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Update on:
• Affirmation requirements
• Discussion on processes
• Applications for Review Teams membership
• Timeline Accountability and Transparency review
Affirmation of Commitments and reviews

• A further step towards transparency and accountability

• Reviews to be performed by Review Teams composed of:
  • Community members representing relevant SO/ACs
  • Independent experts
  • Affirmation-designated members

• Board, staff not involved in performing reviews
4 recurrent reviews

**Accountability & Transparency**
- Board governance
- GAC role & effectiveness
- Public input reception
- Support of ICANN decisions
- PDP
- Implementation recommend. previous reviews

**Security Stability Resiliency**
- DNS security stability resiliency
- Contingency planning
- Clear processes?

**3Cs: Competition Consumer trust Consumer choice**
- Effects of new gTLDs: 3Cs
- Effectiveness of processes
- Effectiveness of safeguards

**WHOIS**
- Policy effectiveness
- Meeting needs law enforcem.
- Promotion consumers trust
Membership Review Teams

Accountability & Transparency
- GAC Chair
- Board Chair
- US DoC
- Represent. of relevant SO/AC
- Independent experts

3Cs: Competition
- GAC Chair
- ICANN CEO
- Represent. of relevant SO/AC
- Independent experts

Consumer trust
- GAC Chair
- ICANN CEO
- Represent. of relevant SO/AC
- Experts
- Represent. law enforcement
- Global policy experts

Security Stability
- GAC Chair
- ICANN CEO
- Represent. of relevant SO/AC
- Experts

Resiliency
- GAC Chair
- ICANN CEO
- Represent. of relevant SO/AC
- Experts

WHOIS
- GAC Chair
- ICANN CEO
- Represent. of relevant SO/AC
- Experts
- Represent. law enforcement
- Global policy experts

Membership
### Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 9: Board meeting</th>
<th>December 234512345123</th>
<th>January 2010 12345</th>
<th>February 123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public comments discussion paper: Dec 26 - Feb 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation public comments: February 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 32 comments received, focus on:
- Methodology of reviews
- Timeline reviews and call for team members
- Size and composition review teams
- Voting rights of Selectors
- Independence of review teams
- Support of review teams
- How should public interest be defined?
Processes: next steps

✓ Discussion paper served to catalyze discussion
✓ No plans for a v.2 of methodology document
  o Review teams have original proposal and public comments for their use
  o Review teams will decide their methodology:
    • Consultation with community
    • Selection of indicators, tools
    • Supporting functions
    • Data analysis
    • .................
Call for review teams membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call volunteer A&amp;T review team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/ACs to endorse candidatures: March 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substantial coordination with SO/ACs:

- High time pressure, but deadline extended twice
- Candidatures received centrally, assessed for completeness, then forwarded to SO/ACs for endorsement
- Each SO/AC developed its own endorsement process
24 Candidates for Accountability and Transparency Review Team

- ALAC: 11 candidates
- ccNSO: 8 candidates
- GAC: 3 candidates
- GNSO: 2 candidates
24 Candidates for Accountability and Transparency Review Team

![Bar chart showing candidates by region: Europe (6), Asia Pacific (2), Latin America/Caribbean (3), North America (10), Africa (1).]

![Pie chart showing gender: 19 men, 5 women.]
• One month delay (extension of call deadline)
• Achieving deadline is doable, now in the hands of review team
• Review Team should be established by March
Thank you