*Comments of the Spanish Government:* “We fully concur with the ATRT2 in other areas such as better explaining the rationale behind GAC advice or attracting more countries to the GAC not just to sit and observe at the face-to-face meetings, but to the their voices both at physical meetings and at conference calls.”

*Comments of the GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency*: “Including a set of recusal metrics will help the community gauge the extent of this problem and help it formulate solutions during the next review of the Board.”

*Comments of the GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency*: “Deluges of simultaneous or overlapping ICANN public comment proceedings on major issues greatly intensify the problem.” “The fact that the reply comment period has often been used to submit initial comments is not, as the staff evidently told ATRT-2, because community members were ignorant or resistant to education about ‘the proper use of the Reply Comment cycle’; rather, it was a rational response to ICANN’s seemingly irrational decision not to provide longer public comment opportunities on major and complex issues.”

*Comments of the GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency*: “ICANN should use the hiatus period consistently to exclude the dates of ICANN public meetings in calculating comment deadlines.”

*Comments of the GNSO Council*: “Some of our councilors suggest that as ell as outreach to increase participation from outside of ICANN, we should also do ‘in reach’ to deepen participation by individuals already involved in ICANN but who have either never participated in a Working Group or have become discouraged after participating in only one or two.”

*Comments of the GNSO Council:* For example, the recommendation could be changed to suggest the Board interact formally or informally with the GNSO to understand the root causes of delay in cases where PDPs seen to be going too slowly; to make consistent and informed determinations as to whether the delay is justified, and to constructively offer advice or resources to help.”

*Comments of the GNSO Council*: “But we would like to see it strengthened to encourage the Board to refer suggested alterations back to the PDP working group fro review and refinement prior to enacting them.” (changing comments…)

*Comments by China Institute of Communications*: “Since the launch of New gTLD program, ICANN had been receiving large amount of application fee. At the same period, ICANN headed for internationalization with great strides and rapidly expanded its personnel and institution. Stakeholders pointed out that ICANN use its resource and fund inappropriately. Without question, ICANN is facing higher risk in this aspect and should put further emphasis on accountability and transparency.”

*Comments by The Government of Egypt*: “On exploring mechanisms to improve public comments, Egypt believes that it may be worth a trial for ICANN to consider accepting inputs to PDPs in languages other than English, subject to availability of translation facilities.”

*Comments by The Government of Egypt*: “Regarding the high-level meeting, it is suggested that invitations be extended to non-GAC members.”

*Comments of the United States Council for International Business*: There is a sense, particularly among business stakholders, that the ICANN Board and staff call an item ‘implementation’ when they want to execute on the item without community input. (Likewise, if the ICANN Board and staff do not want to act upon a particular matter, then they may call the matter “policy” and have it lost within the lengthy PDP process.) The ATRT2 recommendations need to acknowledge the current dilemma and advocate for more effective solutions than the ‘additional efforts’ called for….”

*Comments of the United States Council for International Business*: USCIB believes that the 21-day comment and reply periods are too short to offer meaningful input.

*Comments of the United States Council for International Business*: hyperlink supporting cross community deliberations….

*Comments of the Danish Business Authority*: “In line with our previous comments to the ATRT2 process, Denmark believes that it is essential to the global legitimacy of ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model that accountability and transparency mechanisms are institutionalized into all parts of the organization. The Affirmation of Commitment Reviews are instrumental to achieving this an it is therefore essential that ICANN prioritise and institutionalize the AOC Reviews in the organisation’s governance structures.”

*Comments of the Danish Business Authority*: “ICANN should also ensure that all its strategic initiatives, including the Strategic Plan, Strategy Panels and the ATRT2 review, are duly coordinated.”

*Comments of the At-Large Advisory Committee*: “We agree with the ATRT2’s general Recommendations that, in moving forward, ICANN needs to: establish clear metrics and benchmarks against which improvements in accountability and transparency can be measured;”

*Comments of the At-Large Advisory Committee*: “In addition, it is extremely important to ensure that the comment mechanisms allow sufficient time for intra and cross-regional consultations for stakeholders such as the At-Large, which has significant consultation requirements.”

*Comments of the At-Large Advisory Committee*: We suggest that the language services department work with the community to prioritize documentation/materials for translation, which may differ from constituency to constituency.