

ATRT3 Recommendation 2

Implementation Report

Implementation Operations
9 February 2024



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble	4
BOARD	4
ATRT2 Recommendation 1	4
ATRT2 Recommendation 2	6
ATRT2 Recommendation 3	8
ATRT2 Recommendation 4	9
ATRT2 Recommendation 5	11
ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1	12
ATRT2 Recommendation 9.2	14
ATRT2 Recommendation 9.3	15
ATRT2 Recommendation 9.5	16
ATRT2 Recommendation 10.5	17
ATRT2 Recommendation 12.1	17
ATRT2 Recommendation 12.2	18
ATRT2 Recommendation 12.3	18
ATRT2 Recommendation 12.4	20
ATRT2 Recommendation 12.5	21
GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GAC)	21
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1a	21
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1b	23
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1c	23
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1d	24
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1e	25
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1f	26
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1g	26
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1h	27
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.2	28
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.3	28
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.4	28
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.5	29
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.6	29
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.7	31
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.8	32
ATRT2 Recommendation 6.9	33
PUBLIC INPUT	33
ATRT2 Recommendation 7.1	33
ATRT2 Recommendation 7.2	34
ATRT2 Recommendation 8	34
ATRT2 Recommendation 9.4	36
POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDP)	36
ATRT2 Recommendation 10.1	36
ATRT2 Recommendation 10.2	38
ATRT2 Recommendation 10.3	39

ATRT2 Recommendation 10.4	40
REVIEWS	41
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.1	41
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.2	42
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.3	43
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.4	44
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.5	45
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.6	45
ATRT2 Recommendation 11.7	46

Preamble

This report serves to address Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT3) Recommendation 2: “ICANN org shall review the implementation of ATRT2 Recommendations in light of ATRT3’s assessment and complete their implementation subject to prioritization.”

The ATRT3 Review Team assessed the ATRT2 recommendations as follows:

Implemented	25
Partially implemented	13
Not implemented	8

This report contains the ATRT3 assessment of the ICANN organization (org)’s implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, and provides ICANN org follow-up to the “partially implemented” and “not implemented” recommendations as well as evidence of their implementation.

ATRT3 Recommendation 2 was assigned priority level “4”, the lowest level, at the end of the pilot prioritization exercise that took place in the second calendar quarter of 2022.

In the sections below, the text in italics is the assessment of the ATRT3 Review Team.

BOARD

ATRT2 Recommendation 1

Recommendation 1 - The Board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and the success of Board improvement efforts and analyze those findings over time.

Implementation – The Board ensures that all Board members complete Board Member Skills Assessment and has developed both general on-boarding training programs for new Directors as well as individual training programs to address any gaps in skills to ensure Board members are properly equipped for the job. General Board training materials are available on the ICANN site. Overall, these efforts have ensured that the quality of the Board has improved over time, but no detailed data is available to support this as required in the recommendation. It should be noted that measuring the quality of Board members and performing an analysis of this over time has not been done and that it would be futile to do so given the Board does not select its members. Improvements in the NomCom as part of its review are addressing some of these issues in cooperation with the Board.

Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness – As it is only partly implemented it is not possible to gauge effectiveness. Effectiveness assessment - Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: The recommendation has been partly implemented. Given constraints on the Board described above, the review team provides no follow up recommendation or suggestion.

ICANN org follow-up

The ICANN org is not in the position to measure the quality of Board members before their appointment and can only accept the decisions made by the different stakeholders groups and the Nominating Committee (NomCom). The ICANN org has no ability and/or responsibility to define or measure skills of new Board members.

Since 2017, every December the ICANN Board sends a communication to the NomCom Chair with “Guidance from the ICANN Board to the Nominating Committee Re: Important Skills for Board Members”. Refer to the [2022 communication](#) for additional information.

The guidance provides the NomCom with the current Board’s views on characteristics and skills that they believe “will enable meaningful contribution to the Board’s work and enhance the Board’s effectiveness. These characteristics are drawn from three distinct sources: the ICANN Bylaws; considerations related to continuity and diversity; and specific skills of value to ICANN’s Board.”¹

A balanced and well-functioning Board is essential. Therefore, rather than looking at individual skills sets only, attention should be paid to the full Board’s profile. The ICANN org constantly reassesses skills based on upcoming changes (e.g., in preparation for end of tenure of Board members). This assessment informs the content of the aforementioned guidance.

Additionally, for several years now, the ICANN org has asked Board newcomers to take the [34 Clifton Strengths assessment survey](#) which helps provide a detailed snapshot of the Board’s skills at every Annual General Meeting.

Moreover, as part of the onboarding process, each Board newcomer is requested to submit a self-assessment of their experience/expertise in all major areas identified as key to the ICANN Board of Directors: governance (incl. in U.S. incorporated or not-for-profit organizations, for instance); finance, audit, unique identifiers system.

The Board Governance Committee (BGC), supported by the ICANN Legal and Board Operations teams, then runs a skills gap analysis. This analysis is not intended to measure the quality of the Board members per se, rather it proposes or encourages training that could help develop the skills of Board members and facilitate their role as ICANN Directors.

Finally, every two years the Board undertakes a survey to self-evaluate the Board’s performance. The survey consists of 25 questions divided in four different categories: Board culture and environment, Board effectiveness, Board ethics, and Board roles. It is administered by an external independent consultant.

Introducing a key performance indicator (KPI) culture and approach, which includes the development of objective metrics to measure any individual’s skill set and measurements for their improvements over time, represents a challenge. Therefore, with the support of external experts, the ICANN org has explored options to help the BGC determine a first set of minimum skills based on best practices in nonprofit public benefit corporations, as explained in the yearly guidance that the ICANN CEO sends to the Board Chair. Based on the above work and the self-assessment outcome, the BGC Chair develops a training plan.

The guidance issued by the ICANN org to the NomCom coupled with the various Board assessment steps and the training offered to the Board members demonstrate the following:

¹ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/deutsch-to-gayyum-20dec23-en.pdf>

that measures are in place to check, ensure, and monitor membership quality and that actions to fill possible expertise gaps are developed regularly.

ATRT2 Recommendation 2

Recommendation 2 - The Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.

Implementation

The following indicators have been developed and published

- *Achievement of globally diverse culture and knowledge levels – Board with the per region distribution of Board members: FY19*
- *Achievement of Global Knowledge Development Programs – Board with 3 elements:*
 - *Board training by fiscal year*
 - *Board composition: FY19*
 - *Board training sessions: FY19*
- *Regarding measuring the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts, there is no specific information. There is only some data about training. Implementation assessment – Not Implemented.*
- *Regarding the publication of the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement. Some information is available. Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented.*

Overall Implementation Assessment – Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: The executive summary which was provided as an implementation report for ATRT2 recommendations only discusses assessment of Board member skills and training except for one item which states:

“Initial set of KPIs including training efficiency and Board Performance documented and vetted with the BGC and the Board in preparation for operationalization.”

Now KPIs have evolved into the accountability indicators which were initially published in August 2019 (see Section 11 of this report for more information on these as well as an assessment by ATRT3). The only section of the accountability indicators which touches on the Board is a small portion of Objective 3, Goal 3.3, which addresses the geographic diversity of the Board. This does not address developing “metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts,” as required by the recommendation.

When ICANN org was asked about these metrics, ATRT3 was referred to the accountability indicators as the only metrics available.

Various other sections of the accountability indicators do offer some other metrics, such as the time for publishing annual reports, agendas, and minutes of Board meetings vs. targets, etc., which are useful.

Suggestion: Given the results of the ATRT3 survey show limited satisfaction on Board performance, transparency, and decision-taking, the ATRT3 makes the following suggestions:

- *The Board should establish the same targets it uses for publishing agendas and minutes of Board meetings for the agendas and minutes of all its official committees and publish these in the accountability indicators.*
- *All of the relevant indicators of Board performance should be grouped in a single area of the accountability indicators.*
- *Board minutes should indicate how members voted, including in Executive Sessions.*
- *Board minutes should include, in addition to the rationale, summaries of the main discussion points covered prior to taking votes.*

ICANN org follow-up

With reference to “measuring the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts”, the main KPI is the ability of the Board to deliver successfully on all Bylaw-mandated aspects (e.g., publication of the Board meetings’ agendas in due time, publication of minutes in due time). The Bylaw-mandated deadlines are the best KPI to demonstrate Board effectiveness. Data regarding the trainings attended by the Board should not be used as a KPI to measure Board effectiveness as to date it is not possible to correlate the attendance of a training with a possible, subsequent effectiveness of the attendee.

Regarding the publication of materials for the Board training, the majority is covered by copyright. Therefore, while it can be shared with the attendees, the materials cannot be published. This is a common, worldwide practice for training materials. Their publication cannot be viewed as evidence that these materials have become part of the Board member literacy and have contributed to possible improvement.

The initial set of KPIs, including efficiency and Board performance documented and vetted with the Board Governance Committee and the Board in preparation for operationalization, has evolved since the ATRT2 Review into a very complete set of measures including, as mentioned above, trainings, self-assessments, and the Board evaluation survey.

With reference to the ATRT3 survey findings and subsequent suggestions:

- “The Board should establish the same targets it uses for publishing agendas and minutes of Board meetings for the agendas and minutes of all its official committees”. The agenda of any Committee meeting is published ahead of time. Minutes are also made available. Please see the [Board online webpages](#) for resources, which include a search tool.
- “Board minutes should indicate how members voted, including in Executive Sessions” and “Board minutes should include, in addition to the rationale, summaries of the main discussion points covered prior to taking votes”. These requests are already implemented. See, for instance, the [preliminary report](#) of a recent Board meeting that indicates how the Board voted.

The information provided above [Preliminary Report | Regular Meeting of the ICANN Board | 21 January 2023](#) demonstrates that ATRT2 Recommendation 2 has been implemented to the possible extent and that the ATRT3 suggestions have been also addressed subsequently.

ATRT2 Recommendation 3

Recommendation 3 - The Board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time and should regularly assess Directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards.

Implementation: This is broadly implemented by the Board Governance Committee. There are annual skills surveys that the Board forwards to the NomCom to help it identify skill gaps in the current board. It is not known whether SOs and ACs are informed about the skill survey so that SOs and ACs can take this into consideration when they select Board Directors. There are assessments of the Director's compensation but so far there was no review of the work of the Compensation Committee and its recommendations. The Board has received a new compensation study in 2019 and is currently studying it.

Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been implemented as much as it was possible to implement it. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ICANN org follow-up

Recommendation 3 states "The Board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time and should regularly assess Directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards."

As to the first part of this recommendation, "The Board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time...", ICANN clarified in its report on ATRT2 Recommendation 3 that "With respect to the first part of this recommendation it is not in the Board's remit to affect Board candidate pools. This falls within the remit of the Nominating Committee as well as the community groups that nominate individuals for the Board." In addition to it not being in the Board's remit, the Board does not have access to information about the candidate pools that either the NomCom or the Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) consider for the ICANN Board seats they are tasked to fill. Accordingly, neither the organization nor the Board has the information to determine the qualifications of Board member candidates.

Once selected, and every year thereafter, Board members complete a skills assessment survey, which ICANN uses for various purposes. One such purpose is to help determine how each Board's member's skill sets can be best utilized on various Board committees (as well as working groups and caucuses). Another use of the Board member skills set survey is to help identify potential gaps in required Board member skills. This enables the Board Operations team to help develop Board-level and individual Board member training programs to support each Board member in filling in any skills gap(s) they have identified. While the Board's budget anticipates the Board-wide level training, each Board member is additionally afforded US\$30,000 per term to help enhance and expand their expertise as a Board member. Board members are strongly encouraged to use the bulk of this training allocation amount at the beginning of their term so that such training can properly enhance that Board member's service to ICANN. As oversight of the Board member training program, the BGC recently initiated a review of the Board member training program to determine if any changes or enhancements might be appropriate to recommend for Board consideration.

Based on the skills survey results and observation of the skills each Board member brought before and has developed during their tenure, the Board develops guidance about the skill sets that it believes could be beneficial to have for incoming Board members. While these guidelines are addressed to the NomCom in response to its request years ago, the NomCom publishes the guidelines yearly on its webpage to ensure that all SOs and ACs have equal access to this information. Here are the [guidelines](#) the Board sent to the NomCom before the 2023 selection process. Similar guidelines have been published for years.

The second part of ATRT2 Recommendation 3 asks ICANN to “... regularly assess Directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards.” Board compensation benchmarking was initially established several years before ATRT2 Recommendation 3 was adopted by the Board. For more information, please refer to the [report](#) on ATRT2 Recommendation 3 “Implementation for activities up and including to 2014”.

In 2019, the Board Compensation Committee commissioned a third-party expert study on nonprofit Board-level compensation and, in line with that report, the Committee did not recommend any changes to Board member compensation. In 2021, the Board Compensation Committee commissioned another third-party expert study on nonprofit Board-level compensation. At that time, after the Board Compensation Committee and the Board discussed the matter in detail, the Board decided to maintain the level of Board member compensation.

As the Board is committed to regularly evaluate comparable nonprofit Board-level compensation levels, the Board Compensation Committee is currently working on a new proposal for an expert compensation benchmark study on nonprofit Board-level compensation for consideration. It is anticipated that this study will be completed and considered by the Board during fiscal year (FY) 2024. Additional benchmarking studies are now regularly included in the Board Compensation Committee’s work plan. It is anticipated to commission these kinds of reports every two or more years going forward to the extent practicable and feasible.

ATRT2 Recommendation 4

Recommendation 4 - The Board should continue supporting cross- community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation. Develop complementary mechanisms whereby the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/AC) can consult with the Board on matters including but not limited to policy, implementation, and administrative matters on which the Board makes decisions.

Implementation: This recommendation is effectively implemented in the GNSO, but requires further cross-community engagement to be considered fully implemented with respect to all ICANN communities regarding the distinction between policy development and policy implementation.

With respect to developing complementary mechanisms whereby SO/ACs can consult with the Board, the Board has instituted the Board Advice Register (<https://features.icann.org/board-advice>) for the ALAC, SSAC, and RSSAC advice. There is a separate register for GAC advice (<https://gac.icann.org/activity/icann-action-request-registry-of-gac-advice>). There is no such registry for the ccNSO, GNSO, or ASO. Obviously policy recommendations to the Board from these SOs are tracked but all other

requests simply fall in Board Correspondence (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/correspondence>). This a wide variety of topics included from condolences (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/marby-to-zhao-16oct19-en.pdf>) to notices regarding changes to GNSO Registry Agreements (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/marby-to-bunton-21oct19-en.pdf>). Given correspondence is only sorted by date, it is very difficult to identify topics, which SO communicated with the Board, or vice versa. Additionally, it is difficult to track the status of any request made by a SO in this system.

Effectiveness: Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: There is no meaningful metric to show any improvement in the wider ICANN community understanding the difference between policy development and implementation of policy as was called for by the recommendation. ATRT3 does recognize and appreciate the considerable work already done in the GNSO regarding non-PDP and cross-community working group processes. However, this is not an example of ongoing and Board-facilitated cross-community engagement. It does not properly implement what was in the recommendation.

Suggestions:

- *Similarly to Reviews and the implementation of Review recommendations ICANN should provide a centralized system to track the development, approval, and implementation of policy by the SOs.*
- *Additionally, ICANN should, in a similar fashion to its Action Request Registry for ACs, institute a section on its website to track requests and communications from SOs and associated follow-on actions if any are required.*

ICANN org follow-up

With reference to the ATRT2 Recommendation 4 request to the Board to support cross community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation, the Board has always been supportive of measures to educate the community about ICANN's mission, projects, and initiatives to help ensure a stable, secure, and unified global Internet. That includes the policy development and implementation processes. More in detail:

- How policy is developed within ICANN's remit is explained [here](#). The page contains references to the policies developed at the level of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), Address Supporting Organization (ASO), and Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), the latter with the limitation that policies at country code top-level domain (ccTLD) level are and continue to be developed at the local level by each ccTLD operator.
- How policy is implemented within ICANN's remit is explained [here](#) (including a link to a regularly updated Implementation Policy Timeline).

Over the past few years, ICANN has enhanced the communication between the Board and the SOs and ACs with a view to developing the ways and means SOs and ACs consult with the Board on various matters. Among the actions developed to date:

- Regular roundtables between the seven SO/AC Chairs, ICANN org Executive Team and senior staff, and the Board Chair and ViceChair. While these meetings are closed and not recorded, staff produce summary notes and action items that are shared with the SO/AC Chairs for their action and (if agreed) shared with their

members. Meeting agendas, notes, and other relevant information is published on a dedicated SO/AC Chairs workspace (undergoing maintenance and updates at the time of writing this report).

- The topics for the Board-SO/AC community group bilateral meetings at ICANN Public Meetings, as well as notes from those meetings, are now published as part of the Policy Outcomes Report from each ICANN Public Meeting.
- The Policy Team has (in accordance with one of the FY23 CEO Goals) developed initial versions of a uniform Program Management Tool for each SO and AC. While still in “internal-only” mode, the plan is to share a first version with the SO/AC Chairs during FY24. These tools track all projects and activities being worked on, planned, and deferred by each SO and AC. This will enable the reporting of timelines and milestones in a regular and consistent manner.

Regarding the ATRT3 assessment of ATRT2 Recommendation 4 and the ATRT3 suggestion “Similarly to Reviews and the implementation of Review recommendations ICANN should provide a centralized system to track the development, approval, and implementation of policy by the SOs”, for GNSO policy recommendations; this information is tracked at <https://www.icann.org/policy/implementation>. Regarding the limited policies developed at ccNSO level, in September 2023 the ccNSO Council adopted a CCNSO [Policy Implementation Assistance Process](#).

Furthermore, since ICANN75, in preparation for each ICANN meeting, ICANN offers a [Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs briefing](#). This includes status updates on the implementation of policy recommendations, amongst others. Policy Outcomes reports and CEO reports are also produced regularly, as well as the pre-ICANN meeting briefing by the Policy Research and Stakeholder Programsteam.

Regarding the ATRT3’s suggestion to track requests and communications from SOs, tracking every “request” from a SO or an AC, especially on “non-policy” issues, on a dedicated section of the ICANN website covers a huge spectrum of possibilities, from requests to meet with the CEO to invitations to Board members to attend SO/AC calls. This would require extensive resources against benefits that appear to be limited.

ATRT2 Recommendation 5

Recommendation 5 – The Board should review redaction standards for Board documents, Document Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy. Institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted material to determine if redactions are still required and if not, ensure that redactions are removed.

Implementation: The recommendation seems to be calling for a single unified policy, not merely a central hub where the different policies may be centrally accessed (which is what the implementation report delivered). The implementation report specifically states that ICANN is declining to apply this policy to existing published minutes, instead focusing on looking forward to future board redactions. This is a resourcing decision, but this seems like an important caveat that would nonetheless stand in the way of marking this as implemented. The report also notes, correctly, that the easiest way to implement this would be to track time-sensitive harms at the time that records are created. Looking at the latest published Board minutes (<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2019-06-23-en>), there is no indication this is being done, even though certain redactions, related to ongoing negotiations, are a fairly typical example of the kinds of redactions that would often be time-limited.

Implementation assessment - Not Implemented.

Effectiveness: Effectiveness assessment – Not Applicable.

Conclusion: ATRT3 believes that the efforts made in response to the recommendation regarding “...review redaction standards for Board documents, Document Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy. Institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted material to determine if redactions are still required and if not, ensure that redactions are removed” has not been implemented.

Recommendation: See Section 7 of this report.

ICANN org follow-up

Informed by the iterative recommendations generated by the ICANN community, ICANN continuously works on improving how it publishes Board materials. After ATRT1 resulted in ICANN adding rationales to Board decisions and publishing the Board briefing materials, ICANN refined these processes in response to ATRT2, providing a unified resource regarding ICANN’s publication and redaction processes. Multiple considerations guide those processes, including the community-approved Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP), that are capable of being described in a single place, but not necessarily appropriate for inclusion within a single, unified policy. ICANN Publication Practices for Board, Litigation, and Accountability Processes can be found on a [single repository page](#).

The Cross Community Working Group that conducted the second Work Stream (WS2) of the Enhancing ICANN Accountability produced a recommendation and associated implementation guidance on [redaction policies](#), for which ICANN org has built in new systems and internal repositories to assure quicker, more streamlined, future annual review processes.

The implementation work to address this recommendation, including a process to regularly evaluate redacted material to determine if redactions are still required and if not, ensure that they are removed, is in its final stages. It is estimated to be completed in early calendar year 2024.

Addressing the WS2 Recommendation will also address the remaining, pending elements of the ATRT2 Recommendation 5 as mentioned in the ATRT3 assessment.

Furthermore, WS2 includes [Recommendations on improving ICANN's Documentary Information Disclosure Policy \(DIDP\)](#). It led to ICANN releasing, in the first calendar quarter of 2023, a revised [DIDP policy](#), and an update of the [process document](#) on responding to DIDP requests to align with revisions made to the DIDP.

ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1

Recommendation 9.1 - Proposed Bylaws change recommended by the ATRT2 to impose a requirement on the ICANN Board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN's Advisory Committees.

Implementation: The Board has implemented a Board Advice Registry which is not part of the Bylaws. However, there is no time requirement to respond to advice which is entered in

the Registry. There is a need for proper management and tracking of responses like a response management tool which may be related to project management but for tracking responses.

Implementation Assessment - Not Implemented. Effectiveness: Not applicable.

Conclusion: The Action Request Register is a good step towards meeting the intent of this recommendation. Setting minimum times for the Board to respond to advice from SO/ACs is challenging as implementing some advice requires time and resources. These are usually not specified in the advice provided and often require ICANN to undertake an appropriate evaluation to produce an implementation plan. The recommendation required “ICANN Board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN’s Advisory Committees” which the Board Advice web page does using the Board Advice Register Phases and Descriptions and as such there is no need in the current context for a Bylaws change.

Recommendation: See Section 7 of this report.

Suggestion: ICANN implement a maximum time to provide an initial assessment of recommendations which require action that are made to the Board by the SO/ACs.

ICANN org follow-up

As acknowledged by the ATRT3, “implementing some advice requires time and resources. These are usually not specified in the advice provided and often require ICANN to undertake an appropriate evaluation to produce an implementation plan”.

While acknowledgement following the receipt of advice happens instantly, the subsequent review and assessment of advice is dependent on the complexity of the advice, the resources available, and the need for interaction with the advice provider to understand the advice.

While setting standard maximum response times may set unrealistic expectations as not all advice is equal, the Advice Improvements project that has been undertaken since 2021 by ICANN org with the support of the ICANN Board and the Advisory Committees, aims to enhance the predictability, transparency, and implementability of advice. Instead of focusing on establishing a one-size-fits all approach, which would be the result of setting maximum response times, the project has focused on right sizing advice. The goal is to provide an informed assessment of the expected time needed to address the advice which is then communicated to the advice provider.

This is a phased approach. Immediately following the receipt of advice, an ICANN org internal project team (IPT) is formed. One of its first activities is to complete an advice intake template. As part of this template, the IPT has to include an outline of the expected next steps and a high-level timeline by when these steps should be completed. This information is shared with the advice provider to manage expectations and provide transparency about next steps and timing. Throughout phase 2 (understand) and phase 3 (evaluate and consider), ICANN org provides regular updates. As part of those updates ICANN org indicates whether there are changes to the originally communicated timeline.

For advice that is adopted by the ICANN Board and requires implementation, similarly, an ICANN org Implementation Internal Project Team (IIPT) is formed to establish a project plan and timeline at the outset to be communicated to the advice provider. Throughout implementation, ICANN org provides regular updates. If there are significant changes to the

timeline, the IIPT is expected to communicate these and the rationale for them to the ICANN Board and the advice provider.

To document and ensure that all advice is addressed in a timely manner, the ICANN org developed an Action Request Register several years ago and uses that process to ensure advice is tracked and updated correctly.

To cope with the continuously increasing advice volume, a new workspace has been created to capture the status of each Board advice item. The space can be accessed directly on the [Board Advice page](#). This new wiki tool complements the Advice Improvements Project, underway since September 2021, and ensures ongoing and proactive improvements to the advice process.

In consultation with the ICANN Board and the At-Large Advisory Committee, the Root Server System Advisory Committee, and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, this work evolved the process to identify improvements to: 1) the predictability of the ICANN Board's process to review and respond to advice received; 2) transparency around how and what decisions are taken by the ICANN Board; and 3) implementability of advice provided. For further information about advice, please see the [Recommendations to the Board page](#).

ATRT2 Recommendation 9.2

Recommendation 9.2 - Review ICANN's existing accountability mechanisms through a community-comprised group.

Implementation: This is a recommendation that was subsumed into the CCWG-Accountability WS1 and WS2 and resulted in removal of, amongst other things, the SO/AC Accountability recommendations from WS2. While ICANN org has resolved the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendation 9.2 by passing it on, the actual implementation of the WS2 recommendations at the time of this review has yet to begin. As such, the purpose of the ATRT2 recommendation has not been completed, effectively implemented, withdrawn, or superseded.

Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: Given WS1 recommendations were implemented in the Bylaws and that some of these changes, such as the Empowered Community approval of Bylaws changes, are being used, this supports at least being partially effective. The fact that the WS2 recommendations have not been implemented makes it impossible to assess the effectiveness of those recommendations. Effectiveness assessment – Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been transferred to the CCWG- Accountability WS1 and WS2 where the recommendations of WS2 have not yet been implemented. However, given that the implementation of WS2 recommendation is required in the Bylaws (Article 27) there is no need for any further action by ATRT3.

ICANN org follow-up

ATRT2 Recommendation 9.2 was specifically focused on “options for improving Board accountability with regard to restructuring of the Independent Review Process (IRP) and the Reconsideration Process.” The Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, in its Work Stream 1, devoted significant attention and issued

recommendations on redesigning both of these processes. The Bylaws giving effect to those recommendations went into force in October 2016. Additional accountability mechanisms, such as the Empowered Community, were also put in place through the Enhancing ICANN Accountability Process.

One part of these accountability mechanisms, the updating of the Cooperative Engagement Process (or CEP) was deferred to WS2 of the CCWG-Accountability effort. The CCWG-Accountability agreed to transfer the responsibility for completing this review to the IRP Implementation Oversight Team. It consists of community members and still has work to perform to update the CEP.

ATRT2 Recommendation 9.3

Recommendation 9.3 - Review of the Office of the Ombudsman, the role within ICANN, and whether the duties/scope of the Ombudsman should be expanded or changed in line with suggestions from the ATRT2.

Implementation: The ATRT2 recommendation for the evaluation of the ICANN Office of the Ombudsman (IOO) was transferred to the CCWG- Accountability WS2 to avoid overlap or duplication of work.

To undertake this work, the CCWG-Accountability WS2 created an IOO sub- group (IOO SG). An external evaluator delivered a report that was considered by IOO SG in its final report.

This final report was part of the WS2 final report. It included 11 recommendations. The review is completed but implementation of WS2 recommendations has not yet officially begun. However, some of the WS2 recommendations relating to the IOO, such as providing gender diversity in the IOO, have been implemented.

Implementation Status - Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been transferred to the CCWG- Accountability WS2 and the recommendations of WS2 have not yet been implemented. However, given that the implementation of WS2 recommendation is required in the Bylaws (Article 27), there is no need for any further action by ATRT3. This should be confirmed by future reviews.

ICANN org follow-up

Since the ATRT3 formulated its Final Report, ICANN org has made significant progress in addressing the implementation of the 65 org-owned recommendations resulting from WS2 of the Enhancing ICANN Accountability initiative including the 11 recommendations related to the ICANN Ombuds Office, as documented on the [ICANN.org website](#), on community [wiki webpages](#), and in [implementation quarterly reports](#).

At the time of writing this report, two of the 11 Ombuds-related recommendations are complete. ICANN org is working on updating the Ombuds Framework and procedures to implement 8 of the remaining 9 recommendations. Once the office of the Ombuds is relaunched, ICANN org will begin implementing the WS2 Implementation Guidance on the Ombuds Advisory Panel.

On [10 September 2023](#), the ICANN Board appointed an interim Ombuds, and announced the establishment of a temporary Board Committee to help facilitate the search for ICANN's next full-time Ombuds. The WS2 Ombuds Office recommendations will inform the Board Committee's work in redefining the search.

ATRT2 Recommendation 9.5

Recommendation 9.5 - Conduct a review of the Anonymous Hotline policy and processes, implement any proposed modifications to policy, and publish a report on results to the community.

Implementation: The review was conducted and ICANN began the implementation of the recommendations. It was noted that these would be completed, but there is no record of completion. Additionally, WS2 made further recommendations on this topic which were in-line with the review recommendations. Implementation assessment - Partially implemented.

Effectiveness: Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: Implementation should be completed.

Suggestion: ICANN should complete the implementation of the reviewer's recommendations as well as those of the CCWG-Accountability WS2 on this topic.

ICANN org follow-up

The ICANN org's Anonymous Hotline Policy was [updated](#) and reposted internally on 1 December 2020 to encourage the reporting of all issues and concerns and also to provide specific examples of when the hotline should be used.

The ICANN org's [Anonymous Hotline Policy and Procedures for Handling Reports](#) to it were posted on the Accountability and Transparency section of ICANN.org on 5 November 2021 under the heading of "Employee Anonymous Hotline Policy and Procedures (Whistleblower)".

The Anonymous Hotline Policy and Procedures may be accessed by entering the term whistleblower in using the search bar on the ICANN.org website. The Employee Anonymous Hotline Policy and Procedures (Whistleblower) website includes the following introduction: "The ICANN organization (org) is committed to the highest possible standards of ethical, moral, and legal business conduct. ICANN org has several policies, including Open-Door, Prohibition of Harassment, and Fraud, that provide ICANN org employees with procedures for reporting work-related concerns. ICANN org provides an Anonymous Hotline as an additional resource for employees to report issues, in good faith, regarding unethical, illegal, or unsafe activity. Employees can use the Anonymous Hotline to report issues directly to an independent external agency staffed with trained professionals, who are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The independent external agency will notify the Hotline Committee of all issues reported to the Anonymous Hotline. The policy and procedures are contained within the Anonymous Hotline policy and procedures documents. The policy and procedures may also be known as Whistleblower Protections."

The Anonymous Hotline Policy and Procedures have been reviewed by a third party vendor. The third party's report will be published to meet WS2 Recommendation 8.4.8. Implementation documentation for completing Recommendation 8.4.8. will be made available in due course on the [Work Stream 2 – Recommendations to Improve ICANN Transparency](#) page.

ATRT2 Recommendation 10.5

Recommendation 10.5 - The Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players.

Implementation: With the key word of facilitating in mind, the ICANN Board and ICANN org have developed or enhanced the following programs: Fellowship, NextGen@ICANN, ICANN Academy Leadership Program, some improvement in remote participation (captioning), and funding additional members of the community (GAC).

The other keyword, equitable, may be more difficult to assess. But the programs listed above show some good implementation and can count as good attempts towards being equitable.

Implementation assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness -There are some available statistics:

*<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/fellowship-statistics-2018-03-02-en>
<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/nextgen-statistics-2017-09-27-en>*

Effectiveness assessment – Partially effective.

Conclusion – This is obviously a major recommendation which has met with some success. As such the ATRT3 will suggest keeping this objective alive with a continuing enhancement.

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggest that ICANN continue to support and enhance the following programs (among others): Fellowship, NextGen, ICANN Academy Leadership Programs, and CROP. ICANN should also continue to improve the options for remote participation, including captioning.

ATRT2 Recommendation 12.1

Recommendation 12.1 - The Board should implement new financial procedures in ICANN that can effectively ensure that the ICANN community, including all SOs and ACs, can participate and assist the ICANN Board in planning and prioritizing the work and development of the organization.

Implementation: This seems fully implemented. There has been community involvement. The Board does everything to include the community in every step with regard to planning and prioritizing ICANN's work. And it is listening to the community. Community members have noted that sometimes the workload is too much for them. One member of the ICANN Community Finance Group noted that he never had a question rejected and did see the CFOs work as "extremely transparent and responsive to any questions". It is also important

to note that the Empowered Community now has to approve the budget. Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: Although the process is quite transparent and open to community input, the sheer complexity and volume of information provided require significant knowledge and experience as well as time to participate effectively. Providing information which the average member of the community could understand easily and comment on effectively with only the requirement of investing a few hours would go a long way to increasing the transparency and accountability of the process. Effectiveness assessment – Partially Effective.

Conclusion: As noted this recommendation has been implemented but as stated in the Effectiveness assessment there could be improvements to allow for greater participation.

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggests that the budget consultation process be improved to allow for greater community participation by providing a plain language summary of the proposed budget as per the suggestions ATRT3 has made with respect to Public Comment proceedings of this report.

ICANN org follow-up

The recent ICANN budget documents include a plain language budget summary at the beginning of the document. See the [ICANN Budget for Fiscal Year 2024](#).

ATRT2 Recommendation 12.2

Recommendation 12.2 - The Board should explicitly consider the cost-effectiveness of ICANN's operations when preparing its budget for the coming year, in keeping with ICANN's status as a non-profit organization operating and delivering services in a non-competitive environment. This should include how expected increases in the income of ICANN could be reflected in the priority of activities and pricing of services. These considerations should be subject of a separate consultation.

Implementation: As evidenced in the post IANA transition and CWG Accountability WS1 Bylaw changes, this recommendation appears to be fully implemented with the current methodology for the annual preparation and reporting on the ICANN Operating Budget and Financial Assumptions, which includes the longer-term strategic planning periods. Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: Effective

Conclusion: As stated in the Implementation assessment this recommendation was implemented and is effective. As such ATRT3 will not be making any recommendations or suggestions as a result of its assessments.

ATRT2 Recommendation 12.3

Recommendation 12.3 - Every three years the Board should conduct a benchmark study on relevant parameters, (e.g. size of organization, levels of staff compensation and benefits, cost of living adjustments, etc.) suitable for a non-profit organization. If the result of the benchmark is that ICANN as an organization is not in line with the standards of comparable organizations, the Board should consider aligning the

deviation. In cases where the Board chooses not to align, this has to be reasoned in the Board decision and published to the Internet community.

Implementation: This seems to be (unless there is source material or study done and not readily searchable within icann.org public records) marked as done, but it is not done nor is it clearly explained with a rationale as to why it was not done, superseded, or not adopted by the Board as per the recommendation from ATRT2. Note that both the early original One World Trust external review on ICANN Accountability and Transparency, as well as the following one commissioned from ATRT1 recommendations also recommended regularity in benchmarking studies. Recognizing the difficulty of finding a good match for ICANN in type of organization for benchmarking, it remains disappointing that an adoption of accountability indicators, KPIs, metrics, etc., can be proposed as an alternative or in isolation from such occasional comparison exercises to cross-organizational benchmarking. Not completed, not implemented, superseded, or not done/rejected without rationale and clear explanation.

Implementation assessment – Not Implemented

Effectiveness: Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: Benchmark studies, if done properly, are an effective tool in helping to assess accountability. This ATRT2 recommendation was made in December 2013 and the requested benchmark study has not yet been produced at the time of the writing of this report in 2019. This is of great concern to ATRT3.

The implementation report of October 2018 noted that:

12.3 – “ICANN currently identifies targets in its KPI Dashboard which informs the Annual Report that is reviewed and approved by the ICANN Board. Benchmark references will be included in the KPI Dashboard once a comparable nonprofit organization is identified. The estimated time for the first benchmarking study to be completed is FY18.”

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggests that the Board implement ATRT2 Recommendation 12.3. ATRT3 understands that ICANN does perform some benchmarking related to salaries.

However, this is only one element of the ATRT2 recommendation. If no comparable organization can be found for performing overall benchmarking, then the benchmarking activity should be broken down into component parts for which comparable organizations can be found in a similar fashion to what was done for salaries.

ICANN org follow-up

ICANN participates in reputable compensation benchmark surveys and works with outside benefits brokers annually to gain an understanding of the competitive levels of staff compensation and benefits offerings. ICANN also benchmarks prevalent practices such as salary increases and adjustment, staff turnovers, etc. ICANN uses benchmarking data to guide and align its compensation and benefits practice.

In addition, a comprehensive market study on the current compensation was conducted in 2020 by an outside consulting firm, Wills Towers Watson, to ensure that ICANN remains competitive compared to the market and that ICANN jobs remain in line with ICANN's pay practices. The analysis used survey data to get a composited market average and benchmark (as data available). Based on the study, ICANN launched a new Career Framework and refreshed its compensation structure and ranges. ICANN provided training

and a Question & Answer session to managers and staff to offer a broader understanding of this matter.

ICANN org also posts [Organization Remuneration Practices](#) on the ICANN.org website to document the organization's compensation philosophy, blending data of multiple talent markets (including non-profit) approach, target market positions, as well as total remuneration elements, and major compensation programs design. This document is publicly available and contains the remuneration details of ICANN Officers.

ATRT2 Recommendation 12.4

Recommendation 12.4 - In order to improve accountability and transparency ICANN's Board should base the yearly budgets on a multi- annual strategic plan and corresponding financial framework (covering e.g. a three-year period). This rolling plan and framework should reflect the planned activities and the corresponding expenses in that multi-annual period. This should include specified budgets for the ACs and SOs. ICANN's (yearly) financial reporting shall ensure that it is possible to track ICANN's activities and the related expenses with particular focus on the implementation of the (yearly) budget. The financial report shall be subject to public consultation.

Implementation: This is fully implemented. ICANN now performs public consultations on both strategy and financial planning topics. This is operationalized very effectively through two major processes. The formal process of the 5-year strategic plan development is performed by ICANN org. The high-level strategic plan is then open for Public Comment. There is evidence of extensive incorporation of community feedback into the strategic plan. The 5-year strategic plan is used to inform the annual operating financial plan for the organization, which is also published for Public Comment and revision. Additionally, the community's role in this process has been expanded post- IANA transition: The Empowered Community has a veto right over the budget if it disagrees with the budget as presented. There was some thought to doing two yearly budgets, but that did not get acceptance from the community.

Implementation assessment is Implemented.

Effectiveness: Although the process is quite transparent and open to community input the sheer complexity and volume of information provided requires significant knowledge and experience as well as time to participate effectively. Providing information which the average member of the community could understand easily and comment on effectively with only the requirement of investing a few hours would go a long way to increasing the transparency and accountability of the process. Effectiveness assessment – Partially Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been implemented but as stated in the Effectiveness assessment there could be improvements to allow for greater participation. As such, ATRT3 will consider making suggestions to improve the process to allow for greater participation.

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggests that the budget consultation process be improved to allow for greater community participation by providing a plain language summary of the proposed budget as per the suggestions ATRT3 has made with respect to Public Comment proceedings of this report.

ICANN org follow-up

The recent ICANN budget documents include a plain language budget summary at the beginning of the document. See the [ICANN Budget for Fiscal Year 2024](#).

ATRT2 Recommendation 12.5

Recommendation 12.5 - In order to ensure that the budget reflects the views of the ICANN community, the Board shall improve the budget consultation process by i.e. ensuring that sufficient time is given to the community to provide their views on the proposed budget and sufficient time is allocated for the Board to take into account all input before approving the budget. The budget consultation process shall also include time for an open meeting among the Board and the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to discuss the proposed budget.

Implementation: The current processes to develop the Strategic Plan, Five- Year Operating Plan, and Annual Operating Plan and Budget all incorporate a variety of methods to either provide outreach to the ICANN community and/or request input from the ICANN community through webinars and public comment periods. Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: In terms of effectiveness, it's clear that methods for community input have been implemented and are effective as an outlet for community opinion. However, it's difficult to measure effectiveness in the sense of ensuring "the budget reflects the views of the ICANN community" without ongoing metrics or research to track the level of acceptance and approval within the community. Effectiveness assessment – Partially Effective.

Conclusion: Given the recommendation has been assessed as implemented but only partially effective ATRT3 will be making a suggestion with respect to gathering sufficient data to track the level of acceptance and approval within the community.

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggests ICANN conduct regular surveys of the community to gather data to track the level of acceptance and approval within the community that the budget reflects the views of the ICANN community.

GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GAC)

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1a

Recommendation 6.1a – Convening “GAC 101” or information sessions for the ICANN community, to provide greater insight into how individual GAC members prepare for ICANN meetings in national capitals, how the GAC agenda and work priorities are established, and how GAC members interact intersessionally and during GAC meetings to arrive at consensus GAC positions that ultimately are forwarded to the ICANN Board as advice;

Implementation: ATRT3 - GAC has intersessional calls to define the agenda for ICANN meetings and to define its relevant points. This certainly does not show how GAC members prepare themselves for ICANN meetings at their own country. This is not an appropriate demand anyway; they have tools - previous agenda, links, etc. How they are prepared is totally dependent on each country's internal government arrangements and does not contribute to transparency or accountability to ICANN community. The intersessional call

allows members to better prepare. This part of the recommendation was implemented. Regarding the process to arrive to consensus, GAC uses the work of writing the communiqué to reach consensus. This is not a written process, but more of a negotiation. Article 47 of the GAC Operating Principles says GAC shall look for consensus under the United Nations definition. When consensus cannot be reached, all positions shall be written.

Implementation assessment – Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: Regarding effectiveness there are some points to consider:

- 1. Communiqué language is still not clear, which can generate misinterpretations. The effort done to date not yet as effective as it should be.*
- 2. More clarity on which kind of consensus was reached. For example, there is no record of how many members fully agreed or disagreed during the process to reach consensus.*
- 3. The consensus process itself is not clear for the community, therefore it is not yet effective.*

Effectiveness assessment – Not effective.

Conclusion – The GAC is a special entity in ICANN. The government representatives have many requirements placed on them from their governments constraining their interactions. This recommendation has been implemented as much as it can be implemented and is also as effective as it can be for the GAC. If there is a desire for further improvements, this would first require that there be some effective measurements of the processes we believe need improvements to be able to confirm that improvements are required and would be effective. As such ATRT3 will not be making any suggestions with respect to this recommendation.

ICANN org follow-up

From the [Governmental Advisory Committee \(GAC\) reaction](#) to the ATRT3 Final Report:

“The ATRT3 “suggestions” regarding implementation of this ATRT2 recommendation seems to have been influenced by community responses to two ATRT3 community surveys and a general opinion that the GAC should be held “more accountable” (see Section II A. of this document below at page 7). The GAC appreciates the ATRT3 assessment that some of the community responses show “significant expectations of accountability for the GAC and its members which seem inconsistent with the charter of the GAC”.

Regarding point “a”, GAC Members find it difficult to give credence to the observation that the “Communique language is still not clear”. The ATRT3 offers no support or explanation for that statement. As the ATRT3 may be aware, the GAC and the ICANN Board have an established process for “clarifying” any consensus advice provided in each GAC Communiqué. If the Board feels the need to clarify any unclear statements, a specific call is held with the GAC within six weeks of the Communiqué’s publication to resolve those concerns. Records of those calls are posted on the GAC website.

Regarding point “b”, the GAC Operating Principles clearly state the definition of GAC Consensus and the process for achieving it. GAC Operating Principle 47 specifically states:

“The GAC works on the basis of seeking consensus among its membership. Consistent with United Nations practice[1], consensus is understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal

objection. Where consensus is not possible, the Chair shall convey the full range of views expressed by members to the ICANN Board.”

Additionally, the GAC Communiqué drafting process is conducted in open plenary sessions for the entire community to observe. Those sessions are recorded, transcribed, and interpreted in the six U.N. languages and Portuguese. If the GAC achieves consensus as defined in its operating principles, then Consensus GAC advice is included in the GAC Communiqué. If no consensus is reached for sharing specific advice to the Board on a particular topic, then, typically, the Communiqué will not include any GAC Consensus advice on that topic.

Regarding point “c”, the GAC is concerned that despite a clearly written Operating Principle and completely open Communiqué drafting sessions, that its process for reaching consensus is still, somehow, “not clear to the community”.

The above concerns notwithstanding, the GAC Leadership will discuss how this process might be made more visible to non-GAC community members and will work with the GAC Support staff to investigate the practicality of evolving the Communiqué drafting and consensus process to make it more generally visible to interested members of the ICANN community.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1b

Recommendation 6.1b - Publishing agendas for GAC meetings, conference calls, etc., on the GAC website seven days in advance of the meetings and publishing meeting minutes on the GAC website within seven days after each meeting or conference call.

Implementation: Agenda for meetings and calls are posted at the GAC website in a timely fashion.

Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: The information about agendas is easily available on the GAC website – the language and details and links are already published. All improvements were quite effective, allowing the community to easily find topics to be discussed in all meetings and, if interested, attend open meetings during ICANN Public Meetings. Effectiveness assessment – Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1c

Recommendation 6.1c- Updating and improving the GAC website to more accurately describe GAC activities, including intersessional activities, as well as publishing all relevant GAC transcripts, positions and correspondence;

Implementation – The GAC website was fully improved and is kept updated. The website is always a work in progress due the evolving of issues and membership. All formal activities are on the calendar and includes a clear statement if it is an open or closed session or call. All documents are posted. Implementation assessment - Implemented

Effectiveness: It is possible for an external community member to find all issues and documents on the website even if the interface is not very intuitive. Websites are normally a work in progress, and we can consider the recommendation is effective. Effectiveness assessment – effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1d

Recommendation 6.1d - Considering whether and how to open GAC conference calls to other stakeholders to observe and participate, as appropriate. This could possibly be accomplished through the participation of liaisons from other ACs and SOs to the GAC, once that mechanism has been agreed upon and implemented;

Implementation: GAC meetings are open during ICANN Public Meetings as well as some other meetings. Calls are mostly closed to guarantee efficacy due the large number of members and due to the nature of its members. The themes and agendas are published ahead of time. This part of the recommendation is implemented as feasible, respecting the nature of GAC members. Regarding liaisons, GAC is open to receive liaisons from SO/ACs. Liaisons were implemented depending on individual SO/ACs. Liaisons and even staff are helping to increase communication among GAC and other SO/ACs.

Implementation assessment - Implemented.

*Effectiveness – Liaisons’ performance will depend upon the people allocated to the position. We have examples of positive and effective liaisons that have improved the relationship with the GAC. The implementation is effective. Eventually one specific liaison may not contribute to the effectiveness, but it is not a fault with the implementation, but of the liaison.)
Effectiveness assessment – Effective.*

Conclusion – Overall, this recommendation is implemented and effective when considering that it was an unrealistic expectation that GAC conference calls could be open to all given the current number of GAC members. The effectiveness is directly related to the quality of the liaisons that are appointed to the GAC. ATRT3 will be suggesting that the GAC publish a short list of suggested qualities or requirements for liaisons to assist SO/ACs to select the best candidates to be GAC liaisons. Another suggestion could be to provide training to liaisons.

Suggestion:

- *ATRT3 suggests that the GAC publish a short list of suggested qualities or requirements for liaisons to assist SO/ACs to select the best candidates to be GAC liaisons.*
- *ATRT3 suggests that the GAC, in conjunction with ICANN, should provide orientation for liaisons to the GAC so they understand the environment of the GAC as well as the expectations for liaisons.*

ICANN org follow-up

Since the ATRT3 suggestions were shared, GAC Leadership has considered ways to expand information flow and exchanges between liaisons to the GAC and Points of Contact

(POCs) from the GAC to increase information sharing and communications between community groups.

GAC POCs to various other communities (At-Large Advisory Committee, GNSO, and ccNSO) have since been added to the GAC Leadership email list so that POCs can hear and pass on relevant committee updates and information to their community liaisons, as appropriate.

GAC Leaders also now consider when direct communication can be made with liaisons from other communities and, to date, most of these communications are now implemented by the GAC POCs through regular connection or calls with their counterparts. This has now become a regular feature of the GAC and GNSO Liaison/POC relationship with the benefit of expanded information exchange between communities.

The leadership teams of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the GNSO now hold regular calls with the GAC Leadership before an ICANN Public Meeting to discuss matters of overlapping interest and to prepare for bilateral sessions during ICANN Public Meetings. The GAC Chair now also participates in regular Chair-only discussions with other community chairs to share information and discuss matters of common interest among the SOs and ACs.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1e

Recommendation 6.1 e - Considering how to structure GAC meetings and work intersessionally so that during the three public ICANN meetings a year the GAC is engaging with the community and not sitting in a room debating itself for closed sessions.

Implementation – The GAC has opened its F2F meetings to implement this recommendation. The GAC does not meet F2F like other SOs intersessionally and due the nature of its members' work this would not be possible: time dedicated to ICANN is quite limited for a number of governments. There are intersessional calls which focus on agendas and clarifying points demanded by members. Like many other groups inside ICANN the GAC decided to have those calls be closed. The reason is clear: The GAC now has more than 170 members and opening these calls could cause interference on the discussion of sensitive points for the members (political interest from anyone). Additionally, having even more people not focused on GAC issues (for instance: chats during the call or even not allow participants to talk would be rude) can compromise the efficiency of the call. Having F2F meetings open and with web presence, allows the community to share any points in an open ambience. Implementation assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness – Many GAC members cannot dedicate much time to ICANN related issues outside of the F2F meetings. Intersession calls are usually dedicated to administrative issues and preparing the next F2F meeting. As such, the GAC must use its F2F meetings to focus on and advance its work. This being said, the GAC has now opened all its F2F sessions to the public, has a series of liaisons with various SO/ACs and invites relevant SO/ACs to present to them and discuss issues of mutual interest.

As such this recommendation, when considering the special nature of the GAC, is as effective as it can be.

Effectiveness assessment – Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective as much as can be expected given the special nature of the GAC. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1f

Recommendation 6.1f - Establishing as a routine practice agenda setting calls for the next meeting at the conclusion of the previous meeting.

Implementation: Agenda for next calls are posted on the website and the calendar is agreed between members. Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: It is clear and easy to find the calendars for the next meeting (for instance: 29 of July 2019 call - clarification on wording related to communiqué) and (August 8th, 2019, leadership call). Effectiveness assessment – Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1g

Recommendation 6.1 g - Providing clarity regarding the role of the leadership of the GAC.

Implementation: The GAC understood that they needed to enlarge the leadership team to provide better access to regions, bring cultural diversity to the debate, and allow those views to be more active in the work of the GAC. This was implemented and posted at <https://gac.icann.org/about/leadership- and-support#leadership>. The leadership team was enlarged to 5 vice chairs and this required a change in the GAC Operating Principles. This was completed and can be seen at <https://gac.icann.org/operating-principles/operating-principles- june-2017>.

Implementation assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness – The change to having 5 vice chairs improved the effectiveness of the leadership team since it is implemented to reflect the geographic and developmental diversity of the membership, and as such will bring their visions to the work of the GAC leadership. With regions being better represented on the leadership team, members of that region have more and better access to the leadership to debate, understand issues, and help in the consensus negotiation. The community itself can also get some benefits from this change since regional access to those members is easier (some of them participate in RALOS calls when they are invited) and allows for a better exchange of ideas.

Effectiveness assessment – Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.1h

Recommendation 6.1h - When deliberating on matters affecting particular entities, to the extent reasonable and practical, give those entities the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole prior to its deliberations.

Implementation – The GAC is reaching out on such positions through liaisons as well as working groups. Several examples can be cited - <https://gac.icann.org/working-group/> and liaison, for instance with the At- Large allowed two relevant statements to be posted together as a work of the two ACs (GAC and At-Large, making clear the liaisons work can help communication, timely work, and consensus between GAC, ACs, and SOs). It is a work in progress. We can only consider this partially implemented given several issues of GAC interest are not debated in working groups. This is because some processes were not well established with some of the SO/ACs. As we also stated in ATRT2 Recommendation 10.2, it is also important to understand that to populate a WG is not an easy task for the GAC due the nature of its members who have limited time to dedicate to ICANN related activities. Having good liaisons is the best way to make it more effective using a clear process established beforehand. Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented

Effectiveness – It is difficult to measure the effectiveness of this using working groups. Liaisons in some cases are facilitating the engagement with the GAC prior to a decision. More analysis on effectiveness to SO/ACs could be done. Some complaints about advanced information was done by GNSO. Partially effective.

Conclusion – Overall the implementation and effectiveness are currently satisfactory. However, ATRT3 will be suggesting that the GAC engage in continuous improvement in its relations with SO/ACs to increase the effectiveness of those interactions via early engagement whenever possible.

Suggestion - ATRT3 suggests that the GAC continue to commit to its improvement efforts focusing on ensuring early engagement with relevant SOs and ACs on matters of importance to the GAC.

ICANN org follow-up

With the expanded use of cross-community groups since the ATRT3 suggestions were shared, the GAC has substantially increased its early engagement with other community groups on matters of policy development and advice. GAC members now participate in a wide range of policy discussion hosted by the GNSO (e.g., future rounds of new generic top-level domains; Internationalized Domain Names; disclosures of registrant data information; etc.). The recent facilitated dialogue on closed generics between the GNSO, GAC, and ALAC illustrates how the ICANN community is more broadly adapting to a more general and proactive engagement approach to Domain Name System (DNS) policy matters.

GAC members also meet regularly in bilateral sessions with the ALAC and GNSO memberships during ICANN Public Meetings. These sessions are scheduled as early as possible during each public meeting week. This allows GAC members to deliberate the language of the GAC Communiqué later in the meeting week. Future engagement opportunities are expected to be expanded with the ccNSO as well.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.2

Recommendation 6.2 - ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC formally adopting a policy of open meetings to increase transparency into GAC deliberations and to establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions.

Implementation: This recommendation has, de facto, been implemented. The GAC open meetings policy has been implemented since ICANN47 as is clearly identified on the GAC website (<https://gac.icann.org/>) and a search will easily lead to the relevant page where this type of information can be found.

Implementation assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness: Nevertheless, if we stick with the recommendation to increase transparency into GAC deliberations and, considering the GAC's special nature, the implementation has been overall effective. Effectiveness assessment - Effective (as much as possible).

Conclusion: Given the nature of the GAC this recommendation has been implemented as much as it can be and is as effective as it can be. As such no further action is required relative to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.3

Recommendation 6.3 - ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC developing and publishing rationales for GAC Advice at the time Advice is provided. Such rationales should be recorded in the GAC register. The register should also include a record of how the ICANN Board responded to each item of advice.

Implementation: The improvements to the GAC Register of Advice which includes Board responses seems to meet the intention of this recommendation. In addition, a system has been put in place for the Board to follow up on all GAC advice (Action Request Register), see <https://gac.icann.org/activity/>. This ensures that no GAC advice can get lost, and there is a clear track to follow-up by Board reply. Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: The improvements seem to be effective in relation to the stated objectives. Effectiveness assessment - Effective

Conclusion – This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.4

Recommendation 6.4 - The Board, working through the BGRI working group should develop and document a formal process for notifying and requesting GAC advice (see ATRT1 Recommendation 10).

Implementation: The current status is that there is a clear process operating between the Board and the GAC establishing times to send feedback on advice, time to respond, clarification calls etc. A Board member comment on this noted: "On the current Board- GAC

interaction: there is a well-documented approach towards the lines of communications between Board and GAC, in which the GAC's communiqué is central. It comes up at the end of every public GAC meeting and gets a formal response from the Board via a "scorecard" which is made available latest 4 weeks before the next GAC Public meeting. The agreed step in-between is a call for clarifying the questions from the GAC to the Board several weeks after the communiqué was published." The timeline for this is explicitly proposed, discussed, and agreed already during public meetings and during the Board-GAC public session. This process was put firmly in place in 2017 and has been followed diligently ever since to mutual satisfaction with the process, but not necessarily with the responses themselves. In addition, a system has been put in place to follow up on all GAC advice (Action Request Register), see <https://gac.icann.org/activity/>. This helps ensure that no GAC advice is lost, and there is a clear track to follow-up by Board reply.

Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: It certainly improved the effectiveness of communications between the GAC and the Board. However, ATRT3 noted during its interviews with the GAC at ICANN65 that there was a lack of "closing the loop" at the end of the process. However, improvements to the BGRI processes since ICANN60 have addressed the remaining issues. Effectiveness assessment - Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.5

Recommendation 6.5 - The Board should propose and vote on appropriate bylaw changes to formally implement the documented process for Board- GAC bylaws consultation as developed by the BGRI working group as soon as practicable (see ATRT1 Recommendation 11). Increase support and resource commitments of government to the GAC (see ATRT 1 Recommendation 14).

Implementation: From the Implementation Report "The ICANN Bylaws approved by the ICANN Board on 27 May 2016, require a vote of 60% of the Board to reject GAC Consensus Advice, rather than the supermajority identified in this recommendation. The ICANN Bylaw also requires that the Board is only to give this special consideration to GAC Consensus advice that meets a specific definition for the term "Consensus." The Bylaws went into effect in October 2016.

Implementation Assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness: Effectiveness assessment – Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.6

Recommendation 6.6 - ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to identify and implement initiatives that can remove barriers for participation, including language barriers, and improve

understanding of the ICANN model and access to relevant ICANN information for GAC members. The BGRI working group should consider how the GAC can improve its procedures to ensure a more efficient, transparent and inclusive decision-making. The BGRI working group should develop GAC engagement best practices for its members that could include issues such as: conflict of interest; transparency and accountability; adequate domestic resource commitments; routine consultation with local Domain Name System (DNS) stakeholder and interest groups; and an expectation that positions taken within the GAC reflect the fully coordinated domestic government position and are consistent with existing relevant national and international laws.

Implementation

- 1. The language barrier has been overall addressed as the spoken languages exceed U.N.O. language (Portuguese has been added vs. UNO, see <https://gac.icann.org/meeting-services/attending-your-first-gac-meeting>). Such measures as overall information delivered on the GAC website, (see <https://gac.icann.org/about>) are proof of made progress in enhancing diversity and education. Travel Assistance, on the other side, encourages GAC participation by lowering eventual budget issues that selected countries and approved organizations might have felt vs. participation of their representative teams (see <https://gac.icann.org/meeting-services/travel-assistance>). Going further could imply organized teaching sessions for requesting members or GAC 101 sessions as recommended in ATRT2 6.1a but this recommendation can be considered as overall implemented.*
- 2. Recommendations 6.1 to 6.3 represent a major recommendation corpus as far as ATRT2 GAC assessment is concerned. Major measures have been implemented further to these recommendations (see for example 6.1/b, 6.1/d, 6.1/e, 6.1/f, 6.1/g, 6.2), and while these matters should still be considered as on-going work, this recommendation can be considered as implemented.*
- 3. Reviewing GAC operating principles, it appears some of them can be considered as addressing members' best practices, see Principle 20 (commitment to efficiency vs. voting principles), Principle 41, 42 and 43 (Members statements and debates organization). In this sense, this recommendation can be considered as partially implemented. While agreeing GAC nature makes it harder to enforce strict rules on its members, it seems a clear and unoffensive definition of "best practices" as a "set of non-mandatory practices to facilitate efficiency and transparency of GAC work" could be established on a consensual basis and lead to further progress in GAC work efficiency. It is recommended that GAC members explore this avenue.*

Overall Assessment: Partially implemented Effectiveness

- 1. GAC attendees' number is stable over the years 2016-2019 with a rough estimate of 200 attendees per forum, forum category (Community, Policy, AGM) notwithstanding, with a slightly higher rate of Community forum participation. There is no major difference if we consider the participation per meeting nature, as the graphics show. It appears the recommendation implementation, while removing a certain number of barriers, has not been effective in enhancing participation. Further detailed studies would be necessary to target areas of improvement depending of the meetings. Note: Overall, the numbers of government/intergovernmental organizations attendees (not necessarily participating in GAC) are slightly higher but tend to be aligned in variation with GAC participation (AGM November 2016 being the exception: as a reminder, ICANN transitioned on September 30th, 2016). Hence it appears government participation tends to concentrate on GAC attendance, so further measures to enhance government participation can usefully be concentrated on this body.*

-
2. *Considering previous analyses and GAC 2017 Operating principles, and while recognizing progress can still be made, this recommendation can be considered as overall effective.*
 3. *Reviewing GAC Operating Principles, it appears some of them can be considered as addressing members best practices: See Principle 20 (commitment to efficiency vs. voting principles), Principle 41, 42, and 43 (members statements and debates organization). In this sense, this recommendation can be considered as partially implemented. On the other hand, while agreeing the GAC nature makes it harder to enforce strict rules on its members, it seems a clear and unoffensive definition of best practices as a “set of non-mandatory practices advised to facilitate efficiency and transparent GAC work” could be established on a consensual basis and lead to further progress in GAC work efficiency. Further work with GAC It is recommended that GAC members explore this avenue. Overall Assessment: Partially effective.*

Overall Assessment: Partially effective

Conclusion: Significant improvements have been made by the GAC since the ATRT2 recommendations. Additionally, it should also be noted that this type of recommendation implies more of a continuous improvement process rather than a single outcome.

Suggestion - ATRT3 suggests that the GAC continue with improvements in this area.

ICANN org follow-up

Since the adoption of the ATRT2 recommendations, the Board-GAC Interaction Group has evolved its approach and processes to reflect the collaborative working relationship between the Board and the GAC. This work has more recently focused on improving the cadence of work and process that the Board and GAC employ regarding consideration of the advice and issue of importance identified in each regular GAC Communiqué. These efforts have resulted in more substantive issue discussions and even closer collaborative efforts between the Board and GAC intersessionally between ICANN Public Meetings and throughout the calendar year.

These processes have become much more defined and regularized to incorporate a regular GAC Communiqué clarification call to confirm the intentions of GAC advice and to enable recognition and further dialogue regarding issues of importance identified by GAC Members three times a year. These discussions now result in written information exchanges (e.g., scorecards produced by the Board) that help clarify and inform the ICANN community about the matters and positions of the various parties.

In 2023, the current GAC Leadership team has also initiated what is intended to be an annual and multi-year approach to committee strategic planning and workload development. The approach is designed to give GAC representatives more tools to incorporate GAC issue discussions into the broader strategic and policy discussions of their individual governments.

Additionally, the GAC is currently planning its first High Level Government Meeting in six years to help renew existing lines of communication with senior government officials globally and to establish new relationships that reflect the evolving nature of GAC work within the ICANN community in a post-pandemic world.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.7

Recommendation 6.7 - ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to regularize senior officials' meetings by asking

the GAC to convene a High-Level meeting on a regular basis, preferably at least once every two years. Countries and territories that do not currently have GAC representatives should also be invited and a stock-taking after each High-Level meeting should occur.

Implementation: This recommendation led to High-Level Governmental Meetings being held in 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018. Additionally, the Guidelines for GAC High Level Governmental Meetings have been published. However, no new meeting is currently planned. Implementation assessment - Implemented

Effectiveness: The meetings were well-attended and the growth in GAC membership could be partially attributed to holding these meetings.

Effectiveness assessment - Effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.8

Recommendation 6.8 - ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to work with ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement group (GSE) to develop guidelines for engaging governments, both current and non-GAC members, to ensure coordination and synergy of efforts.

Implementation: The GSE/GE and GAC had defined a guideline process for their coordination, that can be seen at: <https://gac.icann.org/principles-and-guidelines/public/guidelines-coordination-gse.pdf> and started to be implemented at the national level. Monthly calls for GSE/GE calls are now including GAC (in general leaderships) and reports are posted. "At the request of the GAC the reports were further revised to arrange information by regions and later the scope of the report was changed to cover three months of activity each time - two months of completed engagement as well as the next months planned engagement are reflected. With the agreement of the GAC leadership the frequency of the reports changed to bimonthly when the scope of the reports was expanded." STAFF from both sides have weekly calls to keep track of notes, reports etc. Specially dedicated to Underserved Regions, a joint working group concluded a collaborative capacity-building workshop pilot program to increase outreach.

Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness – The recommendation is effective as demonstrated by:

- *GSE/GE and GAC organized together the High-Level meeting in Barcelona at ICANN63 with a huge success.*
- *GAC membership significantly grown hugely last year. Effectiveness Assessment – Effective.*

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 6.9

Recommendation 6.9 - The Board should instruct the GSE group to develop, with community input, a baseline and set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement that addresses the following:

- 1. Relationships with GAC and non-GAC member countries, including the development of a database of contact information for relevant government ministers;**
- 2. Tools to summarize and communicate in a more structured manner government involvement in ICANN, via the GAC, as a way to increase the transparency on how ICANN reacts to GAC advice (e.g. by using information in the GAC advice register).**
- 3. Making ICANN's work relevant for stakeholders in those parts of the world with limited participation; and,**
- 4. Develop and execute for each region of the world a plan to ensure that local enterprises and entrepreneurs fully and on equal terms can make use of ICANN's services including new gTLDs.**

Implementation: In response to Recommendation 6.9, the Board gets regular reports on interaction from the GSE. The GSE team meets and collaborates with the regional teams where they collaborate and manage a joint calendar sharing the events.

In collaboration with the ICANN org's regional GSE and GE teams facilitate regional discussions. GSE and GE then plan the work to identify and prioritize those activities for the coming year. Part of that planning process is the further development of the community wiki space to encompass the metrics, forums, and regional projects. In practice, GSE/GE implementation in the regions is according to community priorities as expressed in the community- driven regional engagement planning and prioritization.

Implementation Assessment - Implemented

Effectiveness: This is a directive and the Board has regular reports on interaction from the GSE.

Effectiveness assessment – effective.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been fully implemented and is effective – as such no further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

PUBLIC INPUT

ATRT2 Recommendation 7.1

Recommendation 7.1 - The Board should explore mechanisms to improve Public Comment through adjusted time allotments, forward planning regarding the number of consultations given anticipated growth in participation, and new tools that facilitate participation.

Implementation – There is a very thorough report on the ATRT2 Public Comments Enhancements. A minimum 40-Day comment period was set and the average number of days for the comment period is around 50. The 2-week deadline for Staff Summary Reports was reinforced, the new process provides for management escalation if the report is not published in time. All Public Comment requests are redirected through Policy Development Support department and a Staff Advisory Committee was established. As such this is almost completely implemented. ATRT2 required "forward planning regarding the number of public comments". Could not find any reference of this, but it is difficult to plan how many comments there will be. This recommendation was implemented as it was meant to be at the time it was made.

Implementation assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness: It seems that the Public Comment process is functioning correctly and that the new tools have helped.

Effectiveness assessment – Partially effective.

Conclusion – This recommendation has been implemented and is partially effective. No further action is required with respect to this recommendation, but it should be noted that the survey portion of this section will be making some suggestions to facilitate participation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 7.2

Recommendation 7.2 - The Board should establish a process under the Public Comment Process where those who commented or replied during the Public Comment and/or Reply Comment period(s) can request changes to the synthesis reports in cases where they believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comment(s).

Implementation – Implemented as requested but never used. Given the difficulties with Reply Comment period this functionality was discontinued. Since there was never a request to change synthesis reports, even after publicizing this option, and given the difficulties with the Reply Comment period where users would simply use this process to put in new comments both of these functionalities were discontinued without any significant protest from the community.

Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness – It was never used. Implementation assessment - Not Effective.

Conclusion – This recommendation was implemented, but was not used for the intended purpose. Respondents exclusively used this function as a second chance to provide comments. After reviewing the use of this new function, it was decided to remove it given it was not being used by anyone for the intended purpose. As such, no further action is required with respect to this recommendation.

ATRT2 Recommendation 8

Recommendation 8 - The recommendation states: To support public participation, the Board should review the capacity of the language services department versus the

community need for the service using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. ICANN should implement continuous improvement of translation and interpretation services including benchmarking of procedures used by international organizations such as the United Nations.

Implementation – Many improvements have been made and all official UNO languages are systematically supported through ICANN. The only KPI's available and referred to in the implementation report are in the accountability indicators 1.1 (<https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators>). They show the number of sessions interpreted for ICANN meeting vs. total number of sessions. This seems to clearly fall short of what was requested in the recommendation. Additionally, the Implementation Report clearly indicates that no benchmarking has been done. The Implementation Report does show that there are efforts being made along the lines of continuous improvements but because of the lack of any real KPIs or benchmarking it is difficult to assess the level of these efforts.

Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness – Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion: Some significant improvements have been implemented to the benefit of the community, but the establishment of effective measurements seems to be an ongoing issue (see section on accountability indicators). ATRT3 will make a suggestion with respect to its assessment of this recommendation.

Suggestion: Given ATRT2 Recommendation 8 was not completely implemented, ATRT3 strongly suggests that ICANN perform and publish some type of quality measurements with respect to its language services. These could include, for example, regular user satisfaction surveys at ICANN meetings for interpretation and obtaining a rating as to the quality of the translation of documents from members of the community who use these translated documents.

ICANN org follow-up

The ICANN Language Services Department has an established internal process to respond and assist with any request(s) for revision of a translation. This process is part of the internal Samanage ticketing system, thus the request must be initiated by an ICANN staff member. This system is used by the Language Service Team (LS) to produce a yearly report to share the data and resolution of the requests.

Additionally, the ICANN.org website provides, with the publication of every translated blog and announcement, an email address translations@icann.org for anyone to submit a comment and/or question related to the translation. The LS Team will work with the Information Transparency Platform (ITP) Team to extend this feature to other parts of ICANN.org, where appropriate.

The LS Team will develop a series of processes, by the end of FY24, to assist with the assessment of the services the department provides. These processes may include:

Community Facing

- A survey to assess overall LS support during ICANN Public Meetings, including interpretation services as well as Real-Time-Transcription (RTT, also known as

scribing) services that will be sent out to ICANN meeting participants after each ICANN Public Meeting.

- A short survey to rate each teleconference call supported with interpretation (working in liaison with community support staff).
- A short survey to assess transcription services that should be sent out to the community twice a year (working in liaison with community support staff).

Internal

- The internal ticketing system provides a customer satisfaction feature from which the LS Team can draw reports. The LS Team will work with IT to implement this feature to assess all submitted requests.
- As for the projects submitted through the internal ticketing system, the LS Team will explore with the ITP and IT Team how it can implement a customer satisfaction feature, in the future.

ATRT2 Recommendation 9.4

Recommendation 9.4 - Developing a full set of statistical data that will be published annually with each Fiscal Year Annual Report.

Implementation: The focus of the recommendation was on developing a full set of statistical data that will be published annually with each Fiscal Year's Annual Report. This was partially implemented in 2015 and has been continually improving in successive publications since then.

Implementation Assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: In terms of effectiveness of the recommendation implementation, compliance as evidenced inclusion in annual reports publication could be satisfactory. However, on the community side, there are no metrics available to measure users' application of statistics obtained on the published data and hence determine if the implementation is effective or not. Effectiveness Assessment – Insufficient information to assess.

Conclusion – As stated in the Implementation assessment this recommendation was implemented. As such ATRT3 will not be making any recommendations or suggestions as a result of its assessments.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDP)

ATRT2 Recommendation 10.1

Recommendation 10.1 - To enhance GNSO policy development processes and methodologies to better meet community needs and be more suitable for addressing complex problems, ICANN should:

- 1. In line with ongoing discussions within the GNSO, the Board should develop funded options for professional services to assist GNSO policy development WGs. Such services could include training to enhance work group leaders' and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situations, professional facilitation, mediation, negotiation. The GNSO should develop guidelines for when such options may be invoked,**

-
2. The Board should provide adequate funding for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, wiki, and teleconferences for GNSO policy development processes. Such face-to-face meeting must also accommodate remote participation, and consideration should also be given to using regional ICANN facilities (regional hubs and engagement centers) to support intersessional meetings. Moreover, the possibility of meetings added on to the start or end of ICANN meetings could also be considered. The GNSO must develop guidelines for when such meetings are required and justified, and who should participate in such meetings.
 3. The Board should work with the GNSO and the wider ICANN community to develop methodologies and tools to allow the GNSO policy development processes to utilize volunteer time more effectively, increasing the ability to attract busy community participants into the process and also resulting in quicker policy development.

Implementation – This recommendation was based on the detailed evaluation and analysis of the GNSO Policy Development Process undertaken by InterConnect Communications for ATRT2, and three specific actions were recommended for ICANN to implement; paraphrased they were to a) develop, fund and ensure the availability of professional services to assist PDP WG's to "...include training to enhance work group leaders 'and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situations, professional facilitation, mediation, negotiation..." under guidelines to be developed by the GNSO; b) Provide adequate funding for "... for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, wiki and teleconferences for GNSO policy development processes..."; c) "The Board should work with the GNSO and the wider ICANN community to develop methodologies and tools to allow the GNSO policy development processes to utilize volunteer time more effectively, resulting in quicker policy development." We have observed the provision of some of these Professional Services (specifically facilitated meetings and mediation in the recent EPDP, but no generalized training or in-service development of current PDP WG Leadership has been observed. As well as face to face meetings (again most obviously for the EPDP); but no engagement with GNSO and wider community as outlined in c) beyond the relevant input of some aspects of the Governance Evolution work being undertaken since ICANN 64, though we do note the current and ongoing work of the GNSO Council with its own PDP 3.0 development and so this seems to be not fully implemented but only partially.

Implementation assessment – Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: There is evidence that where the implemented actions have been utilized, they have been effective if not highly effective, based on anecdotal evidence at least, but not all proposed actions have been deployed or as yet implemented and so effectiveness cannot be stated on these.

Implementation Assessment - Partially Effective.

Conclusion: Although this recommendation is assessed as only Partially Implemented and Partially Effective, ATRT3 must also take into consideration that there are several significant activities ongoing in other parts of the ICANN Community, such as the GNSO PDP 3.0 and the 'Evolution of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model.' These will potentially have wide ranging effects on the current gTLD PDP process but will only complete their work after ATRT3 has delivered its final report.

As such ATRT3 will refrain from making any specific suggestions with respect to the GNSO PDP process but will rather concentrate on making an overarching strong suggestion regarding any proposed changes to that process.

Suggestion: ATRT3 recognizes that there are several significant activities being undertaken in parallel by other parts of the ICANN Community that will potentially have wide ranging effects on the current gTLD PDP process. These include the GNSO Council's work on "PDP 3.0," the results of the GNSO's EPDP process and outcomes from the current work on the 'Evolution of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model,' none of which will likely deliver results prior to ATRT3 submitting its final report. Therefore, ATRT3 has deemed it as premature to make any specific recommendations or suggestions regarding gTLD PDPs.

However, regardless of the results of these other processes, the ATRT3 strongly suggests that any proposal to change the current gTLD Policy Development Process clearly enhance, and not in any way reduce or restrict, the open, equitable and collaborative nature of the ICANN multistakeholder model nor adversely affect the security and stability of the DNS.

ICANN org follow-up

ICANN org acknowledges and is aligned with the ATRT3 final suggestion that *"any proposal to change the current gTLD Policy Development Process clearly enhance, and not in any way reduce or restrict, the open, equitable and collaborative nature of the ICANN multistakeholder model nor adversely affect the security and stability of the DNS."*

At the same time, work has been done and/or is in progress to address some of the remaining elements of the original ATRT2 recommendation. This includes the availability of resources such as facilitation of face-to-face meetings when determined by the GNSO Council as the policy development process (PDP) manager, the translation of the Consensus Playbook which is a training tool available to the broader community, and the leadership programs.

ATRT2 Recommendation 10.2

Recommendation 10.2 - The GAC, in conjunction with the GNSO, must develop methodologies to ensure that GAC and government input is provided to ICANN policy development processes and that the GAC has effective opportunities to provide input and guidance on draft policy development outcomes. Such opportunities could be entirely new mechanisms or utilization of those already used by other stakeholders in the ICANN environment. Such interactions should encourage information exchanges and sharing of ideas/opinions, both in face-to-face meetings and intersessionally, and should institutionalize the cross-community deliberations foreseen by the AoC.

Implementation – As it was raised during the ATRT3 interviews with the community at ICANN 65, there is no process established between GNSO and GAC to facilitate communications related to issues that are key to both parties. There should be a complete process like the one defined between the Board and the GAC, with specific adjustments to fit into GNSO. The nature of GNSO makes it more difficult to do this with the GAC vs GAC-Board, but since this recommendation was made by ATRT2 both sides are trying to improve communications. This is a work in progress that needs to continue.

Implementation assessment - Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness: Some alternatives to improve communication and effectiveness have been tested, but at this time we cannot consider the effectiveness. Effectiveness assessment - Insufficient Information.

Conclusion: ATRT3 recognizes that the history between the GAC providing and the GNSO accepting input into the policy development process has been and remains inconsistent per this ATRT2 recommendation. While the community may believe that there is no process established between the GAC and the GNSO to facilitate participation there are examples such as the Public Safety Working Group that has engaged early and consistently on topics where clear positions are established and reinforced early enough for the GNSO to consider this input as part of the policy deliberation and recommendation process. ATRT3 has already made a suggestion in Section 4 of this report that “ATRT3 suggests that the GAC, considering the success of the current mechanisms that are in place for interacting with the Board, work with the GNSO to implement similar mechanisms to facilitate interactions between the GAC and the GNSO.” which address this issue.

ICANN org follow-up

Rather than developing any new formal processes to date, the GAC Leadership has pursued implementation of new informal methodologies to improve information flow and ensure contributions to GNSO policy development from governments and the GAC. Regular discussions among the GAC and GNSO leadership teams intersessionally and at ICANN Public Meeting sessions between community memberships continue to inform policy contributions and cross-community interaction.

The GNSO has established opportunities for GAC appointees and volunteers to participate in cross-community work efforts to substantively discuss both the development and implementation of gTLD policies (e.g., New gTLD Implementation Review Team; GNSO Guidance Process Regarding Applicant Support; GNSO Rights Protection Management PDP; GNSO EPDP on Definition and Management of IDN Variant TLD policy proposals; various Registration Data Service matters; etc.).

In 2022, the ICANN Board initiated a novel and innovative effort to facilitate dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC as a mechanism for reaching mutually agreeable solutions regarding the identification and processing of closed generic applications in the next round of gTLD applications. This pilot effort, which was later joined by the ALAC, reflected the spirit and intent of the ATRT3 Recommendation 10.2 and may pave the way for future efforts consistent with this approach.

The GAC Leadership will continue to gather and assess feedback from its members regarding the effectiveness of these efforts and the need for any further informal and/or formal improvements.

See also the initial [GAC reaction](#) to the ATRT3 Final Report.

ATRT2 Recommendation 10.3

Recommendation 10.3 - The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO policy development processes, as well as other GNSO processes. The focus should be on the viability and methodology of having the opportunity for equitable, substantive and robust participation from and representing:

- 1. All ICANN communities with an interesting TLD policy and in particular, those represented within the GNSO;**
- 2. Under-represented geographical regions;**

-
3. **Non-English-speaking linguistic groups;**
 4. **Those with non-Western cultural traditions; and**
 5. **Those with a vital interesting TLD policy issues but who lack the financial support of industry players.**

Implementation – The language of the recommendation and report makes it somewhat difficult to discern which programs are designed specifically to address this implementation. However, the Leadership Program, Community Regional Outreach Program, and mentorship efforts can all be considered to fulfill this recommendation.

Implementation Assessment: Implemented.

Effectiveness: Implementation effectiveness has not been shown by the limited testing of such action.

Effectiveness assessment - Partially Effective

Conclusion: Although this recommendation is assessed as Implemented and Partially Effective, ATRT3 must also take into consideration that there are several significant activities ongoing in other parts of the ICANN Community, such as the GNSO PDP 3.0 and the ‘Evolution of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model’. These will potentially have wide ranging effects on the current gTLD PDP process but will only complete their work after ATRT3 has delivered its final report.

As such ATRT3 will refrain from making any specific suggestions with respect to the GNSO PDP process but will rather concentrate on making an overarching strong suggestion regarding any proposed changes to that process.

Suggestion: See Recommendation 10.1

ATRT2 Recommendation 10.4

Recommendation 10.4 - To improve the transparency and predictability of the policy development process the Board should clearly state to what degree it believes that it may establish gTLD policy in the event that the GNSO cannot come to closure on a specific issue, in a specified time- frame if applicable, and to the extent that it may do so, the process for establishing such gTLD policies. This statement should also note under what conditions the Board believes it may alter GNSO Policy Recommendations, either before or after formal Board acceptance.

Implementation – Evidence to support implementation is limited to checklist type statement of 'implemented' and there has been little opportunity to test this is in fact the case. It is notable that this specific aspect of Board opinion or statement was lacking in the recent Board Resolution relating to its only partial acceptance of recommendations from the work of the EPDP Phase 1.

Implementation assessment – Not implemented.

Effectiveness: Not Applicable.

Conclusion: Although this recommendation is assessed as Not Implemented, ATRT3 must also take into consideration that there are several significant activities ongoing in other parts

of the ICANN Community, such as the GNSO PDP 3.0 and the ‘Evolution of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model’. These will potentially have wide ranging effects on the current gTLD PDP process but will only complete their work after ATRT3 has delivered its final report.

As such ATRT3 will refrain from making any specific suggestions with respect to the GNSO PDP process but will rather concentrate on making an overarching strong suggestion regarding any proposed changes to that process.

Suggestion: See Recommendation 10.1

ICANN org follow-up

The language of this recommendation seems to indicate a misunderstanding of the Board’s and the GNSO’s respective roles as defined by the Bylaws.

ICANN org wishes to highlight that the Board is not a policy making body, so even if the GNSO “cannot come to closure on a specific issue” that does not mean the Board should make policy. Similarly, the Board cannot “alter GNSO Policy Recommendations, either before or after formal Board acceptance”. This is all clearly established in the Bylaws.

Annex A and Annex A-1 of the Bylaws describe a very specific, detailed, step-by-step process to govern a situation where the Board may decide not to adopt a GNSO policy recommendation and the consultation process that must take place if that occurs. This is supplemented by the [GNSO PDP Manual](#), which specifically describes a process for the GNSO to modify its policy recommendations before Board action.

REVIEWS

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.1

Recommendation 11.1 - The Board should ensure that the ongoing work of the AoC reviews², including implementation, is fed into the work of other ICANN strategic activities wherever appropriate.

Implementation: The AoC Reviews are currently referred to as Specific Reviews and are mandated in section 4.6 of the Bylaws. They include the Accountability and Transparency (ATRT) reviews, the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT) reviews, the Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR) reviews and Registration Directory Service (RDS) reviews.

Implementation of recommendations is tracked in the <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/specific-reviews>. The SSR2 team has thus far found that many of the SSR1 recommendations were not implemented or not effective, contradicting ICANN’s own assessments.

² AoC reviews: The Affirmation of Commitment Reviews were part of the Affirmation of Commitments between the United States Department of Commerce and ICANN with which ICANN committed to take a series of specific actions together with ongoing commitment reviews. Following the IANA Stewardship Transition, the reviews have been included in Article 4.6 of ICANN Bylaws.

There are significant concerns about delays in completion of this new round of reviews, and delay or lack of acceptance of the CCT recommendations.

Implementation assessment – Not Implemented.

Effectiveness – Not effective.

Conclusion: The Board has been overwhelmed with recommendations, many of which the Board is not in a position to execute on its own, and which in total appear to be cost-prohibitive for ICANN to implement. This goes to the issue of prioritization which will be addressed in Section 12 of this report.

Suggestion: None

ICANN org follow-up

To implement ATRT3 Recommendation 5, a community-led prioritization group, the Planning Prioritization Group, was set up in 2022 to prioritize ICANN work, including Specific Reviews Board-approved recommendations. Their input is fed into the ICANN Operating Plan. See [here](#) for more information.

During the pilot planning prioritization exercise in 2022, 45 Specific Reviews recommendations were prioritized through the importance/urgency technique. The outcome of the exercise was a priority level assigned to each recommendation that provided input for the various ICANN org departments to plan their activities accordingly.

To address the ATRT3 concern about the delayed completion of review recommendations, ICANN org is committed to delivering on all Board-approved recommendations. Their implementation status is tracked via:

- ICANN org and wiki webpages;
- Detailed implementation reports for each complete recommendation;
- Quarterly report on the status of the Specific Reviews recommendation.

Furthermore, a final implementation report for each Specific Review will be published as soon as all the recommendations are complete.

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.2

Recommendation 11.2 - The Board should ensure strict coordination of the various review processes so as to have all reviews complete before next ATRT review begins, and with the proper linkage of issues as framed by the AoC.

Implementation: The reviews schedule to meet this objective was put up for public comment and finalized in 2015 intended to allow for all reviews to be completed prior to the beginning of the next ATRT review. Unfortunately, the SSR2 review is not yet completed, the CCT recommendations have not been processed, and the CCWG- Accountability WG recommendations have not yet been implemented.

Implementation assessment – Not implemented.

Effectiveness – Not effective.

Conclusion – ATRT3 will consider its ATRT2 implementation assessments along with the responses to the ATRT3 survey questions regarding Specific Reviews when considering making a general recommendation regarding reviews.

Suggestion: None

ICANN org follow-up

This recommendation has been superseded by the following Board-approved ATRT3 Recommendations on reviews (status at the end of the last calendar quarter of 2023):

- 3.1 – defer RDS review (Complete. The Board [took action](#) on 22 September 2022 to defer the Third Review of the Registration Directory Service, RDS3);
- 3.2 pertaining to CCT reviews (in progress), specifically that the next review should be started two years after the first introduction of the next round (instead of one year);
- 3.3 – defer SSR3 (Complete. The Board [took action](#) on 10 March 2022 to defer the third Security, Stability, and Resiliency, SSR3, Review);
- 3.4 pertaining to ATRT (in progress);
- 3.5 to initiate a new review – Holistic Review (in progress);
- 3.6 to evolve Org Reviews into a Continuous Improvement Program (in progress). The Board took action [on 21 June 2021](#) to defer the third GNSO Review and [on 12 June 2022](#) to defer the Organizational Reviews of the ALAC, ASO, ccNSO, NomCom, RSSAC, and SSAC, until such time as the Board, community, and ICANN org better understand the impact of the ATRT3 recommendations on the next Organizational Review cycle, as well as in consideration of the current community workload.

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.3

Recommendation 11.3 - The Board should ensure that AoC Review Teams are appointed in a timely fashion, allowing them to complete their work in the minimum one (1) year period that the review is supposed to take place, regardless of the time when the team is established. It is important for ICANN to factor in the cycle of AoC reviews; the Review Team selection process should begin at the earliest point in time possible given its mandate.

Implementation: The Board can trigger any review, but it is no longer in charge of selecting the members of the (ex-AOC) review teams. The decision to start a RT is taken by both the Board and the empowered community. We can therefore consider this as implemented.

Implementation assessment - Implemented.

Effectiveness – Partially effective.

Conclusion – ATRT3 will not be making any suggestions or recommendation with respect to this recommendation.

Suggestion: None

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.4

Recommendation 11.4 - The Board should prepare a complete implementation report to be ready by review kick-off. This report should be submitted for public consultation, and relevant benchmarks and metrics must be incorporated in the report.

Implementation- ATRT3's kickoff meeting was 3-5 April 2019. The implementation report, which was only a set of slides, was first sent to the list on 23 April 2019 and did not contain any relevant benchmarks or metrics. ICANN org did eventually point the review team to the Executive Summaries which detailed the implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations.

Additionality, there was no public comment on this document as ICANN org. interpreted "public consultation" to mean that publishing this would meet this requirement.

Implementation assessment: Partially Implemented.

Effectiveness – Given this is the first ATRT review since this recommendation was made by ATRT2 and considering the significant issues with respect to its implementation for ATRT3 the implementation cannot be considered effective. Effectiveness assessment: Not effective.

Conclusion: As outlined in various sections of this report, ATRT3 found significant issues in its assessment of the implementation report (the Executive Summaries – see section 9 of this report). This being said, ATRT3 recognizes the implementation of, and likely positive effects of, the new tracking options in the Reviews section of the ICANN website, as well as the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews adopted by the ICANN Board in June 2019.

Suggestion: Given the significant issues ATRT3 has identified with ICANN's implementation and reporting of implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations coupled with the untested changes which should address this, ATRT3 suggests that:

- *The Board follow through with requesting an Implementation Shepherd (Section 4.5 of the Operating Standards) from ATRT3 for the implementation of its suggestions and recommendations*
- *ICANN open a Public Comment Proceeding on its implementation of the ATRT3 suggestions and recommendations such that the Implementation Report is available at the launch of the next ATRT type review (recognizing ATRT3 will be making recommendations with respect to Specific Reviews).*

ICANN org follow-up

To address the ATRT2 Recommendation 11.4 and its ATRT3 assessment, ICANN org is already:

- Publishing detailed implementation reports for each complete recommendation.
- Publishing quarterly reports on the status of the Specific Reviews recommendation which contain metrics.

ICANN org plans to publish a final implementation report for each Specific Review as soon as all the recommendations are complete with the goal of making such report available to the public, including to the review team responsible for the following review iteration.

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.5

Recommendation 11.5 - The ICANN Board should ensure in its budget that sufficient resources are allocated for Review Teams to fulfill their mandates. This should include, but is not limited to, accommodation of Review Team requests to appoint independent experts/consultants if deemed necessary by the teams. Before a review is commenced, ICANN should publish the budget for the review, together with a rationale for the amount allocated that is based on the experiences of the previous teams, including ensuring a continuous assessment and adjustment of the budget according to the needs of the different reviews.

Implementation: As stated in the Implementation Report "A standard process for budgeting for AoC reviews has been established via a budget worksheet. Developing budgets for the next round of AoC Reviews has been completed as part of the FY16 Operating Plan and Budget which was approved by the Board in June 2015 and is currently underway for FY 17." which all evidence points to being exact including this ATRT3 Review.

Implementation assessment – Implemented.

Effectiveness: From a transparency point of view the Review Fact Sheets provide great transparency into a review's progress on all fronts including financially. This brought to light the almost doubling of the expenses vs the original budget for the CCT review however it is unclear what accountability was associated with this? It is difficult to fault the review team as the budget for all specific reviews is set at a specific amount, currently 550K\$, prior to the review team being selected and determining its work plan. Effectiveness assessment – Partially Effective.

Conclusion: The ATRT3 recognizes and endorses the importance of ATRT2 Recommendation 11.5 and notes that it has generally been implemented.

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggests that Review Teams assess their allocated budget with staff once they have established a work plan. Review Teams should be allowed to request reasonable and justified amendments as necessary to ensure they can complete their task. The Review Team and staff should review the budget at regular intervals during the course of the project and could request to have it amended it under exceptional circumstances.

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.6

Recommendation 11.6 - The Board should address all AoC Review Team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous manner, indicating to what extent they are accepting each recommendation.

Implementation: Since this ATRT2 recommendation was made the only AOC/Specific review which has completed its work is the CCT-RT where the Board has published which recommendations it would accept (<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-03-01-en#1.a>) and which it would "pass on" but is unclear on the 17 recommendation it has placed in pending status.

Implementation assessment – Not Implemented.

Effectiveness – Given the implementation assessment one must conclude that this recommendation is not effective. Effectiveness assessment – not effective.

Conclusion – This goes to the issue of prioritization which will be addressed in Section 12 of this report.

Suggestion: None

ICANN org follow-up

At the time of writing this follow-up report, the Board has taken action on all the CCT, RDS-WHOIS2, SSR2 and ATRT3 recommendations, with the exception of five of them (four from the CCT and one from the SSR2 Review) that were placed in pending status due to dependencies.

The Board action on each recommendation is supported by rationale contained in a scorecard that accompanies Board action.

Furthermore, in 2020 the Implementation Operations department was set up with the responsibility for implementation of community recommendations, including moving the recommendations placed in pending status to Board consideration.

Since the establishment of the Implementation Operations department, the periodic reporting on the status of implementation of Board approved recommendations has been significantly enhanced, with published implementation reports once a recommendation is complete, quarterly reports and public webinars, as well as with revamped org and wiki webpages where the implementation status of each recommendation can be easily tracked. See [here](#) for more information.

ATRT2 Recommendation 11.7

Recommendation 11.7 - In responding to Review Team recommendations, the Board should provide an expected time frame for implementation, and if that time frame is different from one given by the Review Team, the rationale should address the difference.

Implementation: The Board has only considered recommendations from the one Review that has completed -- CCT-RT. For these recommendations, the Board accepted 6, placed 17 in “pending” status, and “passed through” 14 recommendations to other community groups. For the 6 approved recommendations, neither the Board resolution nor its implementation plan include or reference any expected time frame, nor did they comment on the time frames given by the Review Team. The implementation plan seems to rely on public comments with respect to time frames.

Next Steps: In exercising its fiduciary duty, the Board intends to consider the proposed plan for implementation as well as community feedback received on the proposed path forward and considerations specific to each recommendation. Once the community input adequately considered, the ICANN Board will direct ICANN org to produce a detailed implementation plan that results in the implementation of Recommendations 1, 17, 21, 22, 30, 31, including any adjustments the input received through the Public Comment proceeding may potentially prompt. Further implementation details, including resources availability, scheduling, will be

supplemented with specific details and budget plans once the implementation steps are underway. (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cct-rt-final-08sep18-en.pdf>)

The ATRT3 notes that the ICANN Board has recognized the reality of the overwhelming number and scope of recommendations, and in June 2019 implemented new Operating Standards for Specific Reviews, with requirements that attempt to navigate this challenge:

- "...transparent exchange between the review team, subject matter experts, ICANN organization, ICANN Board must occur so that the identified problems, the recommended solutions, and the expected impact of implementation is clearly defined and well understood by all."
- "The review team shall take into consideration the expected impact of implementation on ICANN resources and on the ICANN community workload. Also, the review team should consider whether there is sufficient community capacity and expertise to ensure successful implementation. These considerations should not limit the number of recommendations."

The ATRT3 also notes that the SSR2 review team did not accept these (then optional) new Operating Standards, and the ATRT3 considers them in the experimental stages now. Our understanding is that the ATRT3 team is the first review team to attempt to operate under them. It is not clear whether this level of analysis (i.e., expected impact on community resources and workload) is reasonable to expect from a set of volunteers.

Implementation assessment – Not Implemented.

Effectiveness – Given the implementation assessment one must conclude that this recommendation was not effective. Effectiveness assessment – not effective. (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cct-rt-final-08sep18-en.pdf>)

Conclusion – Given the assessment by ATRT3 that this recommendation was not implemented ATRT3 suggests that the Board implement this recommendation as it was originally proposed by ATRT2.

Suggestion: ATRT3 suggests that the Board implement this recommendation as it was originally proposed by ATRT2.

ICANN org follow-up

ICANN org acknowledges the importance of ensuring a timely implementation of the recommendations coming from any review. The Implementation Operations department was created in 2020 to coordinate the implementation of such recommendations.

Following the implementation of ATRT3 Recommendation 5 that introduced a prioritization process for Board-approved, recommendations are subject to such a prioritization process. The Board, as a result, cannot provide an expected time frame for implementation at the time a recommendation is approved. Refer to the implementation documentation for [ATRT3 Recommendation 5](#) for more information.

A recommendation's implementation status is publicly available (e.g. for ATRT3, see [wiki page](#) and [org page](#)), and reported on in the quarterly reports. Changes in the implementation timeframe are documented and explained to the extent possible.

Additionally, webinars on the implementation status of the Specific Reviews recommendations that take place during Prep Week for the ICANN Public Meetings provide an additional opportunity to obtain information on the implementation status of Board-approved recommendations.



One World, One Internet

Visit us at icann.org



[@icann](https://twitter.com/icann)



facebook.com/icannorg



youtube.com/icannnews



flickr.com/icann



linkedin/company/icann



soundcloud/icann



instagram.com/icannorg