

“Communication {with,for} the Board”

According to the responses provided by staff, communication with/for the Board was relevant in Recommendations 1(a)-(d), 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.1, 7.2, 8, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, and 26. Note recommendations 23, 25, and 26 are dealt with separately.

Table of Contents

Recommendation 1	2
Proposed New Recommendation 1a	5
Proposed New Recommendation 1b	6
Proposed New Recommendation 1c.....	7
Proposed New Recommendation 1d	8
Recommendation 2	9
Proposed New Recommendation 2a	11
Proposed New Recommendation 2b	12
Recommendation 3	13
Proposed New Recommendation 3a	14
Recommendation 4	15
Proposed New Recommendation 4a	16
Recommendation 5	17
Recommendation 6	18
Proposed New Recommendation 6a	20
Recommendation 7.1.....	21
Recommendation 7.2.....	22
Proposed New Recommendation 7.2a.....	23
Recommendation 8	24
Recommendation 19.....	25
Proposed New Recommendation 19a.....	26
Recommendation 20.....	27
Proposed New Recommendation 20a.....	28
Recommendation 24.....	29

Recommendation 1

Recommendation

Recognizing the work of the Board Governance committee on Board training and skills building, pursuant to the advice of both the 2007 Nominating Committee Review and 2008 Board review, the Board should establish (in time to enable the integration of these recommendations into the Nominating Committee process commencing in late 2011) formal mechanisms for identifying the collective skill-set required by the ICANN Board including such skills as public policy, finance, strategic planning, corporate governance, negotiation, and dispute resolution. Emphasis should be placed upon ensuring the Board has the skills and experience to effectively provide oversight of ICANN operations consistent with the global public interest and deliver best practice in corporate governance. This should build upon the initial work undertaken in the independent reviews and involve:

- a. Benchmarking Board skill-sets against similar corporate and other governance structures;
- b. Tailoring the required skills to suit ICANN's unique structure and mission, through an open consultation process, including direct consultation with the leadership of the SOs and ACs;
- c. Reviewing these requirements annually, delivering a formalised starting point for the NomCom each year; and
- d. From the Nominating Committee process commencing in late 2011, publishing the outcomes and requirements as part of the Nominating Committee's call-for-nominations.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions taken:

- a. Formal consultations during all ICANN meetings with all ACs (GAC declined to have such conversation in 2012) and SOs and their constituencies during the general assembly the previous year (2011) to identify all the characteristics and publish them.
- b. Formal meeting with Board chair and CEO to collect their opinions about the profile of Board members needed for the next selection.
- c. Meeting with General Counsel to guarantee all NomCom members will understand the requirements for a Board position and other legal issues.
- d. Meeting with the Board Governance Committee to understand the specific characteristics that already exists on the Board, which characteristics will be missing that next year, and which characteristics are lacking and important for the Board.
- e. Publishing the identified and verified profile characteristics as a guideline for candidate application information.
- f. Publishing an updated timeline for NomCom activities during the whole cycle to

- guarantee transparency to the community and subsequent candidates.
- g. Meeting with the company selected to help NomCom with professional analysis of preselected board candidates.
 - h. Meetings to recheck with the ACs and SOs in order to orient NomCom members on the selection process.
 - i. After the selection process, publishing a Report that provided a matrix with the requirements put forth by the community and Board crossed with what the selected persons' profiles accomplished to meet those requirements.
 - j. Meeting with the ACs and SOs and their constituencies in order to provide feedback about the NomCom activities and how the AC and SO requirements for the Board positions were respected.

Implementability:

With one exception, the recommendations were largely implemented and no unforeseen problems or issues were encountered, thus most of these recommendations would appear to have been implementable. The one exception was related to 1(c). Some input was received indicating the original recommendations was not implemented:

"Reviewing the selections, particularly against the ideal candidate profile, experience gaps etc, thankfully hasn't been carried out to the extent I think the ATRT intended. The original recommendation was too ambitious, example: without knowing the candidate pool the NomCom selected from, it would be impossible to review/justify selections."

Effectiveness:

Staff comments suggest the recommendations were effective as indicated by:

- a. BGC organizational improvements;
- b. Improvements in Board internal management performance, individually and collectively;
- c. More participation from AC & SOs related to the choice of new board members
- d. Candidates have a better understanding of what's required; and
- e. Better knowledge of what the board needs (both the skills of a candidates and the "gaps" in the board's collective skillset)

Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

- Comparison of NomCom output from years prior to and after the publication of ATRT1 recommendations.
- Review of NomCom "Monthly Report Cards" <http://nomcom.icann.org/report-cards-2012-2013.htm>
- "Summary and Analysis of Public Comments for Academia Representation on

- NomCom”, <http://forum.icann.org/lists/academia-nomcom/pdf0bVGYMBG8f.pdf>
- “DURBAN – ATRT-2 - Meeting with NomCom”,
<http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/transcript-atrt2-nomcom-15jul13-en.pdf>

ATR2 analysis of recommendation implementation

1(a): If “benchmarking board skill-sets against similar corporate and other governance structures” is taken literally, this is likely incomplete as the “similar corporate and other governance structures” chosen along with the methodology used to make the choice have not been published nor have the benchmarks been made public.

1(b): Complete.

1(c): Requirements have been and will (can) be reviewed on an annual basis and this review served and will (can) serve as a starting point for the NomCom activities. However, as evidenced by commentary from NomCom volunteers, some clarification may be required on what exactly needs to be reviewed.

1(d): Complete and presumably ongoing.

ATR2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

While apparently informal, recommendations 1(a)-(d) would appear to have been effective based on improvements in NomCom performance as well as improvements in NomCom transparency. As is apparent from output documents and interactions with the community, the 2012 NomCom would appear to be both qualitatively and quantitatively more transparent than previous NomComs.

Proposed New Recommendation 1a

Document the methodology used to identify and choose “similar corporate and other governance structures”.

Hypothesis of problem

Whether or not benchmarking Board member skill-sets meets community requirements depends greatly on the choice of “similar corporate and other governance structures” from which the benchmarks are measured.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Proposed New Recommendation 1b

Document the benchmarks used

Hypothesis of problem

Benchmarking against non-publicly documented standards provides limited improvements in accountability and transparency.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Proposed New Recommendation 1c

Improve NomCom outreach/PR

Hypothesis of problem

A key component to the creation of a successful board is the quality of Board candidates. Anecdotal evidence suggests that many potentially qualified applicants are unaware of the opportunity to apply to be a member of ICANN's Board. Improving the outreach and public relations efforts associate with NomCom may improve the quality of Board candidates.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Proposed New Recommendation 1d

Expand the skills survey and benchmarking to include NomCom selections in GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC.

Hypothesis of problem

Just as Board-related NomCom efforts were improved by identifying missing skills and measuring existing skills against similar governance bodies, the NomCom efforts related to GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC can improved by applying the same efforts for those bodies.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 2

Recommendation

The Board should reinforce and review on a regular basis, (but no less than every 3 years) the training and skills building programmes established pursuant to Recommendation #1.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

From "ATRT Recommendations Proposed Implementation Plans October 2011 – Updated" (www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/atrt-recommendations-implementation-plans-08feb12-en.pdf) and staff supplied spreadsheet:

Task 1: Review 2010 Board Governance Committee work to identify Board member skill sets, both in terms of committee needs and individual Board member skill identifications. **Done**.

Task 2: Compile list of specific skills necessary for independent directors. **Done** [See <http://nomcom.icann.org/board-skills-recommendations-2012.htm>, <http://nomcom.icann.org/ccenso-council-requirements-18dec12-en.pdf>, and <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/nomcom-skills-advice-10apr13-en.pdf>].

Task 3: Solicit SO, NomCom and At-Large input on skills considered in making appointments to ICANN Board and prioritization of those skills. **Done** [see staff spreadsheet comments in recommendation #1].

Task 4: Poll past ICANN Board members and Liaisons for identification of skills necessary for service on the ICANN Board and the training that would be beneficial. **Done**.

Task 5: Determine process to achieve Board member participation in skill assessment presently on annual BGC workplan.

Task 6: Review scheduling for ongoing consultations with community regarding applicability of skill sets to ICANN. **Done** [see staff spreadsheet comments in recommendation #1].

Task 7: Coordinate conversation between NomCom Chair and Chair of Board to identify scope of information requested from Board for skill assessment, in respect of the independence of the NomCom processes. **Done** [see staff spreadsheet comments in recommendation #1].

Task 8: Coordinate with SOs and the At-Large on consideration of skill assessment for future selection. **Done** [see staff spreadsheet comments in recommendation #1].

Task 9: [NomCom] Include identified skill sets as well as any enhanced training

commitments identified in call for nominations. **Done** (annual occurrence).

Task 10: Review need for revisions to ICANN Bylaws. **Done** [from staff spreadsheet: “the Board found it preferable to issue guidelines on transparency rather than modifying or adding any Bylaws provision”].

Implementability:

No unforeseen issues during implementation.

Effectiveness:

Based on staff input, implementation of this recommendation would appear to have been effective in that Board members receive increased training upon entering the Board.

Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete and ongoing.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Actual measurement of effectiveness will require the specification of metrics and comparing those metrics over time to gauge improvements.

Proposed New Recommendation 2a

Metrics should be defined by which effectiveness of board training programs can be measured.

Hypothesis of problem

Without metrics collected before and after training as well as over time, it is difficult to determine effectiveness of the training programs and to gauge the degree to which the situation is improving.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Proposed New Recommendation 2b

Board training materials should be made public.

Hypothesis of problem

In keeping with openness and transparency as well as providing information for potential Board candidates, Board training materials should be made publicly available.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 3

Recommendation

The Board and Nominating Committee should, subject to the caveat that all deliberations and decisions about candidates must remain confidential, as soon as possible but no later than the Nominating Committee process commencing in late 2011 increase the transparency of the Nominating Committee's deliberations and decision making process by doing such things as clearly articulating the timeline and skill-set criteria at the earliest stage possible before the process starts and, once the process is complete, explain the choices made.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

- Workshops with the community
- Improved communications throughout the process with community (more email to lists, a blog) and candidates
- Monthly Report Cards

Implementability:

Implemented, however there was the observation that “transparency is time consuming for the volunteers. Writing to people, publishing, etc.”. Additional resources may be required to translate communications into languages other than English.

Effectiveness:

Effective, “improved confidence in the NomCom”, but the observation that “this is always room to improve transparency” and “incoming chairs should be reminded that they should seek to make improvements”.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

<http://nomcom.icann.org/nomcom-final-report-08oct12-en.pdf>

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete and ongoing.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

NomCom is objectively more transparent.

Proposed New Recommendation 3a

Translate NomCom materials to improve international understanding of NomCom processes and outcomes.

Hypothesis of problem

While NomCom transparency has improved with the publication of various documents, the lack of translations of those documents impedes global transparency.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 4

Recommendation

Building on the work of the Board Governance Committee, the Board should continue to enhance Board performance and work practices.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

From www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/atrt-recommendations-implementation-plans-08feb12-en.pdf:

- Complete Board Committee 2011, 2012 work plans incorporating Rec. 4 objectives (Background in Board Committee minutes)
- Complete Board appraisal
- Conduct two Board effectiveness Training sessions in 2012.
- Update information tools and work flow processes
- Implement upgrade of current Board information and communication tools
- Introduce version 1 of Board Procedure Manual, embed in SOPs

Implementability:

Implemented as opportunities are identified and “as feasible”.

Effectiveness:

Effective in the sense that the board has a “renewed focus on formalizing and documenting standard processes.” The board has adopted changes to their processes to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.

Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete and ongoing.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Board performance and work practices have been enhanced as demonstrated by publication and contents of the Board SOP.

Proposed New Recommendation 4a

Metrics should be established to measure Board performance and gauge changes in work practices.

Hypothesis of problem

Metrics are necessary in order to measure the extent to which the Board's performance and work practices change over time.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 5

Recommendation

The Board should expeditiously implement the compensation scheme for voting Directors as recommended by the Boston Consulting Group adjusted as necessary to address international payment issues, if any.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

From www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/atrt-recommendations-implementation-plans-08feb12-en.pdf:

- Complete research
- Conduct Public comment
- Board decision on compensation
- Documented/embedded in SOPs

Implementability:

Implemented.

Effectiveness:

No direct comment on effectiveness of Board compensation.

Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete for voting board members.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Based on the increased number of applicants in the 2012 NomCom process, it would appear the implementation of this recommendation has had some effect. Whether this materially improves the makeup of the Board remains to be seen.

Recommendation 6

Recommendation

The Board should clarify, as soon as possible but no later than June 2011 the distinction between issues that are properly subject to ICANN’s policy development processes and those matters that are properly within the executive functions performed by the ICANN staff and Board and, as soon as practicable, develop complementary mechanisms for consultation in appropriate circumstances with the relevant SOs and ACs on administrative and executive issues that will be addressed at Board level.

Summary of ICANN’s assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

From www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/atrt-recommendations-implementation-plans-08feb12-en.pdf:

- Conduct research
- Propose categorization/consultation procedures
- Finalize/post paper on consultations procedures & embed in SOPs

Implementability:

ICANN staff states “ICANN addressed all portions of this recommendation in implementation” however then explains:

“Because of the work undertaken for Recommendation 6, ICANN also published a paper on the Community Input and Advice Function, which has led to an ongoing dialogue in the community.”

and

“The follow-on work has reinitiated a challenging debate within the community regarding policy vs. implementation roles and how the community provides advice to the Board.”

Effectiveness:

In the sense that implementation of recommendation 6 has resulted in ongoing discussion (or “challenging debate”) within the community, it may be seen as being effective.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Incomplete, with work on-going.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

The timeframe in which recommendation was couched was optimistic. Given the ongoing debate between policy and implementation, it is unclear when the recommendation will be ultimately implementable.

DRAFT

Proposed New Recommendation 6a

Clear criteria should be established distinguishing between policy and implementation.

Hypothesis of problem

The distinction between policy and implementation is a source of ongoing controversy within the community. Resolving this controversy will improve ICANN's transparency and accountability.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 7.1

Recommendation

Commencing immediately, the Board should promptly publish all appropriate materials related to decision making processes – including preliminary announcements, briefing materials provided by staff and others, detailed Minutes, and where submitted, individual Directors’ statements relating to significant decisions. The redaction of materials should be kept to a minimum, limited to discussion of existing or threatened litigation, and staff issues such as appointments.

Summary of ICANN’s assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

From www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/atrt-recommendations-implementation-plans-08feb12-en.pdf:

- Post Board materials, Directors statements (has been in effect for approximately 2 years). The detail and extent of posted rationales for Board decisions also has been the subject of community comment and warrants review for additional improvements.
- Procedures documented, embedded in SOPs.

Implementability:

Implemented at some anticipated additional resource cost.

Effectiveness:

People have greater transparency into Board materials. Board materials are now posted along with approved minutes for each meeting of the Board and the New gTLD Program Committee as a standard operating procedure.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Additional information provided by the board has been effective in improving transparency and accountability of board actions.

Recommendation 7.2

Recommendation

Commencing immediately, the Board should publish “a thorough and reasoned explanation of decisions taken, the rationale thereof and the sources of data and information on which ICANN relied.” ICANN should also articulate that rationale for accepting or rejecting input received from public comments and the ICANN community, including Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

Summary of ICANN’s assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

From www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/atrt-recommendations-implementation-plans-08feb12-en.pdf:

- Regularly post rationales
- Finalize rationale template, document & embed procedures in SOPs

Implementability:

Implemented at some additional time/monetary/other resource cost.

Effectiveness:

People have greater transparency into the bases for Board decisions and sometimes resolution complexity has been reduced due to the additional information provided in the rationales.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Additional information provided by the board has been effective in improving transparency and accountability of board actions.

Proposed New Recommendation 7.2a

Decisions based on input received from SOs and ACs to the board prior to the implementation of ATRT1 recommendation 7.2 should be reviewed and in those cases where questions exist as to the status of implementation of the recommendation, rationales should be provided.

Hypothesis of problem

A number of decisions have been made in the past in which rationales were not fully provided. In some cases, recommendations were not followed or implemented ways that may not have conformed to the intent of the SO or AC that made the recommendation. The perceived lack of transparency and accountability relating to past decisions should be addressed.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 8

Recommendation

As soon as possible but no later than the start of the March 2011 ICANN meeting the Board should have a document produced and published that clearly defines the limited set of circumstances where materials may be redacted and that articulates the risks (if any) associated with publication of materials. These rules should be referred to by the Board, General Counsel and staff when assessing whether material should be redacted and cited when such a decision is taken.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

Conditions for redaction of posted Board briefing materials were published and embedded into the Board SOP.

Implementability:

Implemented.

Effectiveness:

Publishing the redaction conditions for Board briefing materials is meant to provide the community with a better understanding as to why certain information is held as confidential. Redaction conditions are adhered to with every posting of Board briefing materials as a standard operating procedure.

Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)

Complete.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness [Includes rationale for the recommendation.]

Redaction guidelines have been effective in providing information to the community as to why certain information in Board communications is kept confidential.

Recommendation 19

Recommendation

Within 21 days of taking a decision, the ICANN Board should publish its translations (including the required rationale as outlined in other ATRT recommendations) in the languages called for in the ICANN Translation Policy.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

ICANN has been publishing translated Board resolutions and minutes for approximately two years.

Implementability:

Implemented at some additional cost for the additional translations. In addition, the time needed to provide additional translation has jeopardized meeting the 21 day timeframe.

Effectiveness:

Publishing translations in all six United Nations languages provides greater access to the decisions and deliberations of the Board and positive feedback from community and staff has been received.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

Based on anecdotal comments, the translation of board materials into the 6 languages appears to have been effective with the caveat that on occasion, translations may have been lacking in clarity and/or accuracy.

Proposed New Recommendation 19a

An assessment of whether this is the appropriate material for translations and to what extent these translations are accessed would be useful in guiding potential, future improvements.

Hypothesis of problem

Providing translations can be resource intensive, both monetarily as well as in time. Assessing the extent to which each of the materials being translated are being reviewed and the benefits those translations are providing may allow ICANN's limited resources to be more efficiently utilized.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 20

Recommendation

The Board should ensure that all necessary inputs that have been received in policy-making processes are accounted for and included for consideration by the Board. To assist in this, the Board should as soon as possible adopt and make available to the community a mechanism such as a checklist or template to accompany documentation for Board decisions that certifies what inputs have been received and are included for consideration by the Board.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

- Develop, get input on checklist for use with SO/AC input
- Develop mechanism to ensure all inputs identified in checklists are provided to Board within decision-making process
- Finalize, document and embed in SOPs

Implementability:

Implemented with input from each of the affected Supporting Organizations regarding the sufficiency of the checklists for their policy-making processes.

Effectiveness:

The decisional checklists provide high-level summaries and additional transparency into inputs the Board considers when making policy-related decisions. These decisional checklists have been developed and are used when policy recommendations arise out of the Supporting Organizations and are now part of the standard materials required.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Completed.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

The checklists provide useful transparency into how Board decisions are made.

Proposed New Recommendation 20a

Expand the decisional checklists to include decisions arising from input from all ACs.

Hypothesis of problem

Input from ACs may be provided to the Board prior to decisions being made. Adding ACs to the checklists can improve Board accountability and transparency on those decisions.

Background research undertaken

[XXX]

Summary of ICANN input

[XXX]

Summary of community input

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN bylaws

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published policies

[XXX]

Relevant ICANN published procedures

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis

[XXX]

Draft recommendation including rationale

[XXX]

Public Comment on Draft Recommendations (to be completed later)

Final recommendation (to be completed later)

Recommendation 24

Recommendation

As soon as possible, but no later than the March 2011 ICANN meeting, the operations of the Office of Ombudsman and the relationship between the Office of the Ombudsman and the Board of Directors should be assessed and, to the extent they are not, should be brought into compliance with the relevant aspects of internationally recognized standards for: a) an Ombudsman function; and b) a Board supporting such a function under the Standards of Practice of the International Ombudsman Association.

Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation

Actions Taken:

- Ombudsman review and develop recommendation for BGC
- BGC review and approval of recommended tasks, if any
- Tasks completed, changes adopted and embedded in SOPs.

Implementability:

Implemented.

Effectiveness:

The Ombudsman has a more structured reporting relationship with the Board and a renewed focus on ensuring that he operates under the highest possible standards.

Summary of community input on implementation

[XXX]

Summary of other relevant research

[XXX]

ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation

Complete.

ATRT2 assessment of recommendation effectiveness

[XXX]