**Findings of ATRT1:** ATRT1 found that the timeliness and effectiveness of policy-making was a serious concern among participants in the ICANN process. Among the concerns were the sheer volume of open proceedings and prioritization thereof. ATRT1 found it would be important to improve the nature and structure of the public input and policy-making processes.

**ATRT 1, Recommendation # 16**: “Public notice and comment processes should provide for both a distinct ‘Comment’ cycle and a ‘Reply Comment’ cycle that allows community respondents to address and rebut arguments raised in opposing parties’ comments.”

**Summary of ICANN’s assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness**

ICANN Staff reports that it has implemented fully Recommendation # 16. Staff demonstrated that an implementation plan was developed and put out for Public Comment and that a Comment and Reply Comment cycle were implemented. **(insert citations)** Staff also notes that, at the same time, review of the public wiki was undertaken to consider improvements to the public interface aspect of submitting Comments.

**Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness**

Community input reflected a range of views. While there was little comment on the Comment and Reply Comment mechanisms themselves, there was recognition that ICANN spends a great deal of time and resources offering the opportunity to provide comments in ICANN processes (Alejandro Pisanty). With respect to how “easy” it is to provide comments, views ranged markedly from “very easy” to “not easy.” Commenters recognized the improvements and offered high marks for Staff’s efforts (RySG). A number of commenters pointed to the length of the request for comment and the time period allotted for comments as creating challenges to effective participation. Others noted insufficient planning and the high number of consultations creating barriers to participation. (Nominet). **(insert citations)**

**Summary of other relevant information**

Staff also noted that the Community had not utilized the “Reply Comment” cycle as ATRT 1 intended it. Community members have used the Reply Comment cycle to offer comments (either for the first time or in addition to earlier filed Comments). Staff indicated that education regarding the proper use of the Reply Comment cycle had been offered but that commenters did not follow the recommended use. Staff also noted that it is considering lengthening the time periods for Comments, having heard complaints from the Community that the current time period allowed was too short for some to draft and approve Comments for submission. Staff also noted that it was developing new tools to allow for Comment through different means (e.g. social media tools) and would consult with the Community before deploying such tools.
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**ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)**

Implementation of Recommendation 16 appears complete but with qualified success. Given the Community’s use of the Reply Comment cycle, it does not appear that those mechanisms are offering the intended benefit. That being said, the challenges with respect to the Comment process appear to be in the area of time allotted, frequency of consultations and complexity (for some) of the requests for comments.

**ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness**

The effectiveness of implementation is qualified but, where unsuccessful, is not entirely due to implementation efforts of Staff. Interestingly, the Board has improved in reflecting Public Comment in its resolutions that is a key element of accountability and transparency. ATRT2’s assessment is that fulsome, broader and more frequent public comment can be facilitated through adjustments to time allotted, forward planning regarding the number of consultations and new tools that facilitate easier participation in the Comment process.