


# ATRT3 Group - summary to pdf

## 1. Which SO, AC, GNSO constituent body, or RALO (Structure) is responding?

1	GNSO constituent body: Registries Stakeholder Group
2	SO/AC: GNSO
3	RALOS: APRALO
4	GNSO constituent body: Commercial Business Users
5	RALOS: AFRALO
6	RALOS: NARALO
7	RALOS: LACRALO
8	SO/AC: At-Large
9	SO/AC: ccNSO
10	GNSO constituent body: Intellectual Property
11	GNSO constituent body: Registrars Stakeholder Group
12	SO/AC: GAC
13	RALOS: EURALO
14	SO/AC: RSSAC
15	SO/AC: SSAC

Response: 15

## 2. Please indicate your Structure's satisfaction with the Board's performance overall:




Response: 14

## 3. Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 2. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?

1	There is significant room for improvement in the Board's function, both in substantive terms as well as in terms of optics. There are several internal and external challenges that the Board faces (these include declining revenues, geopolitical considerati
2	At-Large: Refer to PDF document
3	EURALO: Refer to Word document

Response: 3

**4. How does your Structure feel regarding the Board's interaction with your SO/AC?**




**5. Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 3. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?**


- 1 Please see our extended RySG response document, provided over email.
- 2 because board often fails to distinguish BC as a unique constituency. The BC is under the label of CSG (Commercial Stakeholder Group), but the BC is not represented by the CSG.
- 3 At-Large: Refer to PDF document
- 4 IPC: Refer to Word Doc
- 5 RrSG: Refer to Word Doc
- 6 EURALO: Refer to Word document

Response: 6

**6. Does your Structure consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory?**



**7. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 4. Which areas of diversity do you feel need improvement? (select all diversity factors you think apply):**




**8. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 4. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 The Asia-Pacific region is considerably diverse and is the largest region within ICANN, with approximately 61% of the world's population and the global end-user population. This diversity and the size is not reflected in the Board's composition. Further
- 2 Work on recruitment with Women on Boards organizations and other gender board diversification strategy
- 3 Yes, request that 50% of the candidates be women.
- 4 At-Large: Refer to PDF document
- 5 No opinion
- 6 The ICANN NomCom should strive to select people that are stakeholders unconnected to the domain name industry. The ALAC should be afforded an additional Board seat.

Response: 6

**9. How satisfied is your Structure with the Nominating Committee's selection of Directors for the ICANN Board:**




Response: 14

**10. Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 5. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 BC: See word document.
- 2 The ICANN Board could benefit from Directors with more technical abilities. Generally, the ICANN Board could benefit from a higher level of technical expertise.

Response: 2


**11. Please indicate your Structure's satisfaction with the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms such as the Empowered Community:**



**12. Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 6. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 At-Large: Refer to PDF document
  - 2 It is difficult to assess the accountability of the Board under the new accountability mechanisms as a situation has not yet arisen where they have been tested.
  - 3 EURALO input - Refer to Word document
- Response: 3

**13. Rate the mechanisms ensuring the Board's transparency:**




**14. Please answer if you selected 'ineffective' or 'somewhat ineffective' to question 7. If ineffective or somewhat ineffective, do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 Please see our extended RySG response document, provided over email.
- 2 IPC: Refer to Word Doc


Response: 2

**15. How would your Structure rate the importance of the Board implementing the Transparency Recommendations from the CCWG-Accountability WS2?**



Response: 14

**16. Is your Structure satisfied with the Board's decision-taking process?**




Response: 12

**17. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 9. Do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 Please see our extended RySG response document, provided over email.
- 2 The Board has been open and transparent in its decision-making procedure, but in terms of being fully accountable to the community, the Board's performance appears to be weak.
- 3 BC: See word document.
- 4 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 5 The Board's transparency has improved over time. Its accountability gained through explaining the rationale for decisions and providing verifiable feedback on Stakeholder input still requires improvement.

Response: 5


**18. Is your Structure aware of the training program for the Board members?**



Response: 15



**19. How satisfied is your Structure with the financial information that is provided to the public by ICANN?**




Response: 13

**20. Please answer if you selected "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied" to question 11. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 At-Large: Refer to PDF document
- 2 RrSG: Refer to Word document
- 3 EURALO input - Refer to Word document
- 4 SSAC: See word document for response


Response: 4

**21. How would your Structure rate the usability of the financial information?**



Response: 13

**22. Should GAC accountability be improved?**




Response: 11

### 23. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 13. What would you suggest?

- 1 get more responsible people
- 2 The BC recommends that GAC members from EU governments be accountable for decisions taken by their member governments with respect to GDPR and Whois.
- 3 Although work is based on consensus, it's important to document the details of the different/conflicting views of the GAC members
- 4 Work on recruitment with Women on Boards organizations and other gender board diversification strategy
- 5 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 6 We would encourage the GAC to continue to provide clearer rationales in their advice
- 7 Yes, see answer to question #14 below.

Response: 7

### 24. Should GAC transparency be improved?




Response: 13

### 25. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 14. What would you suggest?

- 1 BC: See word document.
- 2 More public debate and decision-making
- 3 For one, all their meetings should be open to the public
- 4 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 5 GAC: Refer to Word document

Response: 5

**26. How satisfied is your Structure with the interactions the GAC has with the Board?**




Response: 14

**27. Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 15. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

Response: 0

**28. How satisfied is your Structure with the interactions the GAC has with the SO/ACs?**



1 - Very satisfied	7.14% (1)	2 - Satisfied	64.29% (9)
3 - No opinion	14.29% (2)	4 - Somewhat dissatisfied	7.14% (1)
5 - Very dissatisfied	7.14% (1)		


Response: 14

**29. Please answer if you selected 'very dissatisfied' or 'somewhat dissatisfied' to question 16. If very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied do you have any suggestions for improvements?**

- 1 Please see our extended RySG response document, provided over email.
- 2 RrSG: Refer to Word Doc

Response: 2

**30. Has your Structure ever filed a Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) request with ICANN?**



Response: 15

**31. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. What information was your Structure seeking?**

Response: 0

**32. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Did your Structure receive the information it requested in full?**

Response: 0


**33. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Did the material that your Structure received answer its question?**

Response: 0


**34. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 17. Please feel free to add any other thoughts you have about the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) process.**

Response: 0


35. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the icann.org website should be better organized to facilitate searching for specific topics?




36. Do you believe the information ICANN makes available on the community wiki website should be better organized to facilitate searching on the wiki?



**37. Is your Structure aware of ICANN's open data mechanisms, including the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI) or the Open Data Initiative (ODI), or of ICANN's transparency policies more generally?**



**38. Are ICANN's mechanisms sufficient to generate policies which are acceptable to the global Internet community?**



**39. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 21. Where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved?**

- 1 There is a perception that ICANN is dominated by a few of the stakeholders, and that the policy developed in ICANN largely favours these groups. There is some truth to this, and ICANN needs to listen closer to stakeholders (including At-Large) that reflect
- 2 The BC believes that the board gives greater weight to the risks and concerns of contract parties, relative to concerns and risks of business users and registrants.
- 3 The PDP process should be more lean and should take a determined time to be done. WG charters that are tasked to work on the policy development should be precise (more than they are now).
- 4 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 5 ICANN's mechanisms are too heavy and too slow to provide timely response to the issues that the global Internet community is facing
- 6 IPC: Refer to Word Doc
- 7 RrSG: Refer to Word Doc
- 8 EURALO: Refer to Word Document
- 9 The SSAC observes the following shortcomings: vested interests, lack of compromise, representation issues, volunteer burnout, unbalanced expertise


Response: 9

**40. What procedures do you have in place within your Structure for electing NomCom representatives?**

- 1 Please see our extended RySG response document, provided over email.
- 2 The ALAC Rules of Procedure provides for the ALAC to decide on its NomCom representatives, the candidates of whom are recommended by each respective RALO.
- 3 Nomination by any member, followed by election by all members.
- 4 We elect a representative to the Nomcom
- 5 We do this through our elections procedure as indicated in our Rules and Procedures document
- 6 Regional election. We have a regional organization structure that consists of 4 sub-regions to seek the greatest possible regional diversity.
- 7 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 8 [https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield\\_10978/appointment-nomcom-delegate-05nov08.pdf](https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_10978/appointment-nomcom-delegate-05nov08.pdf)
- 9 The RrSG elects NomCom reps from Members who hold voting status.
- 10 GAC Answer - The prospect of GAC participation in the ICANN NomCom has been discussed for some time within the committee and is still subject to further discussions. As a result, the GAC has not appointed a delegate to serve on the NomCom for many years.
- 11 EURALO: Refer to Word Document
- 12 The procedure for selecting the RSSAC liaison to the Nominating Committee is defined in RSSAC operational procedures. [See page 11: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf>]
- 13 SSAC: See Word Doc response

Response: 13

**41. Do you feel that the NomCom, as currently constituted, is a sufficient mechanism for fostering nominations that have adequate stakeholder and community buy in?**





1 - Yes

33.33% (4) 2 - No

66.67% (8)


Response: 12

**42. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 23. Where do you think these shortcomings lie, and how could they be improved?**

- 1 Before NomCom's selections are announced, the ALAC Leadership Team at least, should be consulted on the short-listed candidates for final consideration and feedback (buy-in or not should be noted).
- 2 Extensive regional outreach is required in order to be able to attract Good candidates
- 3 Not all the people that are sent to the NomCom have the experience to do a good vetting. So/AC should be more careful as to the people that the select to the NomCom
- 4 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 5 ccNSO: Refer to PDF document
- 6 EURALO: Refer to Word Document
- 7 We believe the technical community should carry more weight in the Nominating Committee in order to add a technical component to the diversity matrix.
- 8 SSAC: See word doc


Response: 8

**43. Does your Structure have formalized or instituted term limits for membership?**



Response: 15

**44. Does your Structure have formalized or instituted term limits for leadership?**




**45. What is your Structure’s feedback regarding its selection of Board members or non-voting Liaisons to the Board?**

- 1 Diversity of the Board needs to be enhanced, and the selection process should take this into account.
- 2 BC: See word document.
- 3 The process in place is very convoluted and at the end it works. However, the people running it are all volunteers which takes that effort away from policy work.
- 4 Very Positive
- 5 Recently, the ccNSO Council adopted a new guideline for selection of Board members. A more detailed analysis of the new procedure will be done after it had been applied.
- 6 IPC: Refer to Word Doc
- 7 None
- 8 GAC: Refer to Word Doc
- 9 Very Positive from a RALO perspective. The EURALO vote has always been directed by its members.
- 10 RSSAC: Refer to Word Document
- 11 No feedback - the SSAC is satisfied with the current process.

Response: 11

#### 46. Does your Structure have a transparency policy?



#### 47. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 27. Please describe or provide a link to any formalized transparency processes/protocols/policy that your Structure uses.

- 1 Transparency is required in multiple parts of the BC Charter, at [https://www.bizconst.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=34:charter&catid=20:site-content&Itemid=131](https://www.bizconst.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=34:charter&catid=20:site-content&Itemid=131)
- 2 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 3 GAC: Refer to Word doc
- 4 EURALO: Refer to Word Document
- 5 RSSAC operational procedures outline how minutes of meetings, including RSSAC decisions, are to be published. [See: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-000-op-procedures-23oct17-en.pdf>]
- 6 Please see SSAC operational Procedures V7.0 (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/operationalprocedures-30nov18-en.pdf>), Section 4: SSAC Work Plan and Activity Reporting.


Response: 6

#### 48. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 27. When was the last time it was revised?

- 1 2017
- 2 Last revision of our Rules of Procedure - 2016
- 3 GAC: Refer to Word document
- 4 Revised in 2018 during discussions of the EURALO Rules of Procedure.
- 5 RSSAC operational procedures are reviewed annually.
- 6 The Operational Procedures were last updated on 30 November 2018.

Response: 6

**49. Does your Structure have a conflict of interest policy?**




**50. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 28. Please describe or provide a link to any formalized conflicts of interest processes/protocols/policy that your Structure uses.**

- 1 Policies regarding conflicts of Interest appear several times in the BC Charter, at [https://www.bizconst.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=34:charter&catid=20:site-content&Itemid=131](https://www.bizconst.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=34:charter&catid=20:site-content&Itemid=131)
- 2 Within our Operative Principles.
- 3 <https://rrsg.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/RrSG-Charter-6.0-May-2018.pdf>
- 4 EURALO does not have a conflict of interest policy as such but respects the minimum criteria for an ALS application to reduce the potential for a conflict of interest.

Response: 4

**51. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 28. Does this include an evaluation component?**




Response: 4

**52. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to the question above. Please provide details:**

- 1 The BC Credentials Committee is charged with the responsibility of ensuring all issues pertaining to membership eligibility (including conflicts of interest) are sorted before admission into membership.
- 2 Due diligence is performed by ICANN Staff at the time of ALS application. For individual membership applications, due diligence is performed by the Board of the EURALO Individual Users.


Response: 2

**53. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 28. Has your structure ever experienced or perceived challenges related to conflicts of interest?**




Response: 7


**54. Please rate how effective the current system of Public Comments is for gathering community input.**




**55. Does your Structure believe the concept of Public Comment, as currently implemented, should be re-examined?**




**56. Has your Structure responded to a Public Comment in the last year?**



**57. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 31. How many responses has your Structure submitted to Public Comments in the last year?**




**58. Please answer if you responded 'no' to question 31. What prevented your Structure from responding?**



Response: 2


**59. Would your Structure respond more often to Public Comments if the consultation included short and precise questions regarding the subject matter in a Survey Monkey or similar format?**



Response: 15




**60. Does your Structure agree that responses made to Public Comments by individuals and external organizations/groups be considered equally?**




Response: 13

**61. Does your Structure agree that the responses made to Public Comments by SO/ACs have more weight than other comments?**




Response: 14

**62. Does your Structure agree that the responses made to Public Comments by the Board have more weight than other comments?**




Response: 15

**63. How useful are staff reports on Public Comments?**




Response: 15


**64. Does your Structure agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were accepted and how they were included?**




**65. Does your Structure agree that staff reports on Public Comments clearly indicate if suggestions made by the commenters were rejected and the reason they were rejected?**



**66. Does your Structure believe the Internet community generally supports the decisions made by the Board?**



**67. Does your Structure generally support the decisions made by the Board?**



## 68. What role should SO or ACs play in fostering buy-in from their community to ICANN's policy-making?

- 1 depends on the issue
- 2 SOs and ACs need to disseminate information about the likely tactical and strategic impact of ICANN's policy proposals within their respective communities, and also should aggregate and channel the response from their communities back to ICANN.
- 3 BC: See word document.
- 4 Cross community policy development is a critical element for a wider community buy-in to any proposed policy
- 5 Include/Invite all SO/AC members to be part of any PDP WG.
- 6 Create or promote an internal process of consultation of the issues in PDP.
- 7 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 8 Information sharing, participation in the work of ICANN
- 9 IPC: Refer to Word Doc
- 10 By ensuring regular communication and efforts to obtain input from Members in order to best represent that community as a whole. Having the mechanism to be able to vote on contentious issues is also important.
- 11 GAC: Refer to Word Doc
- 12 EURALO: Refer to Word Document
- 13 The RSSAC is involved in PDPs when sought for input. To the extent possible, RSSAC also tracks the recommendations of PDPs for potential impact to the Root Server Operator community.
- 14 SOs and ACs should either provide input during the policy development process or provide comment on specific policy proposals.


Response: 14

## 69. How could your Structure improve this?

- 1 more action role
- 2 By facilitating back-and-forth communications, promoting discussions, and building capacity.
- 3 BC: See word document.
- 4 Advice our members/ALS contribute to the policy development process
- 5 BY directly requesting the inclusion to the corresponding SO in charge of the PDP
- 6 More information and tracking.
- 7 At Large: Refer to PDF document
- 8 By setting clearer priorities and not wasting valuable resources on things that are not considered important by the ccTLD community
- 9 See IPC comments on PDP3.0: [https://www.ipconstituency.org/assets/ipc-position-papers/2018/2018\\_08August\\_16%20IPC%20Comment%20on%20PDP%203%20point%20-%20Final.pdf](https://www.ipconstituency.org/assets/ipc-position-papers/2018/2018_08August_16%20IPC%20Comment%20on%20PDP%203%20point%20-%20Final.pdf).
- 10 The RrSG is always trying to improve efforts to gauge opinion from Members outside of those who are the most active, using surveys and regular membership meetings, but it remains a challenge.
- 11 With appropriate consistent dedicated resources from the ICANN org, the GAC and GE would be able to conduct more workshops and reach larger audiences.
- 12 EURALO: Refer to Word Document
- 13 RSSAC: Refer to Word Document
- 14 No suggestions


Response: 14

**70. How would your Structure rate the effectiveness of the specific reviews (ATRT, SSR, RDS) as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws?**




Response: 13

**71. Should specific reviews (ATRT, CCT, RDS, SSR) be reconsidered or amended?**




Response: 11

**72. How would your Structure rate the effectiveness of organizational reviews (those reviewing SO/ACs as they are currently structured in the ICANN Bylaws)?**




Response: 13

**73. Should organizational reviews be reconsidered or amended?**




Response: 12

74. Please answer if you responded "yes" to question 46. Should organizational reviews continue to be undertaken by external consultants?




75. Has your Structure looked at the ICANN Accountability Indicators which can be found at <https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators>?






**76. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 47. How would your Structure rate their usefulness overall?**




Response: 6

**77. Please answer if you responded 'yes' to question 47. How would your Structure rate these for effectiveness in measuring the accountability of ICANN**



Response: 6

**78. Should the ATRT3 make recommendations about prioritization and rationalization of ICANN activities?**




**79. Please answer if you selected 'no' to question 48. Whose responsibility does your Structure think it should be?**


1 Refer to Word Doc

Response: 1


**80. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should such recommendations include a process to retire recommendations as it becomes apparent that the community will never get to them or they have been overtaken by other events?**



**81. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should such recommendations aim to provide a general approach for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?**



**82. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations, or include other operational aspects in ICANN?**




**83. Please answer if you selected 'include other operational aspects' to "Should the mechanism for making recommendations on prioritization and rationalization only apply to PDPs, reviews and their recommendations, or include other operational aspects in ICANN?" What does your Structure think these other operational aspects should include?**


- 1 How effective is the ALS out-reach and engagement and effective regional representation
- 2 Financial matters
- 3 (Note: both option above were selected).Operational readiness, compliance, outreach and engagement, assessment of community efforts and results (metrics, KPIs), accountability mechanisms
- 4 Operational readiness, compliance, outreach and engagement, stakeholder engagement.
- 5 Prioritizing the technically feasibility of projects

Response: 5

**84. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Should the community or representative(s) of the community be involved as a decisional participant in any mechanism which makes recommendations for prioritizing and rationalizing work for ICANN?**



85. Please answer if you selected 'yes' to question 48. Do you think the Empowered Community would be a good mechanism for making recommendations on prioritizing and rationalizing if its role was amended to allow this?



86. Please answer if you selected 'no' to the question above. Is there an existing structure which could fill this role?

- 1 Only 5 of ICANN's SO/ACs are DPs. The remaining ACs should be part of the process too
- 2 GNSO Council with regard to policy related work.
- 3 SSAC: See word doc response

Response: 3