|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendation | Questions regarding Staff Assessment and Response |
| 1 | Most recent draft Recommendation eliminates measuring Board member improvement based on existing peer review process; |
| 2 | ATRT2 hasn’t seen One World Trust Report. Why change a Recommendation to an “observation”? If ICANN commits to provide ongoing reporting and progress updates, milestones and deliverables, (not to mention Accountability and Transparency metrics) what specific, additional burdens would a Recommendation put on the organization? With respect to published training materials, ATRT2 understands that proprietary materials may not be published. What is the downside of publishing ICANN-devloped materials and descriptions of training efforts to the Community so the Community can understand and guage levels of improvement? |
| 3 | If compensation review is regularly conducted, ATRT2 could consider eliminating that aspect of the draft Recommendation. If the NomComm has data concerning candidate qualifications (fact to be checked), what is the downside of conducting the studies? |
| 4 | Most recent draft Recommendation proposes continued work with the Community. What additional burden does a Recommendation put on the organization? ATRT2 can adopt the nomenclature “policy v. implementation.” |
| 5 | Will confirm with ATRT2 intent of Recommendation. |
| 7 | The number of consultations and the challenge of managing participation in public comment is a persistent issue for the community. The Recommendation calls for ICANN to develop new tools as discussed and to address the volume of consultations through forward planning. What additional burden does a Recommendation put on the organization? |
| 9 |  |
| 9.1 | Will confirm with ATRT2 regarding intent of Recommendation. |
| 9.2 | Sharp disagreement between Staff and Community input. Need to discuss. |
| 9.3 |  |
| 9.3.1 |  |
| 9.3.2 |  |
| 9.3.3 |  |
| 9.4 | ATRT2 has not seen One World Trust Report. Important that ICANN not just focus on a framework and measuring itself against peer organizations. ICANN needs to develop metrics for implementation of AoC Review Team Recommendations where feasible and report against those metrics. Developing annual Transparency AND Accountability Report is positive suggestion. If ICANN commits to ongoing reporting and progress updates, including milestones and deliverables to inform the community, what additional burdens would a Recommendation put on the organization? |
| 9.4.1 |  |
| 9.4.2 | Further discussion required. |
| 9.4.3 | ATRT2 needs to review DIDP reference from Staff; Need to discuss what is intended by “other information.” Need to discuss focus of Chatham Rule reference. |
| 9.4.4 |  |
| 9.4.5 | ATRT2 has not seen One World Trust report. Given the commitments as stated, what additional burdens would a Recommendation put on the organization? |
| 9.5 |  |
| 9.5.1 |  |
| 9.5.2 |  |
| 6.1.1 |  |
| 6.1.1 | Need to discuss “illustrative v. prescriptive” issue. |
| 6.1.2 |  |
| 6.1.3 |  |
| 6.1.4 |  |
| 6.1.5 |  |
| 6.1.6 |  |
| 6.2 |  |
| 6.3 |  |
| 6.4 |  |
| 6.5 |  |
| 6.6 |  |
| 6.7 |  |
| 6.8 |  |
| 6.9 |  |
| 6.9.1 |  |
| 6.9.2 |  |
| 6.9.3 |  |
| 6.9.4 |  |
| 6.10 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 8.1 |  |
| 8.2 |  |
| 8.3 |  |
| 8.4 |  |
| 8.5 |  |
| 8.6 |  |
| 8.7 |  |
| 10 |  |
| 10.1 |  |
| 10.1.1 |  |
| 10.1.2 |  |
| 10.1.3 |  |
| 10.2 |  |
| 10.3 |  |
| 10.3.1 |  |
| 10.3.2 |  |
| 10.3.3 |  |
| 10.3.4 |  |
| 10.4 |  |
| 10.4.1 |  |
| 10.4.2 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 11.1 |  |
| 11.2 |  |
| 11.3 |  |
| 11.4 |  |
| 11.5 |  |
| 11.6 |  |
| 11.7 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 12.1 |  |
| 12.2 |  |
| 12.3 |  |
| 12.4 |  |
| 12.5 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |