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Executive Summary

Required by the ICANN Bylaws, this Annual Review Implementation Report aims to document the accountability and transparency of all ICANN review processes for Bylaws-mandated Specific Reviews. It also provides the status of ICANN’s implementation of recommendations set forth in final reports issued by review teams to the ICANN Board.

Highlights for the four Specific Reviews are summarized below. More detail on each can be found in the following pages of this report.

THIRD ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY REVIEW (ATRT3)

• The ATRT3 submitted its Final Report to the ICANN Board on 1 June 2020. It was released for Public Comment on 16 June 2020 to inform Board action on final recommendations.

• The report contains five recommendations with multiple components to enhance ICANN accountability and transparency. Four recommendations were submitted with full consensus.

• The ICANN Board is expected to take action on the recommendations by December 2020. 

READ MORE here.

COMPETITION, CONSUMER TRUST, AND CONSUMER CHOICE REVIEW (CCT)

• The CCT submitted its Final Report to the ICANN Board on 8 September 2018 and it was released for Public Comment on 8 October 2018.

• The report contains 35 recommendations, covering requests for more and better data collection, policy issues to be addressed by the community, and suggested reforms to transparency.

• The Board took action on the Final Report and recommendations on 1 March 2019. The CCT Final Resolutions Board Scorecard can be found here. The recommendations are in various stages, as noted below under the Implementation Status section.

READ MORE here.

REGISTRATION DIRECTORY SERVICE-WHOIS2 REVIEW (RDS-WHOIS2)

• The RDS submitted its Final Report on 3 September 2019 and it was released for Public Comment on 8 October 2019.

• The report contains 22 recommendations submitted with full consensus.

• A Statement of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group Member of the RDS Review Team was attached to the report (see page 125 of the Final Report).

• On 25 February 2020, the Board took action on each of the 22 recommendations issued within the RDS-WHOIS2-RT Final Report, as documented in an associated Scorecard. The recommendations are in various stages, as noted below in the Implementation Status section.

READ MORE here.
SECURITY, STABILITY AND RESILIENCY SECOND REVIEW (SSR2)

- The SSR2 published its draft report for Public Comment in January 2020.
- The report contains 31 draft recommendations with multiple components, resulting in more than 100 recommendations.
- The review team plans to submit the final report by the end of 2020.

READ MORE here.

Specific Reviews at ICANN

Specific Reviews originated under the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) in 2009 and are now mandated in Section 4.6 of the ICANN Bylaws. They are conducted by community-led review teams (RT).

Specific Reviews form an important part of ICANN’s accountability measures, continuous improvements, and maintenance of a healthy multistakeholder model. Over the past year, discussions have focused on improving different aspects of the reviews, including effectiveness, timing, prioritization, and resourcing of review processes. These discussions are summarized below under Streamlining of Review Efforts.

Annual Review Implementation Report

Section 4.5 of the ICANN Bylaws states that:

“ICANN will produce an annual report on the state of the accountability and transparency reviews, which will discuss the status of the implementation of all review processes required by Section 4.6 and the status of ICANN’s implementation of the recommendations set forth in the final reports issued by the review teams to the Board following the conclusion of such review (‘Annual Review Implementation Report’).”

Consistent with this Bylaws requirement, this Annual Review Implementation Report charts the progress of Specific Reviews and the progress of implementing the resulting recommendations.

The four Specific Reviews are:
- Accountability and Transparency (ATRT)
- Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CCT)
- Registration Directory Service (RDS)
- Security, Stability, and Resiliency (SSR)

Specific Reviews follow a documented process. The flowchart and handbook for Specific Reviews are available on the ICANN website and are updated periodically. A set of Operating Standards guides the work of review teams.

Discussions are underway in consultation with the ICANN community to develop a sustainable schedule, streamline future reviews, and address budgeting and prioritization of recommendations.
ICANN Board Oversight of Specific Reviews

The ICANN Board is responsible for the review and oversight of all Specific Reviews or any replacement or revisions to the relevant section of the Bylaws. The ICANN Board performs this work through its Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC).

The OEC’s responsibilities include the “review and oversight of policies, processes, and procedures relating to... Specific Reviews.”2 The OEC oversees the implementation of review recommendations resulting from the Specific Reviews and regularly reports to the full Board on the progress of Specific Reviews and the implementation status of the recommendations.

Additionally, the Board uses caucus groups to provide input to Specific Review teams on the scope of work, feasibility of recommendations, and other key matters. Caucus groups are small groups of Board members with expertise and interest in the particular review-related topics. The goal is to create an interactive environment where the Board can engage with the review teams to offer input and observations for review teams’ consideration on a timely basis.

Operating Standards

Operating Standards were developed with community consultation and provide guidance on conducting Specific Reviews. The standards also address required items detailed in Section 4.6(a)(i) of the Bylaws related to candidate nomination, review team selection, review team size, conflict of interest policies, decision-making procedures, solicitation of independent experts, and review team access to confidential documentation subject to the Confidential Disclosure Framework.

The Operating Standards also incorporate best practices from recent and ongoing Specific Reviews that were launched and/or conducted since October 2016, when Specific Reviews were incorporated into the ICANN Bylaws. In addition to setting out best practices, these standards describe process improvements and public comments on Long-Term Options to Adjust the Timeline for Specific Reviews.

Accountability and Transparency (ATRT) Review

BACKGROUND

The purpose, scope, and requirements for the Accountability and Transparency Review are outlined in the ICANN Bylaws Section 4.6(b). The third Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3) began in January 2017. Its full timeline and milestone can be found on the ATRT3 Review Wiki Page.

KEY ATRT LINKS


2 See the Organizational Effectiveness Committee Charter as approved by the ICANN Board of Directors on 14 March 2019: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/charter-oec-2019-04-05-en.
STATUS OF ATRT3 REVIEW
The ATRT3 Final Report was submitted to the ICANN Board on 1 June 2020, and subsequently released for Public Comment on 16 June 2020 to inform Board action on the Final Recommendations. The ATRT3 Final Report contains five recommendations with multiple components in the following areas:

• Prioritization of review and Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, Work Stream 2 (WS2) recommendations.

• Amending Specific and Organizational Reviews.

• Accountability and transparency relating to Strategic and Operational Plans including accountability indicators.

• Public input.

• Assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations.

The ICANN Board received community feedback through the Public Comment proceeding on the Final Report. It also sought feedback on the suggestion made by the ATRT3 in its 1 June 2020 letter to the ICANN Board:

“Given the recommendation in Section 8 of its report, ATRT3 is proposing significant changes to Organizational Reviews and Specific Reviews. ATRT3 strongly suggests that the ICANN Board implement a moratorium on launching any new Organizational and Specific Reviews until it has made a decision on this recommendation.”

Per the ICANN Bylaws (Section 4.6(a)(vii)(C)), the Board shall consider the final report within six months of receipt of the final report. By 1 December 2020, the Board will consider a feasibility analysis and impact assessment of the implementation of recommendations. This analysis and assessment will take into account initial cost and resource estimates, dependencies with other ongoing efforts within the community, and the report of the Public Comment submissions received. As appropriate, the Board will take action on all the recommendations and will provide rationale for its actions.

ATRT3 FACTSHEET
The graphs below offer a quick look at the makeup of ATRT3 Review Team applicants and members, as well as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).
Participation by the review team members in team meetings ranged from 78% at the start of the review to 70% upon conclusion of the review in June 2020. The review team spent approximately $330,000 through June 2020. This was 60% of its allocated budget of $550,000.
Review team members spent more than 2,500 hours in plenary, leadership, and subgroup calls through June 2020. Project managers and subject matter experts within ICANN org spent more than 900 hours on these calls.

Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT) Review

BACKGROUND
The ICANN Bylaws Section 4.6(d) outlines the scope of the CCT Review.

The scope of this first CCT Review required that the review examine how the expansion of gTLDs promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. The review also assessed the effectiveness of the New gTLD Program’s application and evaluation process, as well as the safeguards put in place to mitigate issues that arose.3

KEY CCT LINKS

STATUS OF CCT REVIEW
The CCT Final Report was submitted 8 September 2018. The Board took action in March 2019, accepted six recommendations, placed 17 recommendations into “pending” status for further analysis, and passed through some recommendations to other parts of the community as stated in the CCT Final Report. More information is in the CCT Implementation section.

3 The CCT Review referenced in this report began under the Affirmation of Commitments as a review of the first round of the New gTLD Program. As the Final Report was released after the Specific Reviews were incorporated in the Bylaws, the ICANN Board and org followed the Bylaws' obligations in consideration of and reporting on the recommendations made by the CCT Review Team.
The CCT Review Team was announced in December 2015 and was composed of 17 community representatives and volunteer subject matter experts as stipulated in the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) Section 9.3. The graphs below offer a quick look at the makeup of CCT Review Team applicants and members, as well as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).
Upon conclusion of the review, overall participation by the Review Team members was 64%.

Review Team members spent more than 3,400 hours in plenary, leadership, and subgroups calls through June 2019. Project managers and subject matter experts within ICANN org spent approximately 1,800 hours on these calls.

The Board took action on the Final Report and recommendations on 1 March 2019. The CCT Final Resolutions Board Scorecard can be found here. The recommendations are in various stages, as noted below in the Implementation Status section.

Registration Directory Service (RDS) Review

BACKGROUND
The purpose, scope, and goals of the Registration Directory Service (RDS) Review are detailed in Bylaws Section 4.6(e).

KEY RDS LINKS

STATUS OF RDS-WHOIS2 REVIEW
The RDS-WHOIS2-RT produced 22 final recommendations for Board consideration and released its Final Report on 3 September 2019. The Board approved 15, rejected two, and placed four recommendations in pending status due to dependencies on ongoing community work.
As required by Section 4.6 of ICANN Bylaws, the Final Report was published for Public Comment to inform Board action on the final recommendations. On 25 February 2020, the Board took action on each of the 22 Recommendations issued within the RDS-WHOIS2-RT Final Report, as documented in an associated Scorecard. The recommendations are in various stages, as noted below in the Implementation Status section.

More information is in the RDS Implementation Status section in this report.

RDS-WHOIS2 FACTSHEET
The RDS-WHOIS2 Review was initiated with a call for volunteers in October 2016.4

After the call for volunteers was extended three times, the review received 38 applications. The SO/AC Chairs made the final selection of the review team in June 2017.

The graphs below offer a quick look at the makeup of the RDS Review Team applicants and members, as well as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

4 The first review effort concluded in 2012 through the WHOIS Policy Review Team.
The review team completed all of its milestones when it submitted its Final Report to the Board in September 2019. Participation by the review team members in team meetings ranged from 82% at the start of the review to 71% by August 2019. The review team spent approximately $230,000, which was 42% of its allocated budget of $550,000.

Review team members spent approximately 1,150 hours in plenary, leadership, and subgroup calls through September 2019. Project managers and subject matter experts within ICANN org spent approximately 785 hours on these calls.
Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS (SSR) Review

BACKGROUND
Section 4.6(c) of the Bylaws sets out the scope and parameters of the SSR Review.

The second SSR Review (SSR2) was initiated in June 2016.5

STATUS OF SSR2 REVIEW
The SSR2 published its Draft Report for Public Comment in January 2020. It contained 31 draft recommendations, many of which have components, resulting in more than 100 recommendations in total in the following areas:

• Implementation and impact of recommendations from the first SSR review.
• Key stability issues within ICANN.
• Security, stability, and resilience of the Domain Name System (DNS).
• Future challenges.

The SSR2 is working on amending the report, with consideration given to public comments received and the global public interest. It is anticipated that the SSR2-RT will issue a final report in October 2020.

SSR2 - FACTSHEET
The graphs below offer a quick look at the makeup of SSR2 Review Team applicants and members, as well as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

---

4 The first iteration – SSR1 - concluded in June 2012.
The review team completed 85% of its milestones as of June 2020. Overall, participation by the review team members in team meetings ranged from 76% at the start of the review to 65% by June 2020. The Board approved additional funding in November 2019 as requested by the review team. Over the course of the review, the review team has spent approximately $630,000, 79% of its revised allocated budget of $800,000 as of June 2020.
Review team members spent more than 2,800 hours (617 hours in FY20) in plenary, leadership, and subgroup calls through June 2020. Project managers and subject matter experts within ICANN org spent approximately 1,450 hours (approximately 275 hours in FY20) on these calls.

Streamlining of Review Efforts

The Bylaws-anchored timing and cadence of Organizational and Specific Reviews leaves very little room for implementation of recommendations, testing out effects of implementation, or planning for the next cycle. Moreover, the schedule has resulted in multiple reviews occurring concurrently, creating a strain on the volunteer community’s bandwidth and ICANN resources.

The Board is engaging in a discussion to determine appropriate steps for streamlining reviews, and related resourcing and prioritization. This is coupled with the prioritization-related dialogue occurring within the community. For additional information on this, please also see ICANN Board Chairman’s October 2019 blog post.

The ATRT3 Final Report includes proposed amendments to the Specific and Organizational Reviews process that have an impact on scheduling and resources. The Final Report was published for Public Comment on 16 June 2020, along with the review team’s recommendation to the ICANN Board:

“Given the recommendation in Section 8 of its report, ATRT3 is proposing significant changes to Organizational Reviews and Specific Reviews. ATRT3 strongly suggests that the ICANN Board implement a moratorium on launching any new Organizational and Specific Reviews until it has made a decision on this recommendation.”

The ICANN Board is expected to take action on the recommendations by December 2020, with consideration given to public comments received as well as a feasibility analysis and impact assessment.
Prioritization of Implementation Efforts

ICANN org supports the community-based activities that lead to reviews recommendations, cross-community working group recommendations, policy drafts, and advice recommendations. After the Board adopts these recommendations and policies, the implementation work of design, planning, scheduling, and delivery starts.

**RESOURCE ALLOCATION**

Implementation efforts are primarily supported by ICANN org resources as needed. Additional specific resources may be required on a case-by-case basis. During the annual planning cycle, the implementation activities expected during the year are incorporated into the annual operating plan.

The Board believes that implementation work, where no significant incremental costs and resources are needed, should begin as soon as possible. This sentiment is reflected in Board actions on the Plan for Implementation of CCT-RT Accepted Recommendations and the RDS-WHOIS2 Final Recommendations. Any recommendations that require significant resources and budget should be included in operational planning and budgeting processes, allowing for appropriate community consideration and prioritization of planned work.

**CURRENT RECOMMENDATION WORKLOAD**

Approximately 180 community recommendations resulted from the following review teams: Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2 (CCWG-WS2), ATRT3, CCT, and RDS-WHOIS2. More are expected from SSR2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th># of total issued rec.</th>
<th># of Board-adopted recommendations</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCWG-WS2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>• Final Report</td>
<td>Board adopted each consensus recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Board Resolution</td>
<td>Final Report submitted 29 May; Board receipt 1 June 2020; Public Comment proceeding ongoing and Board action forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATRT3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>• Final Report</td>
<td>Final Report issued; Board receipt of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Board Receipt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Board Resolution</td>
<td>Board took action on the recommendations: six accepted; 17 pending (in whole or in part); 14 passed through to other parts of the community (in whole or in part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scorecard</td>
<td>Work is underway on pending recommendations; Board took action on plan for implementation of six recommendations in January 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Comment Proceeding on Accepted Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Board action on implementation of six accepted recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS-WHOIS2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>• Final Report</td>
<td>Board took action on the recommendations: 15 approved, four in pending, two passed through to the GNSO, two rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Comment Proceeding</td>
<td>Production of the implementation plan is underway. Four recommendations in pending status will be considered in due course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Board Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY PRIORITIZE?
Community-issued recommendations are numerous, complex, and require significant time and resources to implement effectively. In some instances, there are dependencies on other community work and events occur. Neither the ICANN Bylaws nor the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews provide a clear and consistent methodology or basis for evaluating resource requirements associated with community recommendations, prioritizing recommendations across the universe of review teams and cross-community working groups, or for budgeting for prioritized recommendations.

Implementing all recommendations at once while continuing core ICANN work is not practicable. However, an opportunity exists to identify interdependencies and connections to related projects and to prioritize resources to achieve the intended impact from community recommendations. In assessing how to implement recommendations, factors such as resourcing, prioritization, timing, and interdependencies need to be identified and considered as part of the overall planning in a collaborative way.

PRIORITIZATION DISCUSSIONS AND EFFORTS TO DATE
In June 2019, the Board began a conversation with the leadership of all Specific Review teams to share thoughts on the need to enhance the effectiveness of review recommendations and their implementation, with a focus on resourcing and prioritization of community recommendations. This conversation led to a draft proposal titled Resourcing and Prioritization of Community Recommendations, which was socialized with the community in October 2019. In this draft proposal, the Board suggested an effectiveness framework that includes ideas to facilitate resourcing and prioritization of recommendations in the future.

At the November 2019 public session during ICANN66, the Board and community discussed the challenges that implementing the large number of community recommendations will pose to both the org and community, and stressed the need for prioritization within the context of broader ICANN work.

During the work processes of the ATRT3 and SSR2 review teams, the Board emphasized the importance of producing effective prioritized recommendations. The Board noted that system-wide prioritization cannot take place in isolation and must fit into existing budget and planning mechanisms. (See Board comments on draft reports of ATRT3 and SSR2).

In its Final Report submitted to the Board on 1 June 2020, the ATRT3 team included recommendations on both streamlining of reviews as well as the prioritization and resourcing of recommendations. The ATRT3 notably recommended “guidance for ICANN org in the creation of a community-led entity tasked with operating a prioritization process for recommendations made by review teams, cross-community groups, or any other community-related budgetary elements the Board or ICANN org feels appropriate.”

The paper titled “Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN’s Multistakeholder Model – Next Steps,” posted for Public Comment on 4 June 2020, identifies “Prioritization of Work and Efficient Use of Resources” as among the community’s top three priorities. The document includes a proposed Work Plan anticipated to stretch over the course of FY21–25. This timing aligns with that of both ICANN’s Strategic Plan and Five-Year Operating & Financial Plan.

With the FY21 budget approved by the Board in May 2020, ICANN org began planning for its FY22 budget. The FY22 budget will include prioritization and implementation of recommendations in the context of broader ICANN work and other activities requiring resources and funding. A subset of Board-approved and community-issued recommendations that require minimal incremental resources and funding has already been prioritized for and moved into implementation.
ICANN org continued the prioritization conversation with SO/AC leadership in January and June 2020. Clear agreement emerged from the dialogue about next steps. In summary, participants agreed upon an urgent need to prioritize community and org’s work. They also acknowledged the importance of avoiding voluminous, complex, and overlapping review outcomes in the future. Community leaders were asked to discuss the following four suggested paths forward with their members:

- Assembling a small group of nominated representatives from each community structure, with relevant expertise and experience, to work with ICANN org on categorizing recommendations and identifying limitations.
- Creating a tracking register that documents status, dependencies, and limitations.
- Soliciting review team/WS2 leads’ input on top three or five recommendations.
- Designing an agreed set of parameters that can be applied by ICANN org to the recommendations.

ICANN org’s recently announced organizational changes to incorporate review recommendations work into the overarching planning process will help streamline the planning process, improve collaboration at the planning stage within the org and across the community, and contribute to prioritizing activities in the mid- and long-term.

**Implementation Status**

**CCT IMPLEMENTATION**

In March 2019, the Board took action on the CCT Final Report. In a subsequent blog, then-Board Chair Cherine Chalaby explained how the Board considered the CCT Final Recommendations and provided context for the Board’s decision to conduct phased implementation.

Recognizing that the Board has the obligation and responsibility to plan and manage the work of ICANN org in order to preserve the ability for ICANN org to serve its Mission and the public interest, the Board established three categories of action, as documented in the Scorecard associated with the Board resolution:

- Six recommendations were accepted (resolution 2019.03.01.03), subject to costing and implementation considerations.
- Seventeen recommendations (resolution 2019.03.01.04) were placed in pending status (in whole or in part). The Board committed to take further action on these recommendations subsequent to the completion of intermediate steps, as identified in the Scorecard.
- Fourteen recommendations were passed through (in whole or in part) to community groups the CCT-RT identified for their consideration.

**ACCEPTED CCT RECOMMENDATIONS**

In September 2019, ICANN org posted a Plan for Implementation of accepted recommendations for Public Comment in accordance with the Board’s March 2019 resolution. In January 2020, the Board directed ICANN org to commence implementation of the accepted CCT-RT recommendations, as proposed in the Plan for Implementation. They also called for implementation work to begin as soon as possible, where no significant incremental costs and resources are needed and subject to availability of resources within the context of broader ICANN work. Any accepted CCT recommendations that require significant resources and budget should be included into operational planning and budgeting processes, allowing for appropriate community consideration and prioritization, as applicable, of planned work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update as of 30 June 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1</strong> - Formalize and promote ongoing data collection.</td>
<td>ICANN org is preparing to begin the “Model Definition” phase. Implementation will take place in phases, with existing resources used for the initial definition and planning stages. Ongoing and operational activities may have incremental costs related to staffing, procurement, software, and other tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 17</strong> - ICANN should collect data about and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations.</td>
<td>Implementation is complete, consistent with current policy requirements. ICANN org will review and report on any implementation work needed as a result of ongoing or future policy work conducted by the ICANN community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 21</strong> - Include more detailed information on the subject matter of complaints in ICANN publicly available compliance reports. Specifically, more precise data on the subject matter of complaints, particularly: (1) the class/type of abuse; (2) the gTLD that is target of the abuse; (3) the safeguard that is at risk; (4) an indication of whether complaints relate to the protection of sensitive health or financial information; (5) what type of contractual breach is being complained of; and (6) resolution status of the complaints, including action details. These details would assist future review teams in their assessment of these safeguards.</td>
<td>Contractual Compliance had already included four of these factors (class/type of abuse, safeguard at risk, documented risk to sensitive health or financial information, and type of contractual breach) in its reporting, as noted by the Board in its 1 March 2019 Board resolution on the CCT Final Report. A fifth data point offering “resolution status of the complaints, including action details” was added in August 2019. With respect to the recommendation that the reporting should include the gTLD being abused, the Board directed ICANN org to “investigate the potential negative impacts of implementing this item on enforcement of compliance, track this effort and propose a mitigation plan in case of any negative effects.” Although ICANN Contractual Compliance has the data, discussion and alignment within the org and/or community is required on how to approach publishing such information. Completion of this step is contingent on ongoing community discussions pertaining to reaching a common understanding of what DNS abuse is, and related terms, as well as best practices that the DNS industry could adopt, expand or improve upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 22</strong> - Initiate engagement with relevant stakeholders to determine what best practices are being implemented to offer reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of services that involve the gathering of sensitive health and financial information. Such a discussion could include identifying what falls within the categories of “sensitive health and financial information” and what metrics could be used to measure compliance with this safeguard.</td>
<td>ICANN org is preparing to begin development and execution of the Engagement Plan. ICANN org has identified that this recommendation can be implemented using existing resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 30</strong> - Expand and improve outreach into the Global South.</td>
<td>Implementation of this recommendation depends on completion of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG work. The delivery of a report on engagement with underserved or underrepresented stakeholders is connected to the overall communications strategy associated with another gTLD round and is related to Recommendation 29 (passed through to the GNSO). Ongoing engagement to diverse stakeholders and regions as well as cross-functional work continues ahead of the planning for another gTLD round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 31</strong> - The ICANN org organization to coordinate the pro bono assistance program.</td>
<td>This recommendation is contingent upon whether or not the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group recommends that the pro bono assistance program should continue. ICANN org would develop a detailed implementation plan for the pro bono assistance program as part of the overall implementation plan for the next round of new gTLDs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PENDING CCT RECOMMENDATIONS
ICANN org is working diligently to address the additional information the Board requested in the Scorecard associated with the Board resolution. The Scorecard detailed expected actions ranging from ICANN org analyzing and identifying gaps in a particular area of work, to engaging a third party to analyze the data types needed, and reporting on work done to date. The Board committed to resolve the pending status and take appropriate action on these recommendations once it receives the additional information and ICANN org addresses the Board’s questions.

ICANN org regularly consults with the Board caucus group on the CCT-RT in order to finalize its analyses and prepare for Board action. Based on the work completed to date, the Board expects to make a decision on some of these recommendations in the first quarter of FY21.

PASS-THROUGH CCT RECOMMENDATIONS
The Board received GNSO Council’s initial response in September 2019 and continues to welcome any updates from designated community groups to which CCT-RT recommendations are addressed.

RDS-WHOIS2 Implementation
As noted in its 25 February 2020 resolution and the associated Scorecard, the Board resolved to approve 15 recommendations, in whole or in part, and directed ICANN org to produce an implementation plan. In line with the approach for CCT-RT recommendations, the Board believes that implementation work should begin as soon as possible, where no significant incremental costs and resources are needed and subject to availability of resources within the context of broader ICANN work. Any recommendations that require significant resources and budget should be included into operational planning and budgeting processes, allowing for appropriate community consideration and prioritization, as applicable, of planned work.

Furthermore, the Board rejected two recommendations and placed four recommendations into pending status. For the pending recommendations, the Board called for an impact assessment of the outcomes of ongoing community work, for which dependencies were identified. The Board will consider pending recommendations in due course, in light of an impact analysis to be completed after Board action on the Expedited Policy Development Process on Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data (EPDP) Phase 2 recommendations (as appropriate and applicable). Two recommendations were passed through to the GNSO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.1</strong> To ensure that RDS (WHOIS) is treated as a strategic priority, the ICANN Board should put into place a forward-looking mechanism to monitor possible impacts on the RDS (WHOIS) from legislative and policy developments around the world.</td>
<td>The corresponding activities are already part of ICANN’s plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.2</strong> To support this mechanism, the ICANN Board should instruct the ICANN org to assign responsibility for monitoring legislative and policy developments around the world and to provide regular updates to the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>ICANN org has already assigned responsibility for monitoring legislative and policy developments around the world and for providing regular updates to the ICANN Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.3</strong> The ICANN Board, in drafting the Charter of a Board working group on RDS, should ensure the necessary transparency of the group’s work, such as providing records of meetings and meeting minutes, to enable future review of its activities.</td>
<td>Work is underway to determine which measures must be implemented to ensure the work of the Board working group is transparent and to provide relevant information on its activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation

**R3.1** The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN org to update all of the information related to RDS (WHOIS) and by implication other information related to the registration of second-level gTLDs. The content should be revised to make the information readily accessible and understandable, and it should provide details of when and how to interact with ICANN org or contracted parties. Although not the sole focus of this recommendation, interactions with ICANN organization Contractual Compliance, such as when filing WHOIS Inaccuracy Reports, should be a particular focus. The revision of this web documentation and instructional material should not be undertaken as a purely internal operation but should include users and potentially focus groups to ensure that the final result fully meets the requirements. The resultant outward facing documentation of registrant and RDS (WHOIS) issues should be kept up to date as changes are made to associated policy or processes.

- **Status Update**: ICANN org has begun to redraft the content and navigation of the [WHOIS portal](#).

**R3.2** With community input, the ICANN Board should instruct the ICANN org to identify groups outside of those that routinely engage with ICANN org, and these should be targeted through RDS (WHOIS) outreach. An RDS (WHOIS) outreach plan should then be developed, executed, and documented. There should be an ongoing commitment to ensure that as RDS (WHOIS) policy and processes change, the wider community is made aware of such changes. WHOIS inaccuracy reporting was identified as an issue requiring additional education and outreach and may require a particular focus. RDS (WHOIS) outreach should be included when considering communications in underserved regions. The need for and details of the outreach may vary depending on the ultimate General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) implementation and cannot be detailed at this point.

- **Status Update**: As the GNSO’s Expedited Policy Development Process on Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data (EPDP) and the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) phased implementation could impact the information or the messaging to be delivered by ICANN to new target groups, work will begin as soon as the dependency on outcomes of the EPDP has been resolved.

**R10.2** Reviewing the effectiveness of the implementation of WHOIS1 Recommendation 10 should be deferred. The ICANN Board should recommend that review be carried out by the next RDS (WHOIS) Review Team after PPSAI policy is implemented.

- **Status Update**: The ATRT3 recommendation to suspend any further RDS and SSR Reviews until the next ATRT may impact implementation, depending on Board action taken on the ATRT3 Final Report.

**R11.2** The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN org to ensure that the common interface displays all applicable output for each gTLD domain name registration as available from contracted parties, including multiple versions when the outputs from registry and registrar differ. The common interface should be updated to address any policy or contractual changes to maintain full functionality.

- **Status Update**: While programming is needed to address the first portion of the recommendation, ICANN org is already compliant with the second portion of the recommendation. RDAP was designed with the future need to update or address any future policy or contractual changes.

**R12.1** Reviewing the effectiveness of the implementation of Recs #12-14 should be deferred. The ICANN Board should recommend that review to be carried out by the next RDS Review Team after RDAP is implemented, and the translation and transliteration of the registration data launches.

- **Status Update**: The ATRT3 recommendation to suspend any further RDS and SSR Reviews until the next ATRT may impact implementation, depending on Board action taken on the ATRT3 Final Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R15.1</strong> The ICANN Board should ensure that implementation of RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team recommendations is based on best practice project management methodology, ensuring that plans and implementation reports clearly address progress, and applicable metrics and tracking tools are used for effectiveness and impact evaluation.</td>
<td>ICANN org’s recently announced organizational changes to incorporate reviews recommendations work into the overarching planning process will help improve current practices and tools used to implement recommendations effectively and report on implementation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LE.1</strong> The ICANN Board should resolve that ICANN org conduct regular data gathering through surveys and studies to inform a future assessment of the effectiveness of RDS (WHOIS) in meeting the needs of law enforcement. This will also aid future policy development (including the current Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process and related efforts).</td>
<td>As implementation of the recommendation cannot be completed in time for the EPDP Phase 2, ICANN org, in consultation with GNSO, will identify an appropriate timeline to help inform future work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LE.2</strong> The ICANN Board should consider conducting comparable surveys and/or studies (as described in LE.1) with other RDS (WHOIS) users working with law enforcement on a regular basis.</td>
<td>As implementation of the recommendation cannot be completed in time for the EPDP Phase 2, ICANN org in consultation with GNSO will identify an appropriate timeline to help inform future work. Moreover, this recommendation could be paired with the use of other survey and feedback mechanisms across ICANN org to ensure there is a coordinated process for surveying the community and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG.1</strong> The ICANN Board should require that the ICANN org, in consultation with data security and privacy expert(s), ensure that all contracts with contracted parties (to include Privacy/Proxy services when such contracts exist) include uniform and strong requirements for the protection of registrant data and for ICANN to be notified in the event of any data breach. The data security expert(s) should also consider and advise on what level or magnitude of breach warrants such notification. In carrying out this review, the data security and privacy expert(s) should consider to what extent GDPR regulations, which many but not all ICANN contracted parties are subject to, could or should be used as a basis for ICANN requirements. The ICANN Board should initiate action intended to effect such changes. The ICANN Board should consider whether and to what extent notifications of breaches that it receives should be publicly disclosed.</td>
<td>This will be included in the next round of contractual negotiations with the contracted parties, insofar as it relates to ICANN receiving notification of data breaches in circumstances that threaten to undermine the stability, security, and resiliency of the Internet’s DNS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC.1</strong> The ICANN Board should initiate action intended to ensure that gTLD domain names suspended due to RDS (WHOIS) contact data which the registrar knows to be incorrect, and that remains incorrect until the registration is due for deletion, should be treated as follows: (1) The RDS (WHOIS) record should include a notation that the domain name is suspended due to incorrect data; and (2) Domain names with this notation should not be unsuspended without correcting the data.</td>
<td>This recommendation was approved in part and is to be included in the next round of contractual negotiations with the contracted parties. The Board passed through this recommendation to the GNSO Council to consider as a future policy development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC.2</strong> The ICANN Board should initiate action intended to ensure that all gTLD domain name registration directory entries contain at least one full set of either registrant or admin contact details comparable to those required for new registrations under the 2013 RAA (or any subsequent version thereof) or applicable policies.</td>
<td>This recommendation is part of EPDP Phase 1 implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC.3</strong> The ICANN Board should take steps to ensure that ICANN Contractual Compliance is adequately resourced factoring in any increase in work due to additional work required due to compliance with GDPR or other legislation/regulation.</td>
<td>This recommendation is already included in the existing budgeting and planning process. Compliance will continue to request required resources as part of the existing planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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