to have the greatest cross-community impact on volunteer participation and resources in the event their scope or schedule are modified. These are two Specific Reviews: the ATRT3; and the RDS-WHOIS2.

Specific Reviews Status

- Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CCT) Review Team is refining its final report and recommendations.
- Registration Directory Service (RDS-WHOIS2) Review Team has finalized their Terms of Reference and is progressing toward completing the evaluation of the implementation of prior review recommendations.
- Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the Domain Name System (SSR2) Review Team is progressing toward being resumed.
- Accountability and Transparency (ATRT3) Review is awaiting announcement of the Review Team, with five of seven SO/ACs having completed their nominations.

Organizational Reviews Status

Seven Organizational Reviews are also underway:

- The NRO is currently assessing the Final Report of the independent examiner for the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) Review.
- The independent examiner has issued its Final Report for the At-Large Review, with the At-Large having completed its assessment of recommendations in preparation for Board action in June 2018.

- The planning for the review of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) is underway, with the work of the independent examiner expected to start in August 2018.
- The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) is implementing recommendations from the second review of the GNSO, expected to be completed in December 2018.
- The independent examiner for the review of the Nominating Committee (NomCom) has published its Draft Final Report for public comment, with the final report expected in June 2018.
- The review of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) is underway with the final report expected in July 2018.
- The review of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) began in February 2018 with data collection and analysis underway.

The number of concurrent reviews, the resulting demand on community resources, and review-related budget requirements prompted that ICANN community, ICANN organization, and Board to consider possible avenues for short-term relief.

FY19 Budget

Relationship between the short-term discussions and the FY19 budget planning process is a theme that came up during ICANN61. The FY19 budget reflects adequate funding for any of the options, and can be adjusted accordingly to factor in any budget and resource implications based on the short-term option selected.