

ccNSO Council Statement: Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT3) Final Report

Date: 31 July 2020

The ccNSO Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT3) Final Report (Report)¹. Please note that comments from the ccNSO Council do not reflect the views of the ccNSO as a whole, nor of individual ccNSO members.

The ccNSO Council would like to thank and commend the ATRT3 for their work and their pragmatic and effective approach to making recommendations. We fully support the spirit of all recommendations and believe that the ICANN as a whole will benefit from the proposed improvements, especially, changes in the number and cadence of reviews and recommendations related to the Strategic and Operational Plans.

Additionally, we would like to draw your attention to the following suggestions and observations:

Deadline

Please consider adding a deadline to the suggestion “ICANN org shall publish an overarching report at the conclusion of a strategic plan starting with the FY2016-2020 Strategic Plan.”

Elements for consideration when prioritizing recommendations

The Report recommends several elements to be considered when prioritizing recommendation. As the Report does not specify how those elements should be considered and which element has more weight, it might cause certain issues in the future. For example, does “Cost of implementation and budget availability” allow a recommendation to be declared of a low priority if it is expensive? Or, does “Complexity and time to implement” grant the same if the implementation process of a recommendation is a complex one? Please consider adding weight or any other metrics to those elements. We also recommend adding another element “Cost of not implementing recommendation”.

Furthermore, it should be mandated that the first element “Relevance to ICANN’s mission, commitments, core values, and strategic objectives” is considered, firstly, by the team that comes up with a recommendation, secondly, by the community that comments on it, and, thirdly, by the Board prior to adopting it.

Mismatched frequency of reports

On page 73, the Report suggests that “at least every three years each SO/AC/NC will undertake a formal process to evaluate and report on its continuous improvement activities which will be published for Public Comment”. Executive summary on page 23 says “At least everyone years each SO/AC/NC will undertake a formal process to evaluate and report on its continuous improvement activities which will be published for Public Comment.” We support the proposed frequency of three years and propose the text on page 23 to be adjusted accordingly.

¹ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atrt3-report-29may20-en.pdf>

Frequency of surveys

We believe that “Each SO/AC/NC shall perform a comprehensive annual satisfaction survey” would be an unnecessary burden to the volunteer community. Such frequent comprehensive surveys will wear out volunteers and will not bring any additional value. We suggest that the frequency of the surveys matches the frequency of reports on continuous improvement activities, i.e. every three years or more often if the particular SO/AC sees necessary.

Readability improvement

Tables on pages 33, 36, and 39 can be misleading. Usually, human eye reads tables row by row. In the current version, such an approach can lead to misreading the text as, e.g. “Partially implemented – 3; Partially effective – 2”, while even fully implemented recommendations can be partially effective. To improve readability, we suggest to have two separate tables for each metrics, i.e. “Implementation” and “Effectiveness”.

On behalf of the ccNSO Council,

Katrina Sataki
Chair