Summary of comments on the ACSO collaborative workspace following discussions at the Sydney meeting.

A joint session of the Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations was held at the Sydney meeting in June 2009. A summary of the output of that session was posted in a collaborative workspace so that members of the community could comment and make suggestions for resolving the issues that had been identified. The comments that were received have been compiled under the headings used in the summary posted on the ICANN website.

SUMMARY OF ACSO SYDNEY SESSION

**Frustration and exhaustion**

*There is a huge volume of work and everyone struggles to get through it and so stay up to date on issues.*

One comment was received.

There is a need to get more people involved. Most of the work is currently done by a relatively small core group.

*There is a lack of visibility of the impact that volunteer input has on decision making, particularly for Board decisions.*

Nine comments were received.

Where there really has been an impact, that impact is visible although the names of those who contributed through the bottom-up process may not be known.

Volunteers contribute best when they are engaged with effectively and this includes giving feedback on the impact that their contribution has made.

Comments are often ignored – the IRT process was cited as an example of this. More effort should be put into effectively summarizing comments that have been received.

The comment and revision process can seem never ending. Some things are never deemed final and decided.

Each of the ACs and SOs is treated differently. There needs to be a consistent “best practice” model applied to input from all parts of the community.

**Also:**

*The purpose, roles and responsibilities of volunteers, staff and Board are not clear.*

Six comments were received.

The role of staff is not clear. The difference between operational roles and support roles is sometimes blurred. This is a particular issue for Policy staff. Perhaps Policy staff should report to the policy development bodies that they serve, or at least there should be input from the policy body into the regular performance review process.
Policy staff should be facilitators of the process, not advocates in the process. Having greater diversity in the policy staff may help with this.

*Levels of trust are low.*

No comments were received.

*The Board operates at too operational a level.*

Three comments were received.
The Board needs to be more involved, “a board of worker bees not queen bees”. This need not mean being more operational but rather being interacting more with policy groups.

What the Board does day to day is not very transparent and it is therefore difficult to know if the Board is too operational or not.

*The current processes are not scalable, particularly as the organization continues to grow and internationalize.*

One comment was received.

The improvements work in the GNSO is trying to address this issue. Progress has been made, but there is still a way to go.

**Possible solutions to these issues were raised:**

- *Prioritization of the workload*
  No comments were received.

- *Better scoping of issues at the start of policy processes. This should involve all SOs and ACs.*
  There was one comment supporting this solution.

- *Improving accessibility to issues by providing summaries*
  No comments were received.

- *Working together to clarify purpose, roles and responsibilities*
  No comments were received.

- *Leaders acknowledging that building trust is part of their role*
  No comments were received.

- *Taking time to analyse the root cause of the frustration*
  No comments were received.

- *Improve contact between groups, perhaps through issue-focussed meetings*
No comments were received.