

Initial Staff Assessment of and Response to ATRT2 Draft Report and Recommendations 5 December 2013

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
Board Performance and Work Practices		
1	Develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and the success of Board improvement efforts, and analyze those findings over time.	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested; difficult to implement/not implementable as stated</p> <p>Measuring "quality" or "improvement" of Board members is a difficult task, particularly without some measurement of the status quo. It would be helpful if the ATRT2 could identify the types of qualities they are looking to have measured. Measuring attendance, voting record and the like can be done, but measuring the quality of a person, or improvement in quality over time based on subjective criteria is difficult. The Board does perform a self-assessment of Board conduct, and the Board Governance Committee (BGC) oversees 360 degree evaluations of those Board members whose terms are set to end that will inform the selecting bodies if those Board members choose to seek another term.</p>
2	Develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; portions of the recommendation will be implemented to the extent of work already underway, while others are not implementable as stated</p> <p>In terms of metrics to measure effectiveness of Board functioning, work is underway to implement Accountability and Transparency metrics. Propose to move the metrics component of this recommendation to an observation instead of a recommendation. ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables. It is not clear how publishing training materials helps gauge levels of improvement. Moreover, if third-party materials are used for training purposes, those materials are proprietary to the third party and cannot be posted; we should not limit training to ICANN-developed material. To the extent ICANN-developed material is used to train Board members, it could be posted. See information submitted by staff - Inventory Item #2 (ATRT 1 Rec #2) - Regularly reinforce/review training & skills building.</p>
3	Conduct qualitative/ quantitative studies to determine if the qualifications of Board candidate pools improved once compensation was available, and regularly assess Director's compensation levels.	<p>Propose to withdraw recommendation; difficult to implement/not implementable as stated</p> <p>As it relates to assessment of Director's compensation levels, the Board has this on its schedule and does it regularly; the Board (through the Compensation Committee) is currently in the process of reviewing compensation as scheduled. Accordingly, it seems unnecessary to have a further recommendation on this topic. In terms of qualitative/quantitative studies of the qualifications of Board candidate pools, and whether they have improved since offering compensation, only the Nominating</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		<p>Committee (NomCom) has confidential information about the NomCom candidates. In terms of the Board candidates for the SOs and At-Large seats, to the extent the resumes and CVs for all candidates are available - for the past and the present - the types of skills and experience the candidates had/have can potentially be measured (i.e., number other Board seats the candidate has occupied, size of organizations, types of Board committees, etc.) However, judging the comparative qualitative nature of the qualifications of different Board members seems a very difficult and possibly unachievable task.</p>
Policy/ Implementation/ Executive Function Distinction		
4	<p>Develop complementary mechanisms for SO/AC consultation on administrative and executive issues to be addressed at the Board level.</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>As reported by staff, a working group has been formed within the GNSO, which is open to everyone interested, and work is ongoing within the community on policy vs. implementation issues. Propose that the community be given time to further its work, and that the ATRT2 acknowledge this work as an observation instead of a recommendation. The ATRT2 could further request that ongoing updates be provided regarding this work, including project time lines, milestones and deliverables.</p> <p>In terms of the continued use of the “administrative and executive issues” nomenclature, ICANN proposes that if this recommendation (or future proposal) is indeed about policy v. implementation issues that the terminology be updated to include “policy” and “implementation”. Technically, the Board does not take “executive” issues, and a paper has already been produced for the community classifying administrative actions by the Board. The continued use of “administrative and executive” labels renders this recommendation unclear.</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
Decision Making Transparency and Appeals Processes		
5	Determine how the proper scope of redaction could be reasonably confirmed.	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested; recommendation could be implementable if clarification provided by ICANN is sufficient</p> <p>As recognized by the ATRT2, there are set guidelines and an explanation for each redaction of Board materials posted. If this recommendation is understood to call for ICANN to implement a process through which it tracks the redactions applied and implements a regular review over those redactions to determine if redactions remain necessary, that is implementable. If this is indeed what the recommendation is hoping to achieve, recommend that the text of the recommendation be modified to reflect this tracking and review process.</p> <p>If this recommendation is hoping to achieve something different from the proposed clarification, it would be helpful if the ATRT2 could provide examples or specifics that can be pointed to that could give some context to this question or to help identify where there might be an ongoing concern about the level and nature of redactions to Board materials. There were some suggestions of over-redaction, but no examples have been provided. The Draft Report suggests that there has been a lot of progress made in the publication of Board materials since the ATRT1 report was issued. Without further clarification or examples, it is difficult to understand what exactly is being recommended or requested by the text of the recommendation as it currently stands.</p>
7	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.	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>As reported to the ATRT2, plans are underway to make further adjustments to the public comments channel based on community feedback regarding the existence of reply comment periods, the overall length of the public comment period and the frequency of future comment period forecasts. Additionally, new tools are being developed to facilitate participation, as shared with the ATRT2. Propose that this recommendation be deleted and replaced with an observation that acknowledges work in process. ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables to inform the community.</p>
9	Consideration of decision-making inputs and appeals processes:	See detailed responses below
	9.1 Mandate Board Response to Advisory Committee Formal Advice ICANN Bylaws: Article XI should be amended to include:	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>Propose that this recommendation be deleted and an observation added in its place to acknowledge that work is</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	<p><i>The ICANN Board will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all Advisory Committees explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.</i></p>	<p>underway to address certain aspects of this recommendation. In Durban, ICANN’s Chairman of the Board committed to implementing a publicly available register of advice from all Advisory Committees (in addition to the process already in place for GAC advice). An initial version of this register including SSAC and ALAC advice was introduced shortly before ICANN’s meeting in Buenos Aires and consultations are underway regarding the future design and use of the tool. Adequate time should be given for this mechanism to be rolled out, tested and evaluated for utility before changing the Bylaws. ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, including milestones and deliverables to inform the community.</p>
	<p>9.2 Explore Options for Restructuring Current Review Mechanisms: The ICANN Board should convene a Special Community Committee to discuss options for improving Board accountability with regard to restructuring of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) and the Reconsideration Process. The group will use the report of the Experts Group Report (ESEP) on Restructuring as one basis for its discussions</p>	<p>Propose to withdraw recommendation; time required to assess impact of recent revisions ICANN has just recently completed an intensive evaluation of its accountability mechanisms through the ASEP, the Accountability Structures Expert Panel, which was established pursuant to recommendations from the ATRT1. The Bylaws revisions resulting from the ASEP’s work were only put into effect in April 2013. There has not yet been an Independent Review proceeding conducted under the revised Bylaws, and only a few requests for Reconsideration have been concluded pursuant to the new Bylaws. The community may benefit by having some track record of use and effect of the recently revised mechanisms prior to initiating a new review of those same mechanisms. In addition, any consideration of the accountability mechanisms must take into account the limitations imposed by ICANN's structure; namely, the ICANN Board cannot cede its decision making to a third party, so there cannot be a reference to any body that could overturn decisions of the ICANN Board. ICANN commits to review the situation after adequate time has passed to make a meaningful assessment.</p>
	<p>9.3 Review Ombudsman Role: The Ombudsman role as defined in the Bylaws shall be reviewed to determine whether it is still appropriate as defined, or whether it needs to be expanded or otherwise revised to help deal with the issues such as:</p>	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible/Bylaws change may be required Reviewing the scope of the Ombudsman's responsibilities is feasible. ICANN could commission a review of the Ombudsman's scope of responsibilities to help inform a decision on whether expanding that scope is appropriate given the nature of ICANN. Also, consideration of the role (not the current Ombudsman) must be the focus, particularly since the current Ombudsman was engaged in accordance with the Bylaws as written. If the Ombudsman's scope of responsibility is eventually altered, then a Bylaws change would be required.</p>
	<p>9.3.1 A role in the continued process review and reporting on Board and Staff transparency.</p>	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible; staff clarification provided See Response to Rec. #9.3.</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	9.3.2 A role in helping employees deal with issues related to the public policy functions of ICANN	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible; clarification of recommendation requested</p> <p>See Response to Rec. #9.3.</p> <p>A clarification on what is meant by "related to the public policy functions of ICANN" would be helpful to understand if a review of the Ombudsman's scope is undertaken.</p>
	9.3.3 A role in proper treatment of whistleblowers and the protection of employees who decide there is a need to raise an issue that might be problematic for their continued employment.	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible in that it calls for a review</p> <p>See Response to Rec. #9.3.</p>
	<p>9.4 Develop Transparency Metrics and Reporting: As part of its yearly report, ICANN should include:</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>Agree with this objective but propose that this recommendation be deleted and replaced with an observation acknowledging work currently underway. Production of an annual report addressing not just transparency, but also accountability (of which transparency is one important dimension) is the focus of current work as part of the Accountability and Transparency Benchmarks and Metrics project. ICANN anticipates implementing a framework for measuring, assessing and reporting ICANN's performance relative to its peers as well as relative to its performance over time. Propose that this framework be used to define "the broad range of Transparency issues with supporting metrics." ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, including milestones and deliverables to inform the community.</p>
	9.4.1 A report on the broad range on Transparency issues with supporting metrics.	See response to #9.4.
	9.4.2 A discussion of the degree to which ICANN, Staff and Community, are adhering to a standard of default transparency or where decisions to either use Chatham House Rule or redaction is made on a case by case basis and is documented in a transparent manner.	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested; difficult to implement/not implementable as stated</p> <p>The very broad wording of this request makes success in meeting this request nearly impossible. There is no identification of what should be focused upon, what type of initiatives should be reported upon, or what forms of documents or redactions should be included. Some examples would go a long way to assisting in understanding this recommendation.</p>
	<p>9.4.3 Statistical reporting on ICANN Board information and report disclosure, to include: >the usage of the Documentary Information disclosure Policy (DIDP) >Percentage of Board Book and other information that is released to the general public</p>	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested; difficult to implement/not implementable as stated</p> <p>As this relates to the DIDP, note that ICANN now includes information about the DIDP in an annual report that previously only included information regarding reconsideration requests and independent review proceedings. Please see http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/reconsideration/bgc-accountability-mechanisms-21nov13-en.pdf. Accordingly, to this</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	<p>>Number and nature of issues that Board determined should be treated at either Under Chatham House Rule or Completely confidential</p>	<p>extent, propose to change this recommendation to an observation.</p> <p>With respect to the release of Board book and other information to the general public, what is the "other information" that is being referred to here? This recommendation can be addressed as it relates to Board Books, but may not be possible on other grounds.</p> <p>The Board does not invoke the Chatham House Rule. Is the ATRT2 looking for statistics on the number/nature of issues that the Board considers at executive session, or otherwise determines, pursuant to the Bylaws, as not appropriate for publication?</p>
	<p>9.4.4 A section on employee whistleblowing activity, to include metrics on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Reports submitted >Reports verified as containing issues requiring action >Reports that resulted in change to ICANN practices 	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible</p> <p>ICANN could publish in an annual Report the number of reports that have been submitted through the Anonymous Hotline, as well how many of those required action, and lead to changes in practices. In developing the Report, ensuring the confidentiality and privacy of ICANN's staff members will be paramount.</p>
	<p>9.4.5 An analysis of the continued relevance and usefulness of existing metrics, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Considerations on whether activities are being geared toward the metrics (aka, teaching to the test) without contributing toward the goal of genuine transparency >Recommendations for new metrics 	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>Given that organizational Accountability and Transparency Benchmarks and Metrics will be implemented for the first time in 2014, this recommendation could be deleted and amended as an observation to say: "ICANN's implementation of Accountability and Transparency Benchmarks and Metrics should include several important activities, to be undertaken after the initial set of metrics have been collected and analyzed for a minimum of 2-3 annual cycles. These are: (a) assessment of continued relevance and usefulness of existing metrics in contributing to meaningful accountability and transparency; (2) addition of new metrics. Additionally, ICANN should continuously improve its methods of communicating and disseminating Accountability and Transparency Results to ensure that this reporting meets the needs of the diverse ICANN stakeholders." ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables to inform the community.</p>
	<p>9.5 Establish a Viable Whistleblower Program:</p> <p>Adopt the One World Trust and/or Berkman Center recommendations to establish a viable whistleblower program.</p>	<p>Propose a revision; implementation feasible if revised</p> <p>ICANN does have a "whistleblower" program, which is, under best practices, called the "Anonymous Hotline Policy". This program has been in place since 2009. If this recommendation is revised to suggest that ICANN commission an expert evaluation of its current policy and implement to the extent feasible any revisions recommended by such expert(s), then it would be clear and feasible, and staff would support such a recommendation.</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	9.5.1 The processes for ICANN employee transparency and whistleblowing should be made public.	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested; implementable once clarified</p> <p>It is not clear what "ICANN employee transparency" refers to, as it seems to be discussing something separate from the Anonymous Hotline (otherwise referred to as whistleblowing) program that exists within ICANN. Clarification on what that means will be essential to understanding and assessing the feasibility of this recommendation. Care has to be given that the explanations provided do not tread into seeking specific employee information that cannot be released.</p>
	9.5.2 ICANN also should arrange for an annual professional audit of its whistleblower policy to insure that the program meets the global best practices.	<p>Propose a revision; implementation feasible if revised</p> <p>While the concept of getting an external validation of the Anonymous Hotline program (as best practices dictate it to be called) is supportable, the state of the art on these items tends not to change as rapidly as the recommendation suggests. Once a program to review the policy is in place as referenced under the suggested revisions to Recommendation 9.5, a bi-annual or tri-annual review cycle may represent a better use of resources while still assuring that the policy meets best practices.</p>
		<p>Correction: Page 45 of the Draft Report: Reconsideration review – on 13-3, the Board, through the NGPC, actually accepted reconsideration of the issue, though the ultimate decision was that the action should not be overturned. This is different from the Board denying reconsideration, which is what happened in the other instances cited.</p>
GAC Operations and Interactions		
6	Undertake initiatives to enhance understanding and transparency of GAC deliberations, including publication of GAC meeting agendas, transcripts, rationales for decisions, and a formal process for notifying and requesting GAC advice; expanding public observation/participation in GAC conference calls, and restructuring meetings to better engage the community; and exploring ways to facilitate GAC early on ICANN’s policy development processes.	See detailed responses below.
	6.1 The Board should request that the GAC consider a number of actions to make its deliberations more transparent and better understood to the ICANN community. Where appropriate, ICANN should provide the necessary resources to facilitate the implementation of	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>Work is already underway to accomplish what is being suggested in several examples and ATRT2 may wish to request that ongoing updates are provided regarding project timelines, milestones and deliverables. Additionally, ATRT2 may wish to clarify that the examples listed in the report of activities that GAC could consider</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	specific activities in this regard.	to improve transparency and understanding are intended to be illustrative rather than prescriptive.
	<i>Examples of activities that GAC could consider to achieve to improve transparency and understanding include:</i>	Propose to change recommendation to observation
	6.1.1 Convening GAC 101 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;	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. # 6.1 Note that GAC officers do participate in venues such as the ICANN Open Forum at the IGF to help explain how ICANN works and how the GAC functions within the ICANN multistakeholder model. GAC members have presented to the Fellowship program as part of that program's instruction of new participants. Perhaps an additional venue would be to add a GAC presentation to the Newcomers orientation at the start of ICANN meetings.
	6.1.2 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.	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. # 6.1 Note that a recently launched GAC WG on working methods is currently considering improvements along the lines of this recommendation.
	6.1.3 Updating and improving the GAC website to more accurately describe GAC activities, including intercessional activities, as well as publishing all relevant GAC transcripts, positions and correspondence;	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. # 6.1 Note that a recently launched GAC WG on working methods is currently considering improvements along the lines of this recommendation.
	6.1.4 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 a liaisons from other AC's and SO's to the GAC, once that mechanism has been agreed and implemented;	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. # 6.1 Note that a recently launched GAC WG on working methods is currently considering improvements along the lines of this recommendation.
	6.1.5 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;	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. # 6.1
	6.1.6 Establishing as a routine practice agenda setting calls for the next meeting	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	at the conclusion of the previous meeting.	See response to Rec. # 6.1
	6.2 The Board should request that the GAC formally adopt a policy of open meetings to increase transparency into GAC deliberations, and establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions.	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway A recently launched GAC WG on working methods is currently considering clarifications along the lines of this recommendation. Staff commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables.
	6.3 The Board should request that the GAC develop and publish 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.	Staff supports the recommendation and notes that the GAC would need to decide whether and how to pursue this recommendation/may be difficult to implement Rationales may call for (possibly lengthy) deliberations to agree on exact wording. Time is usually in short supply for deliberations and if time spent on formulation of a rationale means knocking off another important issue from the agenda, then developing rationale is probably suboptimal.
	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)	Clarification of recommendation requested; propose a revision; implementation feasible if revised If this recommendation is about the formalization of a notice process, then it is likely feasible. If the recommendation goes beyond and is placing an affirmative request/response process, that will require additional review. The use of the term "request" suggests a companion requirement of "response" that is not necessarily within the Board's purview to require.
	6.5 As soon as practicable, 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. (see ATRT1 Recommendation 11)	Clarification of recommendation requested; difficult to implement/not implementable as stated The Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation (BGRI) Working Group requested that Bylaws revisions not be considered until more potential Bylaws revisions were proposed. A directive to move forward with the limited Bylaws revisions at this time should take into account the BGRI's wishes on this topic. The Process has been accepted as practice even without Bylaws formalization. How is ICANN recommended to balance the specific request from the BGRI that piecemeal Bylaws recommendations not go before the Board with this recommendation from the ATRT2?
	6.6 The Board and the GAC, through the BGRI working group, should 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 Board should request that the GAC analyze how it can improve its procedures to ensure more efficient,	Propose a revision; implementation feasible if revised Currently, the BGRI Working Group is only invoked for the first paragraph of this recommendation. However, the BGRI WG could be a useful vehicle for the recommendation in its entirety, in order to develop common understanding on a more detailed level. It should also be noted that a recently launched GAC WG on working methods is currently considering improvements relating to parts of the recommendation. Final proposals will obviously be a matter for adoption by the GAC as a whole.

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	<p>transparent and inclusive decision-making. The Board should suggest to the GAC that it develop a code of conduct for its members that could include issues such as: conflict of interest; transparency and accountability; adequate domestic resource commitments; routine consultation with local 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.</p>	
	<p>6.7 The Board should 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.</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent described</p> <p>Propose that this recommendation be changed to an observation recognizing the value of High Level meetings rather than a recommendation that the GAC require these meetings every two years. ICANN will support this effort in any way necessary should the recommendation go forward. Initiating a government high level meeting (HLM) should be a reflection of strategic advantage and regional interests. As stated earlier, the ability and willingness to host a high level meeting could have the, albeit unintended, consequence of limiting the playing field for meeting locations. Not all national governments will see the need to have an HLM in their country, or their region at a particular time.</p> <p>Governments acting as a local host for an ICANN meeting is the exception not the rule, although there should always be collaboration between the host committee and with the national government of the meeting location, they are not often “a host” in the traditional sense of the word. Agree that a significant factor in conducting a successful HLM is gaining the support of the local government. If the issues in a location point to the benefit of a HLM and recommended timing is used rather than making an HLM a meeting pre-requisite, then the observation could still be honored while also assuring maximum participation throughout the regions. With a clear understanding of the importance of regular and well-attended HLMs, ICANN understands and agrees with this objective. Suggest that the appropriate methods for finding suitable locations and scheduling for such HLMs be the combined responsibility of GSE and the Meetings Teams, at the behest of the GAC, whether in conjunction with ICANN meetings or at other appropriate times and locations. The willingness or ability to hold an HLM should</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		not however, be criteria for the decision on the location for the hosting of ICANN meetings nor should there be a frequency requirement.
	6.8 The Board should request that GAC work with ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement group (GSE) team to develop guidelines for engaging governments, both current and non-GAC members, to ensure coordination and synergy of efforts.	<p>Propose to withdraw recommendation or revise it; implementable to the extent described/if revised</p> <p>There are already on-going initiatives to keep the GAC in the loop on ICANN staff activities that engage governments. GSE produces a monthly report for the Chair of the GAC. This document includes a “look back” reporting on the previous months activity and projection looking forward at the next months planned activity involving GSE staff and government interactions. This material is presented to the GAC chair by the CEO or the Senior Advisor to the president with the Chairman of the Board in copy. This report was created at the request of the GAC chair so that GAC members would have advance notice of potential ICANN activity in their countries if this involves other parts of their governments.</p> <p>GSE staff also developed a global government engagement strategy document that was presented to the Board through the Board Global Relations Committee (BGRC) for informational purposes at the committee meeting in Los Angeles in September 2013. A presentation of the materials was scheduled for the GAC at the Buenos Aires meeting (GSE staff to provide update during discussion with ATRT2, targeted for 10 December). As a best practice the RVPs seek to inform the GAC members in their regions of the community regional engagement strategy working group’s activities and outcomes. All of these activities are to support coordination and synergy of efforts between the GAC and staff.</p> <p>However, we do not think it would be appropriate for any advisory group to be engaged in the creation of guidelines that direct the staff activities regarding government outreach and engagement at an operational level. In addition, it may be more than GAC resources can currently support for the Board to direct the GAC even to develop coordination guidelines. We have concern about tasking the GAC to be involved in the operational details of developing guidelines or to be involved in controlling or directing staff and organizational engagement behavior with the GAC or GAC member countries and territories. The Board can certainly request that GAC provide input to GSE on procedures, but the GAC is not and should not be obligated to do this. The recommendation should not prevent GSE from developing guidelines on its own. If the concern is assuring the coordination of efforts, then perhaps the recommendation should be altered to encourage regular communication from GSE to the GAC when</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		<p>ICANN is working and communicating with GAC member countries and territories and engaging with their governments. This will ensure that GSE keeps the GAC in the loop and apprised of work with members' governments.</p>
	<p>6.9 The Board should instruct the GSE to develop, with community input, a baseline and set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement that addresses the following:</p>	<p>Propose a revision – see below GSE engages the community for feedback through outreach conference calls and webinars that create dialog with the SO/AC leadership and members of their communities, as well as through the community wiki site and through the interactive sessions at the ICANN meetings every trimester. The global engagement plan will be discussed in Buenos Aires. The Global Government engagement plan was presented to the Board Global Relations Committee in September 2013 and will be presented to the GAC at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. (GSE staff to provide update during discussion with ATRT2, targeted for 10 December).</p>
	<p>6.9.1 Relationships with GAC and non-GAC member countries, including the development of a database of contact information for relevant government ministers;</p>	<p>Propose a revision; implementation feasible if revised Propose that this recommendation be revised as follows: “Relationships with GAC and non-GAC members and tools to facilitate these relationships.” The word “countries” should be removed as some GAC observers are entities such as the OAS and not individual countries. A range of activities and improvements are underway and planned to accomplish the intent of this recommendation, such as creation of a CRM and integration of GAC membership information with information developed through the community engagement strategies. It would be useful for the ATRT2 to provide a clarification on the purposes and uses of a database of contact information for relevant government ministers.</p>
	<p>6.9.2 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).</p>	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested in order to assess feasibility The GAC Register of Advice has been created and is updated by the ICANN staff supporting the GAC. This is a publicly available resource on GAC advice to the Board. Board resolutions are also posted publicly within two business days of the approval of resolutions. Correspondence between the Board and GAC on advice is also posted. All of these tools exist and demonstrate when the GAC gives advice and what the responses are to that advice. It is unclear if this recommendation is aimed at developing additional tools for this purpose. The generic objective stated is laudable, but more guidance about why the existing tools do not address the recommendation already could be useful.</p>
	<p>6.9.3 Making ICANN’s work relevant for stakeholders in those parts of the world with limited participation; and,</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway Propose that this recommendation be changed to an observation acknowledging work underway in developing and promoting an</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		<p>overall ICANN Engagement Strategy.</p> <p>ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement team is currently working on regional approaches to the internationalization of ICANN. This means that community member committees staffed by the regional GSE staff are developing, implementing or exploring developing regional strategies, depending on the needs and priorities of the regions. Strategic Plans for Africa, Latin America and the Middle East have been announced and launched during the Toronto and Beijing meetings and were updated in Durban respectively. Written updates on the status of the strategies were provided to the Board’s Global Relationship Committee. Interactive sessions are also held at each ICANN Meeting to provide updates on activity and the process for identifying the initiative.</p> <p>The strategies are to increase participation and stakeholder involvement, and these efforts include relationships with all stakeholders including end users as well as local businesses. In addition there is a global business engagement strategy in development through CEO roundtables and regional business outreach and discussions lead by Christopher Mondini.</p> <p>Please see examples of the regional engagement strategy documents here: Africa Strategy; Latin America/Caribbean Strategy; and Middle East Strategy</p> <p>In addition discussions have been held on developing strategies for Europe, Asia, and the API regions. Asia and API discussions will be coordinated to address potential geographic overlap and the coordination of efforts. The collaboration also allows for cross-pollination of ideas while still preserving the community identified priorities and region specific concerns.</p> <p>It may be difficult to create a measurable goal out of “making ICANN works or participation relevant” for those parts or the world with limited participation.</p> <p>ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables to keep the community informed. This recommendation may be difficult to become a measurable goal but the regional engagement plans all include shorter-term projects so perhaps the delivery of those projects could be the measurable deliverables.</p>
	<p>6.9.4 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.</p>	<p>Clarification of recommendation requested; propose to change recommendation to observation, revise it or withdraw it; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. #6.9.3 The key point here is that development of a DNS market or</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		<p>business models is not of the same importance for all the regions. Some regions have prioritized development of the DNS market – but not all. And those that have are not necessarily focused on the next round of new gTLDs. Efforts to support entrepreneurs and to catalyze business also goes to reducing barriers to entry in the registrar business such as insurance and escrow issues, and business model help to aspiring registrars and re-sellers.</p> <p>Explanation/clarification is requested for why Rec. # 6.9.4 is related to the GAC. This recommendation may belong somewhere else. Some explanation for "fully and on equal terms" is needed. If this recommendation is kept in its current place, some reference or context to the priorities set by the communities in the regions through the regional engagement strategies should be included, as regional engagement strategies are driven by the community not the staff.</p>
	<p>6.10 <i>[Tentative recommendation to be reexamined after receiving the report of the independent expert.]</i> The Board, through the BGRI working group, should facilitate early engagement of governments, via the GAC, in ICANN’s policy development processes. Issues to consider include, but are not limited to: whether or not the current siloed structured of SO/AC’s is supportive of early GAC engagement; whether there is a systematic way to regularly engage with other stakeholders that facilitates information exchanges and sharing of ideas/opinions, both in face to face meetings and intersessionally; and, whether the Bylaws need to be amended to ensure that GAC advice is considered prior to policy recommendations being sent to the Board.</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>The BGRI Working Group and other Community groups are already paying very close attention to this issue through various initiatives that are ongoing. The BGRI Working Group has been making steady progress on how to facilitate and ensure early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO Policy Development Processes. This will also be a topic for discussion for the joint GNSO-GAC meeting in Buenos Aires. We hope and expect that this will result in concrete proposals and actions in the near future. The ATRT2 may wish to request that ongoing progress updates be provided to the community, including project timelines, milestones and expected deliverables.</p>
Multilingualism		
8	<p>To support public participation, ICANN should review capacity of the language services department versus the Community need for the service, and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation quality and timeliness and implementing continuous improvement via benchmarking of</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>Ongoing work and upgrades align with this recommendation and staff suggests that it be changed to an observation/recognition of the importance of these activities. The elements listed in this recommendation represent examples of some of the broad range of activities that ICANN may consider as it continuously improves the delivery of Language Services in support of public</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	<p>procedures used by international organizations. Whilst it is recognized that there has been a significant improvement in the Language Services Department, the Translation Services component should evolve to be able to sustain an expected significant increase in activity. This shift from a craft-based ad-hoc supply/demand to a continuous industrial pipeline of documents involves the ability to:</p>	<p>participation, based on the evolving needs of the community (see ICANN Language Services Department Plan –2013-2014). ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, including milestones and deliverables to inform the community.</p>
	<p>8.1 Accurately predict the time to translate a document at any time of the year, based on the knowledge of historical periodic activity (past ICANN meeting cycles, peak periods, holidays, etc.);</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
	<p>8.2 Predict peaks of activity proactively, and dynamically modulating capacity to supplement permanent staff using a pool of additional freelance translators on demand to smooth out peak delays;</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
	<p>8.3 Enable clients (SOs, ACs, etc.) to automatically track the status of their translation request via use of a CRM system;</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
	<p>8.4 Automatically compile metrics on document translation timeliness;</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
	<p>8.5 Implement a feedback path from the community to improve Language Services with native speaker input;</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
	<p>8.6 Implement best practice documentation management to harmonize translation quality and accuracy between experienced permanent and new or freelance translators; and</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
	<p>8.7 Benchmark related procedures with similar international organizations, the most significant being the United Nations Language and Interpretation Services.</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation See response to Rec. #8</p>
<p>Cross-Community Deliberations</p>		
<p>10</p>	<p>Improve the effectiveness of cross community deliberations</p>	

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	10.1 To enhance GNSO PDP processes and methodologies to better meet community needs and be more suitable for addressing complex problems, ICANN should:	
	10.1.1 Develop funded options for professional facilitators to assist GNSO PDP WGs, and also draft explicit guidelines for when such options may be invoked.	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>This is work that is underway; see for example the proposed GNSO PDP opportunities for streamlining and improvements staff paper. Propose that the ATRT2 acknowledge this work in observation and request that ongoing progress reporting be provided, including milestones and deliverables.</p>
	10.1.2 Provide adequate funding for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, wiki and teleconferences for GNSO PDPs. The GNSO must develop guidelines for when such meetings are required and justified.	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>This is work that is underway; see for example the proposed GNSO PDP opportunities for streamlining and improvements staff paper. Propose that the ATRT2 acknowledge this work in observation and request that ongoing progress reporting be provided, including milestones and deliverables.</p>
	10.1.3 Work with the GNSO and the wider ICANN community to develop methodologies and tools to make the GNSO PDP process more time-effective, resulting in quicker policy development as well as increasing the ability to attract busy community participants into the process.	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>This is work that is already actively underway; see for example the proposed GNSO PDP opportunities for streamlining and improvements staff paper. Propose that the ATRT2 acknowledge this work in observation and request that ongoing progress reporting be provided, including milestones and deliverables.</p>
	10.2 The GAC, in conjunction with the GNSO, must develop methodologies to ensure that GAC and government input is provided to PDP WGs and that the GAC has effective opportunities to provide input and guidance on draft PDP outcomes. Such opportunities could be entirely new mechanisms or utilization of those already used by other stakeholders in the ICANN environment.	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>This work is already actively underway as a result of GAC-GNSO interactions in Beijing as well as Durban. The GAC and GNSO have now formed a joint committee that will be reviewing the existing opportunities for input into the GNSO PDP in order to determine what new mechanisms, if any, need to be put in place. Propose that the ATRT2 acknowledge this work in observation and request that ongoing progress reporting be provided, including milestones and deliverables.</p>
	10.3 The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need of ensuring global participation in GNSO PGP, as well as other GNSO processes (see footnote). The focus should be on the viability and methodology of having equitable participation from:	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>Propose that this recommendation be changed to an observation, acknowledging work already underway. ICANN values the contributions of all the stakeholders as they volunteer their services for working groups, councils and other activities and fully supports the importance of evolving the volunteer model. There is a commitment to establishing a sustainable model for volunteer participation, and work has been ongoing. It includes</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		new outreach and engagement strategies, expanded information sharing, travel support to ICANN Public Meetings and a continuing commitment to effective remote participation capabilities. (Please see information submitted previously by staff.) ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, including milestones and deliverables to keep the community informed.
	10.3.1 Under-represented geographical regions;	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. #10.3
	10.3.2 Non-English speaking linguistic groups;	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. #10.3
	10.3.3 Those with non-Western cultural traditions; and	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. #10.3
	10.3.4 Those with a vital interest in GTLD policy issues but who lack the financial support of industry players.	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway See response to Rec. #10.3
	10.4 To improve the transparency and predictability of the PDP process:	Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway Propose that this recommendation be changed to an observation, acknowledging work underway and the fact that this work is recognized as a strategic priority. SOs & ACs are aware of the need to continuously improve the transparency and predictability of PDPs and ICANN staff assists these groups with working tools and communications avenues so that the Community understands each step of a PDP. In addition, the ICANN Multistakeholder Innovation Strategy Panel is specifically focused on “new models for broad, inclusive engagement, consensus-based policymaking and international structures to support such enhanced functions.” This work is expected also to include new ideas on how to effectively engage governments in ICANN Policy Development activities. ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables to keep the community informed.
	10.4.1 The Board should clearly state the process for setting gTLD policies in the event that the GNSO cannot come to closure on a specific issue in a specified time-frame. This resolution also should note under what conditions the Board believes it may alter PDP Recommendations after formal Board acceptance.	Clarification provided; not implementable as stated See response to Rec. #10.4. Additional clarification: The ICANN Board does not develop policy. Rather, if implementable, ICANN Board generally approves policy recommendations developed by the SOs, and the ICANN staff generally is in the position of implementing the approved policy(ies). In the absence of a policy, the Board will set a process or procedure to the extent one is needed in order to conduct business. Such a process or procedure would of course be subject to modification if one of the SOs later develops a

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		policy on the same topic. It would not be prudent to predict the future revision of Board-approved policy recommendations, but the same sentiment as in the first sentence applies in that it is not the Board's role to develop policy.
	10.4.2 ICANN should add a step in the PDP Comment Process where those who commented or replied during the Comment Period can request changes to the synthesis reports in cases where they believe the Staff improperly summarized their comment.	<p>Propose to withdraw recommendation See response to Rec. #10.4.</p> <p>Propose that this recommendation is not needed. Specifically, in relation to the PDP Comment Process, staff only provides a summary report of the comments, not an analysis. That task is left to the PDP WG that has the responsibility to carefully review and consider all comments received in their entirety. This review of the comments by the PDP WG is documented and included and/or referenced in the PDP WG Final Report. There is nothing preventing staff from updating the summary report upon request under the current PDP Process (for the record, no such requests have been received recently to the best of our knowledge in relation to PDP Comment Processes).</p>
AoC Review Process Effectiveness		
11	Effectiveness of the Review Process	
	<p>11.1 Institutionalization of the Review Process:</p> <p>ICANN should ensure that the ongoing work of the AoC reviews, including implementation, is fed into the work of other ICANN strategic activities wherever appropriate.</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; implementable to the extent of work already underway</p> <p>The implementation of AoC reviews, as directed by the Board, is incorporated in ICANN’s standard operating procedures, publicly tracked and reported, and reflected in ICANN’s strategic activities, as appropriate. Recommend that the ATRT2 change this recommendation to an observation, acknowledging this activity and underscoring its importance.</p> <p>Note: As reflected on page 58 of the Draft Report, staff had provided the following information to the Review Team: "ICANN's AoC commitments are incorporated into its strategic and operating plans, and improvements related to AoC reviews are integrated into ICANN's standard operating procedures and programs. As the Board, Staff and other organizations implement the recommendations of the review teams, ICANN follows a continuous improvement model, integrating the spirit of the recommendations into ICANN’s operations and strategic initiatives, as appropriate."</p>
	<p>11.2 Coordination of Reviews:</p> <p>ICANN 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.</p>	<p>Propose a revision; not implementable as stated</p> <p>In order to adopt and implement this recommendation, the AoC mandate of the three-year cycle may need to be reconsidered. As the AoC is an agreement between ICANN and the DoC, modifications to the AoC can only be achieved by the agreement of both parties. Alternatively, the ATRT2 may wish to consider ways that the scope of work of subsequent review teams is streamlined and focused in a way to make shorter and more</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		<p>focused and efficient reviews. The AoC reviews are on a continuous cycle, which contributes to the difficulty of ensuring that all independent, community reviews are complete before the next ATRT review begins, which would have to begin in earnest on January 1, 2016. Please reference Recommendation 11.3, which suggests that the work of each Review Team should be scheduled for a minimum of one year. To have all reviews complete before the next ATRT may not be feasible.</p> <p>Challenges to implementation of this type of recommendation include: the three-year review cycles plus six months for public comment and Board action; no limitations on the length of the review teams' work; three – and soon four – separate reviews (Accountability and Transparency; SSR; WHOIS and Consumer Trust, Choice and Competition); the independent nature of each community review team and the complex topics under review; the absence of authority to strictly coordinate review processes; and implementation work associated with certain recommendations requires considerably longer time frames than can be addressed in the current review cycle.</p>
	<p>11.3 Appointment of Review Teams: AoC Review Teams should be appointed in a timely fashion allowing them to complete their work over a 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 staff to appreciate the cycle of AoC reviews, and that the Review Team selection process should begin at the earliest point in time possible given its mandate.</p>	<p>Propose a revision; not implementable as stated See response to Rec. #11.2</p> <p>According to the AoC prescriptions, reviews of ICANN's Accountability & Transparency commitments should be executed no less frequently than every three years, and the Board has six months to act upon each completed review. The timeline recommended by the ATRT2 would significantly reduce time available to effectively implement recommendations and to assess improvements arising out of the previous effort. It is important that a time frame be established to ensure effective implementation and evaluation. While acknowledging that the ATRT2 would benefit from additional time to conduct their mandate, consideration should be given to the implementation and overall assessment timeline.</p> <p>The three-year review cycle translates into a total of 36 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board review of final recommendations and decision on implementation - six months • Implementation (time dependent on recommendations) • Call for volunteers, SO/AC endorsement processes, selection of Review Team members and organizational/meeting activities – four to six months • Review team work - 12 months • Implementation and assessment work - 12 months -18 months. This may not be sufficient given complexity of implementation and overall activities within the ICANN community.

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	<p>11.4 Complete implementation reports: ICANN 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.</p>	<p>Propose to change recommendation to observation; propose a revision; clarification of recommendation requested; implementable if clarified</p> <p>Agree with this objective and annual implementation reports currently are issued before review kick-off, and benchmarks and metrics arising out of the organizational Accountability and Transparency Benchmarks and Metrics project will be incorporated in future reports. Recommend changing this recommendation to an observation, and acknowledging these ongoing activities.</p> <p>In addition, in order to provide the review team with the most up-to-date information, staff suggests that the public consultation component be a part of the review team's process, as it is now to provide timely reports. Additionally, depending on the timing of the given review, a "complete" implementation report may not be feasible as the implementation work may be ongoing.</p> <p>Furthermore, given the wide array of opinions within this and other Review Teams regarding format and substance of staff reports on implementation, staff suggests that further consideration be given to how annual implementation reports should be standardized.</p>
	<p>11.5 Budget transparency and accountability: 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.</p>	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible; propose correction</p> <p>Agree with the concept of providing the Review Teams with a budget for travel and professional services at the beginning of the given review (noting that review team schedules often straddle multiple budget cycles). A correction is needed on Page 59, Summary of Other Relevant Research - Bullet #3 "There was no discussion on the budget for independent expert and whether or not to engage one, thus limiting the group." At the ATRT2's inception, staff confirmed that funds were available in both FY2013 & FY2014 to support the team's activities, including the hiring of an independent consultant. On 30 May 2013, ICANN provided the ATRT2 with an overview of the budget allocated to the ATRT2 for travel and independent experts, via email. At that time, the ATRT2 was reminded again that the funds budgeted for FY2013 would need to be used by 30 June 2013, in keeping with ICANN Budget practices.</p>
	<p>11.6 Board action on Recommendations: The Board must address all AoC Review Team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous manner, indicating to what extent they are accepting each</p>	<p>Agree that recommendation is feasible</p> <p>No further comment</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	recommendation.	
	<p>11.7 Implementation Timeframes: In responding to Review Team recommendations, the Board must 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.</p>	<p>Propose to modify recommendation and change to observation; implementation feasible Suggest that, based on the process being followed to publicly report on implementation of all AoC reviews, that this recommendation be replaced with an observation. The observation could also reflect that, to facilitate the usefulness and effectiveness of Review Teams' recommendations, that all future Review Teams work collaboratively with the Board, community and staff to determine feasibility and implementability of the recommendations prior to issuing final recommendations. ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables to keep the community informed.</p> <p>Specifically with regard to implementation time frames, plans for implementation of each review team recommendation adopted by the Board, including the timeframe, are developed by the responsible parties after the Review Team's work is completed. Implementation time frames issued by a Review Team without the benefit of carefully developed implementation plans, are speculative and have not been found to be useful. A Review Team prioritizing its recommendations, however, can be helpful in targeting Board, community and staff resources.</p>
Financial Accountability and Transparency		
12	<p>Financial Accountability and Transparency: ATRT2 recommends that, in light of the significant growth in the organization, ICANN undertake a special scrutiny of its financial governance structure regarding its overall principles, methods applied and decision-making procedures, to include engaging stakeholders.</p>	See responses below.
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Implementation is feasible, as discussed with members of ATRT2, in line with the current plans, which include: Establishment of a planning process and cycle, including strategic goals and objectives for five years; a five-year plan and forecast, an annual operating plan and budget. Other elements of the current plan include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community input and engagement during the early part of the annual operating planning cycle (which will include an update to the 5-year plan and forecast based on actual results), in addition to the exiting formal comment period • Community input throughout all phases of strategic planning (see strategic plan development schedule)

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of actual results as compared to plan/budget (variance analysis) • Consideration of appropriate mechanisms to accommodate SO/AC recurring vs. special requests, balanced with the need for fiscal diligence and control
	<p>12.2 As a non-profit organisation operating and delivering services in a non-competitive environment, ICANN should explicitly consider the cost-effectiveness of its operations when preparing its budget for the coming year. This should including 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.</p>	<p>See response to Rec. 12.1 As previously indicated, ICANN is transitioning to a process where high level Strategic Planning (Vision, Mission and Focus Areas), guides measurable organizational goals and the development of the Operating Plan and Budget. Activities referenced in this recommendation are part of the work currently underway and the plans that have been shared with the ICANN community.</p>
	<p>12.3 As a non-profit organisation, every three years ICANN should conduct a benchmark study on relevant parameters e.g. size of organization, levels of staff compensation and benefits, cost of living adjustments, etc.</p>	<p>See response to Rec. 12.1 The spirit of this recommendation regarding benchmarking General & Administrative expenses against similar organizations is in line with the current plans and activities to develop operational / performance benchmarks and metrics. Recommend that the frequency of the benchmarking studies be determined based on good practices of other similar organizations and consider cost/benefit relationship.</p>
	<p>12.4 In order to improve accountability and transparency and facilitate the work of the Review Teams, ICANN’s Board should base the yearly budgets on a multi-annual financial framework [covering e.g. a two- or three-year period] reflecting the planned activities and the corresponding expenses. The following year, a report should be drafted describing the actual implementation of the framework, including activities and the related expenses. This should include specified budgets for the ACs and SOs.</p>	<p>See response to Rec. 12.1</p>
	<p>12.5 In order to ensure that the budget reflects the views of the ICANN community, the ICANN 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 enough time for the Board to take into</p>	<p>See response to Rec. 12.1</p>

#	ATRT2 Draft Recommendations	Initial Staff Responses
	account all input before approving the budget. The budget consultation process shall also include time for an open meeting between the ICANN Board and the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to discuss the proposed budget.	