Planning Prioritization Framework Pilot - Worksheet 04072022

PRE-FILLED Based on Review Final Report and / or Board Resolutions					*ICANN Org Proposed Prioritization (as a starting point only)*				*Community Planning Prioritization Pilot Group - UPDATE HERE*			
Specific Review Name	**Recommendation # Provided in Final Report**	**Recommendation Description**	**Board Adoption Date**	**Review Team Priority Determination**	**Level of Urgency**	**Level of Importance**	**Priority Level (calculated)** P1 = highest priority P4 = lowest priority	**Rationale of the Priority Level**	***Level of Urgency***	***Level of Importance***	***Priority Level (calculated)*** *P1 = highest priority P4 = lowest priority*	**Rationale of the Priority Level**
ATRT3	Rec 3.1-3.4 - Periodic and Organizational Reviews	3.1 RDS Reviews - Given the final results of the EPDP process will certainly have an impact on any future RDS Reviews (and could even remove the need for any further Specific Reviews on this topic) and considering that ATRT3's final report will be published prior to the EPDP delivering its final report, ATRT3 recommends suspending any further RDS Reviews until the next ATRT Review can consider the future of RDS Reviews in light of the final EPDP report recommendations, the results of the Board's consideration of these as well as any other developments which affect Directory Services.	30 Nov 20	High	Urgent	Important	P1	Based on the current Bylaws requirement, the next RDS Review (RDS3) is schedule to take place in Sep 2023. In light of ATRT3 recommendation, all further RDS review should be suspended for now.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. Members also suggested to group ATRT3 Rec 3.1 - 3.4 into 1 row. - 13 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 3.1-3.4 - Periodic and Organizational Reviews	3.2 CCT Reviews - o There should be one additional and clearly scoped CCT Review. o It shall start within the two years after the first introduction to the root of new gTLDs of the (possible) next round. o It should be limited to a duration of one year. o Additionally, a framework of data collection must be in place prior to the next round of gTLDs and the availability of all data sets should be confirmed prior to the selection of the review members and must be provided within 30 days of the review being launched.	30 Nov 20	High	Urgent	Important	P1	Linked to lifecycle of reviews project. Important recommendation that redesigns the process of reviews.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. Members also suggested to group ATRT3 Rec 3.1 - 3.4 into 1 row. - 13 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 3.1-3.4 - Periodic and Organizational Reviews	3.4 ATRT Reviews should continue essentially as they are currently constituted but with the following enhancements: ○ Shall start no later than two years after the approval by the Board of the first recommendation of the Holistic Review.135 ○ Shall maintain responsibility to recommend to the Board the termination or amendment of other periodic reviews and the creation of additional periodic reviews (including assessing reviews terminated by previous ATRTs). ○ All pre-identified documentation that is required for the review, such as the previous ATRT's implementation report, shall be available at the first meeting of the review team. ○ Terms of reference shall be established at the first meeting. ○ Note: The Operating Standards for Specific Reviews shall be amended to allow review teams to obtain professional services, which is not covered by subject matter experts, should they require such services.	30 Nov 20	High	Urgent	Important	P1	Requires Board action to change the timing of the next review cycle, which is different from what is currently stated in the ByLaws.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. Members also suggested to group ATRT3 Rec 3.1 - 3.4 into 1 row. - 13 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 3.5 - Holistic Review	○ Timing considerations: ■ The first one shall start no later than one year after approval by the Board of the first recommendation by ATRT3. ■ The next Holistic Review shall start no later than every two-and-a-half years after approval by the Board of the first recommendation of the latest ATRT Review (e.g. the second Holistic Review would begin two-and-a-half years after the Board approved the first recommendation from ATRT4). This cadence would ensure a minimum of two continuous improvement assessments for each SO/AC/NC prior to holding the next Holistic Review. ■ The launching of any other review activities should be suspended while a Holistic Review is active. ○ Should operate based on Operating Standards for Specific Reviews and should be time-limited to a maximum of 18 months. ○ Objectives: ■ Review continuous improvement efforts of SO/AC/NC based on good practices. ■ Review the effectiveness of the various inter SO/AC/NC collaboration mechanisms. ■ Review the accountability of SO/ACs or constituent parts to their members/constituencies (this will include an in-depth analysis of the survey results). ■ Review SO/AC/NC as a whole to determine if they continue to have a purpose in the ICANN structure as they are currently constituted or if any changes in structures and operations are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as ensure optimal representation of community views (but taking into consideration any impacts on the Board or the Empowered Community).	30 Nov 20	High	Urgent	Important	P1	New review that needs to be run as a pilot first, which will be designed in collaboration with the community.		Important		obtained consensus on "Importance"; not yet obtained consensus on "Urgency" - 13 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 3.6 - Continuous Improvement Program	ATRT3 shall evolve the content of Organizational Reviews into continuous improvement programs in each SO/AC/NC: Continuous Improvement Program: ICANN org shall work with each SO/AC/NC to establish a continuous improvement program. Such a continuous improvement program shall have a common base between all SOs, ACs, and the NC but will also allow for customization so as to best meet the needs of each individual SO/AC/NC. All SO/AC/NC shall have implemented a continuous improvement program within 18 months of this recommendation being approved by the Board. These continuous improvement programs will include: 1. Annual satisfaction survey of members/participants ■ Each SO/AC/NC shall perform a comprehensive annual satisfaction survey, or equivalent mechanism, of its members and participants The focus of the survey should be on member and constituent's satisfaction (and issue identification) vs their respective SO/AC/NC but can also include satisfaction with ICANN org services such as staff support, travel services, translation services, etc. ■ For SOs and ACs that are composed of substructures, this should apply to their individual substructures and the results of all sub-structures shall be aggregated to generate a result for the given SO or AC. ■ The results of these would be public and used to support the continuous improvement program as well as input for the Holistic Review. If the survey results note a significant issue this shall be the trigger to initiate appropriate measures to deal with any such issues. 2. Regular assessment of continuous improvement programs: ■ 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. This would allow the Holistic Review to consider a minimum of two assessment reports and related public comments for each SO/AC/NC. ■ Details of the assessments will be defined during the elaboration of the continuous improvement program with each SO/AC/NC. If the SO/AC/NC desires and the budget permits, the assessment can be conducted by an independent contractor or by having an intensive one to five-day workshop. ■ The Board should publish at least every three years a summary of its continuous improvements over that period. These reports would be used as input for the Holistic Review. 3. Funding of the continuous improvement for SO/AC/NC. ■ This continuous improvement program is not meant to be a cost reduction activity vs current overall costs of Organizational Reviews over a 5-year period. ICANN shall ensure that, as a minimum, the same overall budget is available for the continuous improvement efforts of the SO/AC/NCs. ■ Regardless of the processes selected by the specific SO/AC/NC, this shall fit in the financial constraints available for such activities.	30 Nov 20	High	Urgent	Important	P1	New review/program to be designed with each individual SO/AC/NC and customized as needed to fit the needs of each group.		Important		obtained consensus on "Importance"; not yet obtained consensus on "Urgency" - 19 Apr 2022
CCT	Recommendation 1	Formalize and promote ongoing data collection.	1 Mar 19	High	Urgent	Important	P1	P1 as essential to have a framework in place for data collection related efforts.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
CCT	Recommendation 8	Conduct periodic surveys of registrants that gathers both objective and subjective information with a goal of creating more concrete and actionable information.	22 Oct 20	Low	Urgent	Important	P1	Recommendations 8, 11, 13 items 1, 2, 4 (in part) would be handled through one single implementation effort. Recommendation 11 is a prerequisite - hence the P1.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
CCT	Recommendation 11	Conduct periodic end-user consumer surveys. Future review teams should work with survey experts to conceive more behavioral measures of consumer trust that gather both objective and subjective data with a goal toward generating more concrete and actionable information.	22 Oct 20	High - Prerequisite	Urgent	Important	P1	Recommendations 8, 11, 13 items 1, 2, 4 (in part) would be handled through one single implementation effort. Recommendation 11 is a prerequisite - hence the P1.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
CCT	Recommendation 13 - items 1, 2, 4 (in part)	ICANN should collect data in conjunction with its related data-collection activities on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions) to help regularly determine and report: 1. Whether consumers and registrants are aware that certain new gTLDs have registration restrictions; 2. Compare consumer trust levels between new gTLDs with varying degrees of registration restrictions; [...] 4. Assess the costs and benefits of registration restrictions to [...] the public (to include impacts on competition and consumer choice); [...]	22 Oct 20	Low	Urgent	Important	P1	Recommendations 8, 11, 13 items 1, 2, 4 (in part) would be handled through one single implementation effort. Recommendation 11 is a prerequisite - hence the P1.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
RDS-WHOIS2	R11.2	The ICANN Board should direct the ICANN organization to ensure that the common interface displays all applicable output for each gTLD domain name registration as available from contracted parties, including multiple versions when the outputs from registry and registrar differ. The common interface should be updated to address any policy or contractual changes to maintain full functionality.	25 Feb 20	High	Urgent	Important	P1	This recommendation is rated by the RDS-WHOIS2 as high. ICANN recognizes the importance of this tool to the community. In its action on this recommendation, the Board also noted "support in the public comment proceeding for this recommendation. For instance, the ALAC notes that "although GDPR has reduced the amount of information publicly available, [...] maintaining full functionality is required" and "the portal must provide all available information in a clear and usable fashion". Additionally, ICANN org notes that the Board noted in its action on this recommendation that "RDAP was designed with the anticipation of the future need to update or address any future policy or contractual changes. From a feasibility standpoint, the Board notes that there may be a need to program the RDAP lookup tool to note differences between registrar and registry data for a domain name."				skip for now due to lack of information - 19 April 2022
SSR2	Rec 10.1	ICANN org should post a web page that includes their working definition of DNS abuse, i.e., what it uses for projects, documents, and contracts. The definition should explicitly note what types of security threats ICANN org currently considers within its remit to address through contractual and compliance mechanisms, as well as those ICANN org understands to be outside its remit. If ICANN org uses other similar terminology — e.g., security threat, malicious conduct — ICANN org should include both its working definition of those terms and precisely how ICANN org is distinguishing those terms from DNS abuse. This page should include links to excerpts of all current abuse-related obligations in contracts with contracted parties, including any procedures and protocols for responding to abuse. ICANN org should update this page annually, date the latest version, and link to older versions with associated dates of publication.	22 Jul 21	High	Urgent	Important	P1	Community discussions ongoing to reach a common community understanding of what is DNS abuse and related terms	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022

Planning Prioritization Framework Pilot - Worksheet 04072022

PRE-FILLED Based on Review Final Report and / or Board Resolutions					*ICANN Org Proposed Prioritization (as a starting point only)*				*Community Planning Prioritization Pilot Group - UPDATE HERE*			
Specific Review Name	**Recommendation # Provided in Final Report**	**Recommendation Description**	**Board Adoption Date**	**Review Team Priority Determination**	**Level of Urgency**	**Level of Importance**	**Priority Level (calculated)** P1 = highest priority P4 = lowest priority	**Rationale of the Priority Level**	***Level of Urgency***	***Level of Importance***	***Priority Level (calculated)*** *P1 = highest priority P4 = lowest priority*	**Rationale of the Priority Level**
SSR2	Rec 21.1	ICANN org and PTI operations should accelerate the implementation of new Root Zone Management System (RZMS) security measures regarding the authentication and authorization of requested changes and offer TLD operators the opportunity to take advantage of those security measures, particularly MFA and encrypted email.	22 Jul 21	Medium	Urgent	Important	P1	Efforts to implement the new Root Zone Management System are already underway. This recommendation will build on existing efforts to enhance security in theRoot Zone System.	Urgent	Important	P1	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 4 - Strategic and Operational Plans	4.1 Rationale - ICANN org in strategic plans and operational plans shall provide a clear and concise rationale in plain language explaining how each goal, outcome, and operating initiative is critical to achieving the results of the one it is supporting (e.g., For each strategic goal there must be a rationale as to how it is critical for its strategic objective).	30 Nov 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 to allow time for development of proper template and structure for this new reporting rerquirement.	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 4 - Strategic and Operational Plans	4.2 Criteria - ICANN org in its strategic plans and operational plans shall have a clearly articulated, in plain language, specific criteria defining success which shall be S.M.A.R.T (unless appropriately justified) for all goals (strategic or not), outcomes (targeted or not), operating initiatives, etc.	30 Nov 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 to allow time for development of proper template and structure for this new reporting rerquirement.	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 4 - Strategic and Operational Plans	4.3 Success - For the FY2021-2025 Strategic Plan and FY2021 Operating Plan, ICANN org shall, within six months of approving this recommendation, produce a supplementary document using the criteria defining success in reporting on the progress of any relevant goal, outcome, operating initiative, etc. to create a listing of required rationales and specific criteria defining success (as defined by ATRT3 in this recommendation) for each goal (strategic or not), outcome (targeted or not), operating initiatives, etc. that are found in both of these documents and post it for public consultation prior to finalization. Once finalized ICANN org will append these to the FY2021-2025 Strategic Plan and FY2021 Operating Plan and use the criteria defining success in all reporting on the progress of any relevant goal, outcome, operating initiative, etc.	30 Nov 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 to allow time for development of proper template and structure for this new reporting rerquirement.	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 4 - Strategic and Operational Plans	4.4 Annual Status Report - ICANN org shall publish an annual status report on all Strategic Plan and Operating Plan goals, outcomes and operating initiatives.180 This should clearly assess each of the elements presented in the Strategic and Operating Plans (goals, outcomes etc.) clearly indicating what was made vs the target in concise and plain language. Prior to being finalized the report will be submitted for Public Comment.	30 Nov 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 to allow time for development of proper template and structure for this new reporting rerquirement.	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
ATRT3	Rec 4 - Strategic and Operational Plans	4.5 Overarching report - ICANN org shall publish an overarching report at the conclusion of a strategic plan starting with the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan. This should clearly assess each of the elements presented in the strategic plan its text (objectives, goals, outcomes) clearly indicate if it was attained or not and justify that assessment in concise and plain language. The report shall conclude with a section distilling the results of the assessments and how this could be applied to following strategic plans or their revisions. Prior to being finalized the report will be submitted for Public Comment.	30 Nov 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 to allow time for development of proper template and structure for this new reporting rerquirement.	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Agree with ICANN org pre assessment. - 19 Apr 2022
CCT	Recommendation 7	Collect domain usage data to better understand the implications of parked domains.	22 Oct 20	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 as determined by CCT-RT to be a high priority	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	- 19 April 2022
CCT	Recommendation 13 - item 4 (in part), 5	ICANN should collect data in conjunction with its related data-collection activities on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions) to help regularly determine and report: […] 4. Assess the costs and benefits of registration restrictions to contracted parties […] (to include impacts on competition and consumer choice); and 5. Determine whether and how such registration restrictions are enforced or challenged.	22 Oct 20	Low	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Recommendation 13 items 4 (in part) and 5, Recommendation 20, Recommendation 23 items A, C (in part), D , Recommendation 24 item B would fold into a voluntary pilot survey of Contracted Parties. As one of these recommendations was determined to be a high priority for the CCT-RT, P2 is used across all of these recommendations. Note that per Board action: "Data collection efforts must be preceded by consultation with contracted parties on the approach and methods"				
CCT	Recommendation 20	Assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by determining: (1) the volume of reports of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD that registries receive from governmental and quasi-governmental agencies; (2) the volume of inquires that registries receive from the public related to malicious conduct in the TLD; (3) whether more efforts are needed to publicize contact points to report complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within a TLD; and (4) what actions registries have taken to respond to complaints of illegal or malicious conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. Such efforts could include surveys, focus groups, or Community discussions. If these methods prove ineffective, consideration could be given to amending future standard Registry Agreements to require registries to more prominently disclose their abuse points of contact and provide more granular information to ICANN. Once this information is gathered, future review teams should consider recommendations for appropriate follow up measures.	22 Oct 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Recommendation 13 items 4 (in part) and 5, Recommendation 20, Recommendation 23 items A, C (in part), D , Recommendation 24 item B would fold into a voluntary pilot survey of Contracted Parties. As one of these recommendations was determined to be a high priority for the CCT-RT, P2 is used across all of these recommendations. Note that per Board action: "Data collection efforts must be preceded by consultation with contracted parties on the approach and methods"				
CCT	Recommendation 23 Items A, C (in part) & D	ICANN should gather data on new gTLDs operating in highly- regulated sectors to include the following elements: A) A survey to determine 1) the steps registry operators are taking to establish working relationships with relevant government or industry bodies, and 2) the volume of complaints received by registrants from government and regulatory bodies and their standard practices to respond to those complaints; B) A review of a sample of domain websites within the highly-regulated sector category to assess whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find; C) An inquiry to […] registrars/resellers of highly- regulated domains seeking sufficiently detailed information to determine the volume and the subject matter of complaints regarding domains in highly-regulated industries. D) An inquiry to registry operators to obtain data to compare rates of abuse between those highly-regulated gTLDs that have voluntarily agreed to verify and validate credentials to those highly-regulated gTLDs that have not. […]	22 Oct 20	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Recommendation 13 items 4 (in part) and 5, Recommendation 20, Recommendation 23 items A, C (in part), D , Recommendation 24 item B would fold into a voluntary pilot survey of Contracted Parties. As one of these recommendations was determined to be a high priority for the CCT-RT, P2 is used across all of these recommendations. Note that per Board action: "Data collection efforts must be preceded by consultation with contracted parties on the approach and methods"				
CCT	Recommendation 24 B	Survey registries to determine 1) whether they receive complaints related to cyberbullying and misrepresenting a governmental affiliation, and 2) how they enforce these safeguards.	22 Oct 20	Low	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Recommendation 13 items 4 (in part) and 5, Recommendation 20, Recommendation 23 items A, C (in part), D , Recommendation 24 item B would fold into a voluntary pilot survey of Contracted Parties. As one of these recommendations was determined to be a high priority for the CCT-RT, P2 is used across all of these recommendations. Note that per Board action: "Data collection efforts must be preceded by consultation with contracted parties on the approach and methods"				
CCT	Recommendation 23 Item B	ICANN should gather data on new gTLDs operating in highly- regulated sectors to include the following elements: B) A review of a sample of domain websites within the highly-regulated sector category to assess whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find;	22 Oct 20	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	Recommendation 13 items 4 (in part) and 5, Recommendation 20, Recommendation 23 items A, C (in part), D , Recommendation 24 item B would fold into a voluntary pilot survey of Contracted Parties. As one of these recommendations was determined to be a high priority for the CCT-RT, P2 is used across all of these recommendations. Note that per Board action: "Data collection efforts must be preceded by consultation with contracted parties on the approach and methods"				
CCT	Recommendation 21 item 2	Include more detailed information on the subject matter of complaints in ICANN publicly available Contractual Compliance reports. […] (2) the gTLD that is target of the abuse […].	1 Mar 19	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	This recommendation was rated by the CCT-RT as high.				
CCT	Recommendation 22	Initiate engagement with relevant stakeholders to determine what best practices are being implemented to offer reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of services that involve the gathering of sensitive health and financial information. Such a discussion could include identifying what falls within the categories of "sensitive health and financial information," and what metrics could be used to measure compliance with this safeguard.	1 Mar 19	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	This recommendation was rated by the CCT-RT as high.				
CCT	Recommendation 26	A study to ascertain the impact of the New gTLD Program on the costs required to protect trademarks in the expanded DNS marketplace should be repeated at regular intervals to see the evolution of those costs over time. The CCT Review Team recommends that the next study be completed within 18 months after issuance of the CCT final report, and that subsequent studies be repeated every 18 to 24 months. The CCT Review Team acknowledges that the Nielsen survey of INTA members in 2017 was intended to provide insight into this topic but yielded a lower response rate than anticipated. The Team recommends a more user-friendly and perhaps shorter survey to help ensure a higher and more statistically representative response rate.	22 Oct 20	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	This recommendation was rated by the CCT-RT as high.				
RDS-WHOIS2	SG.1	The ICANN Board should require that the ICANN org, in consultation with data security and privacy expert(s), ensure that all contracts with contracted parties (to include Privacy/Proxy services when such contracts exist) include uniform and strong requirements for the protection of registrant data and for ICANN to be notified in the event of any data breach. The data security expert(s) should also consider and advise on what level or magnitude of breach warrants such notification. In carrying out this review, the data security and privacy expert (s) should consider to what extent GDPR regulations, which many but not all ICANN contracted parties are subject to, could or should be used as a basis for ICANN requirements. The ICANN Board should initiate action intended to effect such changes. The ICANN Board should consider whether and to what extent notifications of breaches that it receives should be publicly disclosed.	25 Feb 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	This will be included in the next round of contractual negotiations with the contracted parties, insofar as it relates to ICANN receiving notification of data breaches in circumstances that threaten to undermine the stability, security, and resiliency of the Internet's DNS. P2 as rated medium by RDS-WHOIS2.				

Planning Prioritization Framework Pilot - Worksheet 04072022

PRE-FILLED Based on Review Final Report and / or Board Resolutions					*ICANN Org Proposed Prioritization (as a starting point only)*				*Community Planning Prioritization Pilot Group - UPDATE HERE*			
Specific Review Name	**Recommendation # Provided in Final Report**	**Recommendation Description**	**Board Adoption Date**	**Review Team Priority Determination**	**Level of Urgency**	**Level of Importance**	**Priority Level (calculated)** P1 = highest priority P4 = lowest priority	**Rationale of the Priority Level**	***Level of Urgency***	***Level of Importance***	***Priority Level (calculated)*** *P1 = highest priority P4 = lowest priority*	**Rationale of the Priority Level**
RDS-WHOIS2	CC.1	The ICANN Board should initiate action intended to ensure that gTLD domain names suspended due to RDS (WHOIS) contact data which the registrar knows to be incorrect, and that remains incorrect until the registration is due for deletion, should be treated as follows: (1) The RDS (WHOIS) record should include a notation that the domain name is suspended due to incorrect data; and (2) Domain names with this notation should not be unsuspended without correcting the data.	25 Feb 20	High	Less Urgent	Important	P2	This is to be included in the next round of contractual negotiations with the contracted parties. P2 as rated medium by RDS-WHOIS2.				
SSR2	Rec 23.2	As a root DNSKEY algorithm rollover is a very complex and sensitive process, PTI operations should work with other root zone partners and the global community to develop a consensus plan for future root DNSKEY algorithm rollovers, taking into consideration the lessons learned from the first root KSK rollover in 2018.	22 Jul 21	Medium	Less Urgent	Important	P2	P2 as determined by SSR2 to be a medium priority				
CCT	Recommendation 6	Partner with mechanisms and entities involved with the collection of TLD data. As feasible, collect TLD registration number data per TLD and registrar at a country-by-country level in order to perform analysis based on the same methods used in the Latin American and Caribbean DNS Marketplace (LAC) Study.	22 Oct 20	Low	Urgent	Less Important	P3	P3 as determined by CCT-RT to be a low priority				
CCT	Recommendation 13 - item 3	ICANN should collect data in conjunction with its related data-collection activities on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions) to help regularly determine and report: [...] 3. Determine whether the lower abuse rates associated with gTLDs that impose stricter registration policies identified in the "Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in gTLDs" study continue to be present within new gTLDs that impose registration restrictions as compared with new gTLDs that do not; [...].	22 Oct 20	Low	Urgent	Less Important	P3	P3 as determined by CCT-RT to be a low priority				
SSR2	Rec 16.1	ICANN org should provide consistent cross-references across their website to provide cohesive and easy-to-find information on all actions—past, present, and planned—taken on the topic of privacy and data stewardship, with particular attention to the information around the Registration Directory Service (RDS).	22 Jul 21	Medium	Urgent	Less Important	P3	May include dependencies on EPDP related work				
SSR2	Rec 23.1	PTI operations should update the DNSSEC Practice Statement (DPS) to allow the transition from one digital signature algorithm to another, including an anticipated transition from the RSA digital signature algorithm to other algorithms or to future post-quantum algorithms, which provide the same or greater security and preserve or improve the resilience of the DNS.	22 Jul 21	Medium	Urgent	Less Important	P3	Dependent on completion on SSR2 Review Rec 23.2.				
ATRT3	Rec 1 - Public Input	1.1 To maximize the input from each Public Comment proceedings, ICANN org shall update the requirements per the following: ● Each Public Comment proceeding shall clearly identify who the intended audience is (general community, technical community, legal experts, etc.). This will allow potential respondents to quickly understand if they wish to invest the time to produce comments. This is not meant to prevent anyone from commenting but is rather meant as clarifying who is best suited to comment. ● Each Public Comment proceeding shall provide a clear list of precise key questions in plain language that the public consultation is seeking answers to from its intended audience. ● Where appropriate and feasible, translations of the summary and key questions shall be included in the Public Comment proceeding and responses to Public Comment proceedings in any of the official ICANN languages shall always be accepted. ● Results of these questions shall be included in the staff report on the Public Comment proceeding.	30 Nov 20	Low	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	The new Public Comment page and templates were implemented in 2021 with a series of improvement.				
ATRT3	Rec 1 - Public Input	1.2 With regards to other types of public input ICANN org shall: ● Develop and publish guidelines to assist in determining when a Public Comment process is required vs. alternate mechanisms for gathering input. ● Develop and publish guidelines for how alternative mechanisms for gathering input should operate including producing final reports. ● Develop a system similar to and integrated with the Public Comment tracking system, which will show all uses of alternate mechanisms to gather input including results and analysis. ● Publish the complete "Public Comment Guidelines for the ICANN Organization." ● Resolve the issue of blog posts collecting feedback information when the "Public Comment Guidelines for the ICANN Organization" state that they "will not be used as mechanisms for collecting feedback."	30 Nov 20	Low	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	The new Public Comment page and templates were implemented in 2021 with a series of improvement.				
ATRT3	Rec 2 - Implementation of ATRT2 Recommendations	ICANN org shall review the implementation of ATRT2 Recommendations in light of ATRT3's assessment and complete their implementation subject to prioritization (see recommendation on the creation of a prioritization process).	30 Nov 20	Low	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	P4 as determined by ATRT3 to be a low priority				
RDS-WHOIS2	R1.3	The ICANN Board, in drafting the Charter of a Board working group on RDS, should ensure the necessary transparency of the group's work, such as by providing for records of meetings and meeting minutes, to enable future review of its activities.	25 Feb 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	The work of the previously chartered Board Working Group on Registration Directory Services has been integrated into the work of the Board Caucus on General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) / Expedited Policy Development Process (ePDP). Work is underway to determine which measures are needed to ensure that appropriate information on Caucus group activities is provided to the community.				
RDS-WHOIS2	R3.1	[...]. The revision of this web documentation and instructional material should not be undertaken as a purely internal operation but should include users and potentially focus groups to ensure that the final result fully meets the requirements. The resultant outward facing documentation of registrant and RDS (WHOIS) issues should be kept up to date as changes are made to associated policy or processes.	25 Feb 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	Updates to web documentation were made - action needed on the need to include users/focus groups. Proposed to be a P4 in light of community bandwidth challenges.				
RDS-WHOIS2	R15.1	The ICANN Board should ensure that implementation of RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team recommendations is based on best practice project management methodology, ensuring that plans and implementation reports clearly address progress, and applicable metrics and tracking tools are used for effectiveness and impact evaluation.	25 Feb 20	Medium	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	ICANN org's newly created Implementation Operations function is deploying a foundational structure that allows for the work of implementation to be carried out thoroughly, effectively, and in a sustainable manner. In addition to the use of an improved project management system, ICANN org's Implementation Operations function has also designed enhanced tools for its implementation planning related work and is working on developing a more frequent and detailed reporting mechanism.				
RDS-WHOIS2	LE.1	The ICANN Board should resolve that ICANN organization conduct regular data gathering through surveys and studies to inform a future assessment of the effectiveness of RDS (WHOIS) in meeting the needs of law enforcement. This will also aid future policy development (including the current Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process and related efforts).	25 Feb 20	High	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	ICANN org conducted a study on the topic of differentiation of legal vs. natural persons' registration data which was used to inform the EPDP Phase 2A working group deliberations. Additionally, ICANN org conducted two surveys and outreach to the ICANN community to inform its work on the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD) Operational Design Phase (ODP). ICANN org is still working on streamlined mechanisms to request, receive, and gather feedback from the community and stakeholders, to help inform future community work.				
RDS-WHOIS2	LE.2	The ICANN Board should consider conducting comparable surveys and/or studies (as described in LE.1) with other RDS (WHOIS) users working with law enforcement on a regular basis.	25 Feb 20	High	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	ICANN org conducted a study on the topic of differentiation of legal vs. natural persons' registration data which was used to inform the EPDP Phase 2A working group deliberations. Additionally, ICANN org conducted two surveys and outreach to the ICANN community to inform its work on the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD) Operational Design Phase (ODP). ICANN org is still working on streamlined mechanisms to request, receive, and gather feedback from the community and stakeholders, to help inform future community work.				
SSR2	Rec 1.1	The ICANN Board and ICANN org should perform a further comprehensive review of the SSR1 Recommendations and execute a new plan to complete the implementation of the SSR1 Recommendations (see Appendix D: Findings Related to SSR1 Recommendations).	22 Jul 21	Low	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	Many of the SSR1 recommendations were either already implemented or need to be retired due to the Internet landscape changing so much. Very low priority recommendations.				
SSR2	Rec 22.1	For each service that ICANN org has authoritative purview over, including root zone and gTLD-related services as well as IANA registries, ICANN org should create a list of statistics and metrics that reflect the operational status (such as availability and responsiveness) of that service, and publish a directory of these services, data sets, and metrics on a single page on the icann.org website, such as under the Open Data Platform. ICANN org should produce measurements for each of these services as summaries over both the previous year and longitudinally (to illustrate baseline behavior).	22 Jul 21	Low	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	Less urgent and less important as determined by SSR2 to be a low priority				
SSR2	Rec 22.2	ICANN org should request community feedback annually on the measurements. That feedback should be considered, publicly summarized after each report, and incorporated into follow-on reports. The data and associated methodologies used to measure these reports' results should be archived and made publicly available to foster reproducibility.	22 Jul 21	Low	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	Dependent on 22.1 and less urgent and less important as determined by SSR2 to be a low priority				
SSR2	Rec 24.2	ICANN org should make the Common Transition Process Manual easier to find by providing links on the EBERO website.	22 Jul 21	Medium	Less Urgent	Less Important	P4	Certain aspects of implementation of this recommendation could be considered as part of the work of ITI and less urgent and less important as information exists in an embedded form today.				