#	Recommendation #	Recommendation	ICANN Assessment	ATRT3 Assessment of Implementation	ATRT3 Assessment of Effectiveness	Comment	Assignee
1	1	The Board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and the success of Board improvement efforts, and analyze those findings over time.	Implemented				Demi Getschko
2	2	The Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.	Implemented				Sebastien Bachollet
3	3	The Board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time and should regularly assess Directors' compensation levels against prevailing standards.	Implemented				Wolfgang Kleinwaechter
4	4	The Board should continue supporting cross-community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation. Develop complementary mechanisms whereby the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/AC) can consult with the Board on matters, including but not limited to policy, implementation and administrative matters, on which the Board makes decisions.	Implemented				Erica Varlese
5	5	The Board should review redaction standards for Board documents, Document Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy. Institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted material to determine if redactions are still required and if not, ensure that redactions are removed.	Implemented			Subject of WS2 Recommendations on Transparency	Maateen Botterman
6	6.1	ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to consider a number of actions to make its deliberations more transparent and better understood to the ICANN community. Where appropriate, ICANN should provie the necessary resources to facilitate the implementation of specific activities in this regard. Examples of activities that the GAC could consider to improve transparency and understanding include:....	Implemented				Vanda Scartezini
7	6.2	ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC formally adopting a policy of open meetings to increase transparency into GAC deliberations and to establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions.	Implemented				Jacques Blanc

8	6.3	ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC developing and publishing 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 2item of advice.	Implemented			Liu Yue
9	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).	Implemented			Liu Yue
10	6.5	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 as soon as practicable (see ATRT1 Recommendation 11).Increase support and resource commitments of government to the GAC (see ATRT 1 Recommendation 14)	Implemented			Maateen Botterman
11	6.6	ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to 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 BGRI working group should consider how the GAC can improve its procedures to ensure more efficient, transparent and inclusive decision-making. The BGRI working group should develop GAC engagement best practices for its members that could include issues such as: conflict of interest; transparency and accountability; adequate domestic resource commitments; routine consultation with local Domain Name System (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.	Implemented			Jacques Blanc
12	6.7	ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to 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. Countries and territories that do not currently have GAC representatives should also be invited and a stock-taking after each High Level meeting should occur.	Implemented			Liu Yue

13	6.8	ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to work with ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement group (GSE) to develop guidelines for engaging governments, both current and non-GAC members, to ensure coordination and synergy of efforts.	Implemented				Vanda Scartezini
14	6.9	The Board should instruct the GSE group to develop, with community input, a baseline and set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement that addresses the following: ….	Implemented				Maateen Botterman
15	7.1	The Board should 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.	Implemented				Osvaldo Novoa
16	7.2	The Board should establish a process under the Public Comment Process where those who commented or replied during the Public Comment and/or Reply Comment period (s) can request changes to the synthesis reports in cases where they believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comment(s).	Implemented				Michael Karanicolas
17	8	The recommendation states: To support public participation, the Board should review the capacity of the language services department versus the community need for the service using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. ICANN should implement continuous improvement of translation and interpretation services including benchmarking of procedures used by international organizations such as the United Nations.	Implemented			Indirectly linked to WS2 recommendations on Diversity	Jacques Blanc
18	9.1	The 9.1 subproject implementation focus is on the proposed Bylaws change recommended by the ATRT2 to impose a requirement on the ICANN Board to acknowledge advice arising from any of ICANN?s Advisory Committees.	Implemented				Daniel Khauka Nanghaka

19	9.2	The 9.2 subproject implementation focus is to review ICANN?s existing accountability mechanisms through a community-comprised group	Implemented			WS1 and 2?	Cheryl Langdon-Orr
20	9.3	The 9.3 subproject is for the implementation of a review of the Office of the Ombudsman, the role within ICANN, and whether the duties/scope of the Ombudsman should be expanded or changed in line with suggestions from the ATRT2.	Implemented			WS2 has a section of recommendations dedicated to the Office of the Ombuds	Sebastien Bachollet
21	9.4	The 9.4 subproject implementation focuses on developing a full set of statistical data that will be published annually with each Fiscal Year Annual Report.	Implemented				Tola Sogbesan
22	9.5	The 9.5 subproject implementation will conduct a review of the Anonymous Hotline policy and processes, implement any proposed modifications to policy and publish a report on results to the community.	Implemented			WS2 commented on this and made additional recommendations.	Michael Karanicolas
23	10.1	To enhance GNSO policy development processes and methodologies to better meet community needs and be more suitable for addressing complex problems, ICANN should:	Implemented				Pat Kane
24	10.2	The GAC, in conjunction with the GNSO, must develop methodologies to ensure that GAC and government input is provided to ICANN policy development processes and that the GAC has effective opportunities to provide input and guidance on draft policy development outcomes. Such opportunities could be entirely new mechanisms or utilization of those already used by other stakeholders in the ICANN environment. Such interactions should encourage information exchanges and sharing of ideas/opinions, both in face-to-face meetings and intersessionally, and should institutionalize the cross-community deliberations foreseen by the AoC.	Implemented				Vanda Scartezini

25	10.3	The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO policy development processes, as well as other GNSO processes. The focus should be on the viability and methodology of having the opportunity for equitable, substantive and robust participation from and representing:	Implemented				Erica Varlese
26	10.4	To improve the transparency and predictability of the policy development process the Board should clearly state to what degree it believes that it may establish gTLD policy in the event that the GNSO cannot come to closure on a specific issue, in a specified time-frame if applicable, and to the extent that it may do so, the process for establishing such gTLD policies. This statement should also note under what conditions the Board believes it may alter GNSO Policy Recommendations, either before or after formal Board acceptance.	Implemented				Pat Kane
27	10.5	The Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities, of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players.-	Implemented			Quality/effectiveness of implementation questionned by A. Greenberg	Tola Sogbesan
28	11.1	Institutionalization of the Review Process The Board should ensure that the ongoing work of the AoC reviews, including implementation, is fed into the work of other ICANN strategic activities wherever appropriate.	Implemented				Osvaldo Novoa
29	11.2	Coordination of Reviews The Board 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.	Implemented			RDS review not yet published and SSR2 review still ongoing - may be considered beyond ICANN's controll.	KC Claffy
30	11.3	Appointment of Review Teams The Board should ensure that AoC Review Teams are appointed in a timely fashion, allowing them to complete their work in the 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 to factor in the cycle of AoC reviews; the Review Team selection process should begin at the earliest point in time possible given its mandate.	Implemented				Sebastien Bachollet

31	11.4	Complete implementation reports The Board 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.	Implemented				Ramet Khalili Nasr
32	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.	Implemented				KC Claffy
33	11.6	Board action on Recommendations The Board should address all AoC Review Team recommendations in a clear and unambiguous manner, indicating to what extent they are accepting each recommendation.	Implemented				Cheryl Langdon-Orr
34	11.7	Implementation Timeframes In responding to Review Team recommendations, the Board should 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.	Implemented				Demi Getschko
35	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.	Implemented				Wolfgang Kleinwaechter

36	12.2	The Board should explicitly consider the cost-effectiveness of ICANN's operations when preparing its budget for the coming year, in keeping with ICANN's status as a non-profit organization operating and delivering services in a non-competitive environment. This should include 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.	Implemented				Pat Kane
37	12.3	Every three years the Board should conduct a benchmark study on relevant parameters, (e.g. size of organization, levels of staff compensation and benefits, cost of living adjustments, etc.) suitable for a non-profit organization. If the result of the benchmark is that ICANN as an organization is not in line with the standards of comparable organizations, the Board should consider aligning the deviation. In cases where the Board chooses not to align, this has to be reasoned in the Board decision and published to the Internet community.	Implemented			Could not find document - first such benchmarking exercise was scheduled for FY18?	Cheryl Langdon-Orr
38	12.4	In order to improve accountability and transparency ICANN's Board should base the yearly budgets on a multi-annual strategic plan and corresponding financial framework (covering e.g. a three-year period). This rolling plan and framework should reflect the planned activities and the corresponding expenses in that multi-annual period. This should include specified budgets for the ACs and SOs. ICANN's {yearly} financial reporting shall ensure that it is possible to track ICANN's activities and the related expenses with particular focus on the implementation of the (yearly) budget. The financial report shall be subject to public consultation.	Implemented			Somewhat at odds with being able to plan the implementation of review recommendations?	Wolfgang Kleinwaechter
39	12.5	In order to ensure that the budget reflects the views of the ICANN community, the 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 sufficient time is allocated for the Board to take into account all input before approving the budget. The budget consultation process shall also include time for an open meeting among the Board and the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to discuss the proposed budget.	Implemented				Erica Varlese