

Public Comment Summary Report

Proposed Revisions to Community Anti-Harassment Policy

Open for Submissions Date:

Monday, 04 November 2024

Closed for Submissions Date:

Friday, 20 December 2024

Summary Report Due Date:

Monday, 04 February 2025 (extended from 17 January 2025)

Category: Governance

Requester: ICANN Board

ICANN org Contact(s): ergys.ramaj@icann.org

Open Proceeding Link: <https://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/proposed-revisions-to-community-anti-harassment-policy-04-11-2024>

Outcome:

The Public Comment proceeding on the proposed revisions to the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy and Terms of Participation and Complaint Procedure (Policy) garnered significant and diverse input from the community, with thirteen detailed submissions from organizations, governments, companies, and individuals. The feedback emphasized the importance of inclusivity, clarity, and due process within the Policy framework. As a direct result of the comments, the ICANN Board will consider refinements, including enhancing confidentiality provisions, clarifying definitions and procedures, and addressing the applicability of the Policy to staff. Additionally, suggestions regarding the Policy's name, expanded examples of harassment, and the Ombuds' role will be evaluated to ensure the Policy remains inclusive and robust.

This proceeding has advanced ICANN's ongoing efforts to foster a safe, welcoming, and respectful community environment. The input underscored the community's commitment to strengthening this vital Policy and highlighted opportunities to align it more closely with global best practices. ICANN deeply values the thoughtful and constructive feedback provided through this Public Comment process, as it underscores the importance of multistakeholder participation in shaping policies that affect all community members. The next steps will involve careful evaluation of the proposed changes to ensure the Policy reflects the shared values and priorities of the ICANN community.

Section 1: What We Received Input On

The ICANN Board Anti-Harassment Working Group sought community feedback on proposed revisions to the [ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy](#) (Policy). The Policy was updated to include a definition of harassment, additional examples of harassment, and expanded and strengthened reporting and complaint procedures. It offers clarity around the role of the Ombuds, including details regarding updates throughout the evaluation process, complaints received from ICANN staff, referrals to the Board, and the resolution process. Those interested also had the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the name of the Policy.

Community input was encouraged on any or all the four elements: (I) the name of the Policy, (II) the Policy and terms of participation, (III) the definition of harassment and examples provided, and/or (IV) the reporting and complaint procedure.

Section 2: Submissions

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Business Constituency	Marie Pattullo, Tim Smith, and Mason Cole	BC
Noncommercial Stakeholder Group	Farzaneh Badiei	NCSG
Registrar Stakeholder Group	Owen Smigelski	RrSG
Registries Stakeholder Group	RySG	RySG
At-Large Advisory Committee	Avri Doria, Claire Craig, Judith Hellerstein, and Eunice Alejandra Pérez	ALAC
Australian Government (Governmental Advisory Committee member)	Bree Alexander	BA
CleanDNS	Alan Woods	AW
Tucows	Sarah Wyld	SW

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Alfredo Calderon-Serrano		ACS
Kennedy Wabuge	ICANN Fellowship Alumni, Data Analyst-Airtel	KW
Samwel Kariuki		SK
Felix Opilli	African Regional At-Large Organization	FO
John Laprise		JL

Section 3: Summary of Submissions

This Public Comment proceeding received thirteen submissions, including five from ICANN community groups, one from a government (GAC representative), two from companies, and five from individuals.

Respondents focused on the following topics, which are analyzed further in the subsequent section:

- I. Policy Name
- II. Policy and Terms of Participation
- III. Definition of Harassment and Examples
- IV. Reporting and Complaint Procedure
 - a. Overall Suggestions
 - i. Confidentiality and Anonymity
 - ii. Timing
 - iii. Language
 - iv. Data and Reporting
 - v. Periodic Reviews
 - b. Suggestions Relating to ICANN Organization/Staff
 - c. Ombuds-Related Suggestions
 - i. Jurisdiction
 - ii. Alternative Options to the Ombuds
 - iii. Independence of the Ombuds
 - d. Process-Related Suggestions
 - i. Third Parties
 - ii. Corroboration
 - iii. Resolution and Appeals
 - iv. Retaliation
 - e. Relationship to Other ICANN Policies
 - f. Other Suggestions

Section 4: Analysis of Submissions

Respondents praised the updated Policy for its thoroughness (FO), inclusivity, flexibility, and global applicability (ACS), noting its emphasis in addressing diverse cultural contexts (ALAC) and fostering a safe and welcoming environment (SW). They commended its strong emphasis on dignity and mutual respect, as well as the expanded definition of harassment, which includes a wide range of inappropriate behaviors (ALAC). Respondents valued the Policy's harm-based approach to ensure that harmful behaviors are addressed regardless of the perpetrator's intent (ALAC, NCSG). Respondents praised the detailed examples provided (NCSG, AW), and there is support for the overall goals of the Policy (RrSG) as well as support for everyone feeling protected, welcome, and safe (BC).

There were a range of suggestions provided along all categories, with some groups, such as the BC, expressing significant concerns.¹

I. Policy Name

Suggestions for the Policy's title varied, with some advocating for the proposal of a more inviting and aspirational name, such as the "ICANN Community Dignity and Respect Policy," to emphasize respect, inclusivity, and positive collaboration and to actively promote positive values (FO, ACS, ALAC). One noted that this would align with initiatives like the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers' "Respectful Conduct Policy" or the U.N.'s "Respect@Work" and emphasize a proactive approach to inclusivity and mutual respect (FO).

Some proposed broader terms like the "ICANN Community Respect and Inclusion Policy" (KW), while others supported combining positive narratives with practical terms, recommending "ICANN Community Respect Policy with Harassment Support and Complaint Procedure" (BA).

The RrSG and RySG expressed relative neutrality, with the RySG finding both the current and proposed names adequate and the RrSG noting that the proposed title is adequate albeit long.

However, the BC cautioned against using subjective terms like "dignity," arguing it could lead to confusion in a multilingual environment (as the "term could be linked to an individual's philosophical, political, cultural or religious beliefs" and that including "dignity" in the name "may create a false expectation that one's own individual sense of "dignity" is paramount, and others must act in accordance with those same beliefs"). They note, "If this policy is intended to lay out our accepted definition of harassment, and the procedural steps for how it is to be addressed, we suggest that 'ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy and Complaint Procedure' is far clearer." (BC)

II. Policy and Terms of Participation

The BC suggested that the Policy emphasize participants' rights to a respectful environment and their responsibility to treat others with dignity, linking this to ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior to ensure consistency without duplication (BC). Other suggestions for enhancing the Policy included adding guidelines on recognizing unconscious biases to foster cross-cultural awareness and inclusivity, aligning with modern standards of conduct (FO). It was also noted that other organizations include aspects of cultural sensitivity in their codes of conduct and incorporate bias-awareness training in their participation guidelines (FO). Respondents also recommended adding

¹ The BC notes that "rumor and unfounded allegations can have extremely serious effects on any individual's ability to perform their job and maintain their professional reputation" and that the Policy must be "comprehensible and targeted in scope at actual harassment, not to general disagreements, perceived slights or individual (subjective) feelings being offended; based on due process, including evidence, corroboration, the right to a defense, the right to appeal and confidentiality; and recognize the possibility that the policy itself may be abused by individuals making unfounded allegations."

text about the Policy’s purpose by explicitly noting that it is to provide guidance on support options and how to seek help (BA), as well as including mention of promoting help-seeking behaviors (BA).

III. Definition of Harassment and Examples

Respondents provided diverse feedback on the definition of harassment, focusing on clarity, inclusivity, and practicality. Suggestions included adding examples specific to digital interactions, such as repeated online contact or excessive or unwarranted messages or calls, to address subtler forms of harassment in virtual spaces (FO).

Some noted that the definition is limited by the terms “hostile or intimidating” and could be expanded to account for non-hostile yet inappropriate or problematic behaviors, like discriminatory jokes presented in a cordial manner (SW) or racially based jokes that are made in a friendly or non-intimidating way (RrSG).

Some noted that the examples are quite specific and relate mostly to sexual harassment or harassment based on Specific Characteristics and recommended consulting human rights organizations for broader definitions and examples that are not physical in nature (RrSG, RySG).

Additional clarity on terms would also be welcomed. For example, the NCSG suggested clarity around the definition of “offensive language,” and BA proposed definitions of “sexual harassment” and “active bystander” as well as examples of active bystander examples to encourage proactive community support.

However, some respondents cautioned against overly detailed examples, arguing they could narrow the definition (focusing on sexual behavior rather than combating other psychological or physical harassment) or create unintended perceptions of ICANN’s environment for new community members reading the Policy (BC). The BC proposed shortening the list of examples and elaborating on the definition of harassment instead.

The BC also presented concern regarding II.2, disagreeing that harassment could be established on the basis of one incident, noting that cultural differences could account for a one-off unintended offense, and emphasizing the need for checks, balances, and due process.

IV. Reporting and Complaint Procedure

Many suggestions were made to enhance this section of the Policy, and recommendations are grouped by theme below.

OVERALL SUGGESTIONS

Confidentiality and Anonymity

Respondents emphasized the need to strengthen confidentiality provisions in the Policy, particularly by clarifying how anonymity is maintained to protect complainants from potential retaliation. Suggestions included adopting practices like those of the World Bank, which separates and manages confidential records to safeguard identities (FO). Multiple concerns were raised about vague language in III.B.11, such as the phrase about ensuring confidentiality “to the extent feasible,” which respondents recommended clarifying and strengthening (RrSG, BA, BC).

Suggestions were also made to add clarity to cases of third-party reporting to ensure confidentiality extends to all affected individuals (RrSG) and to ensure that if progression of a matter would require disclosure, that it be subject to the consent of all parties (BA) and that the complainant’s name would only be made public with express consent (BC). The BC also noted that confidentiality must extend to witnesses, if any, who should be advised not to discuss the matter with third parties (III.B.4).

ALAC suggested that more emphasis needs to be placed on the balance between preserving confidentiality and the need to report on complaints and resolutions for both transparency purposes and for actionable data to keep improving the Policy.

Timing

Respondents noted that the Policy lacks specific timeframes for submitting and resolving complaints, which could lead to delays or uncertainty (NCSG, BA, BC). Recommendations included defining clear deadlines and timeframes (NCSG, BA), conducting evaluations efficiently (BC), and expanding on the timing of the updates to enhance transparency and set clear expectations (FO).

Language

The GAC’s Australian government representative suggests consistent and less legalistic language such as “affected individual” and “alleged offender” in line with the United to Respect Toolkit (BA). Multiple respondents noted that language varies throughout (complainant, respondent, and occasionally victim) (BA, BC). In section A, there is a suggestion to adopt more victim-centered language by emphasizing that it can be challenging to speak up, noting that any affected individual is not alone (BA).

Data and Reporting

The BC, NSCG, and the GAC’s Australian government representative all emphasized the importance of data to evaluate the current Policy’s effectiveness and impact. Recommendations included gathering data to understand whether community members feel comfortable reporting claims (BC) and collecting and analyzing data on complaints and conducting community surveys within six months to a year to assess the Policy’s impact on open discourse (NCSG). This data-driven approach would help identify areas for improvement and guide updates to ensure the Policy remains effective and responsive to community needs (BA). [See Periodic Reviews below.]

Respondents highlighted the importance of balancing confidentiality with transparency. They suggested that while protecting the privacy of complainants and respondents is crucial, the Ombuds office should provide data on complaints and resolutions to enhance community awareness (ACS, NCSG).

In section III.B.5, the BC sought clarity on the manner in which the Ombuds will communicate the results of the investigation and on whether there would be a public notice.

Periodic Reviews

In line with the suggestions for additional data [see above], multiple respondents strongly supported incorporating periodic reviews into the Policy to ensure its ongoing relevance and adaptability. Regular evaluations would allow the Policy to reflect new insights, best practices, and address unforeseen challenges, reinforcing its role as a dynamic framework that evolves with the community's needs (FO). Specific suggestions included conducting reviews every two years (RrSG) or starting regular evaluations no earlier than one year after the Policy's effective date (RySG). This commitment to continuous improvement was seen as essential for maintaining trust and fostering a safe, inclusive, and adaptable environment.

SUGGESTIONS RELATING TO ICANN ORG/STAFF

Multiple respondents expressed significant concerns about the exclusion of ICANN staff from directly filing complaints under the Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Many argued that the Policy should apply to staff (ALAC) and that staff deserve equal protection and access to the Ombuds' services (NCSG, SW, ALAC), which may be perceived as more independent than internal complaint mechanisms (NCSG). It was also noted that excluding staff undermines the Policy's integrity, especially since ICANN staff engage frequently with community members, have high visibility at events, and may face or witness harassment themselves (AW).

It was noted that without any view into the internal policy referenced, it is not possible to determine whether this is appropriate recourse for staff (RrSG); likewise, it was recommended that the internal complaint process be examined to ensure that the community and internal processes complement each other rather than conflict, ensuring consistency and fairness (BC). Others noted that while it is appropriate to have an internal process for harassment between staff members, staff must also be protected by the Community Anti-Harassment Policy (rather than be given less protection and recourse than community members) (SW, AW) and be able to report harassment on behalf of others (AW).

Specific concerns were raised about Section III.B.3, with calls for its removal to allow staff to independently file complaints without requiring ICANN org's validation (AW, SW).

Additionally, respondents highlighted the need for clarity regarding cases involving staff behavior toward community members or between staff members but witnessed by a community member, emphasizing the importance of equal accountability and protections across all participants (BC). These changes were seen as necessary to uphold fairness and inclusivity in the Policy.

It was noted that while the Bylaws (Article 5) addresses exclusions relating to the Ombuds, this does not “justify or ground the exclusion of ICANN staff complaints against other community members” (AW).

OMBUDS-RELATED SUGGESTIONS

Jurisdiction

The RrSG notes that it would help to clarify what is within the Ombuds’ jurisdiction, as their purview remains somewhat unclear (III.B.2); likewise, the NCSG notes that ICANN needs a nuanced process for establishing jurisdiction, as the Ombuds Office “sometimes declines to process complaints, citing a lack of jurisdiction” yet “given ICANN’s critical role in Internet governance, volunteers may commit harassment outside of ICANN, yet the dispute originates from ICANN’s forums.”

Concerns were raised about additional support for complainants whose issues fall outside the Ombuds’ jurisdiction or cannot be resolved adequately, suggesting additional resources and access to mental health resources or law enforcement when necessary (RySG). The RrSG and RySG emphasized the need to clarify that the Ombuds’ role is part of ICANN’s internal policy and is not the sole avenue for addressing harassment; there is a need to clarify that complainants retain the right to report issues to external authorities when necessary (RrSG, RySG). The BC also noted that behaviors violating criminal laws should be referred to law enforcement, as such matters fall outside the Ombuds’ mandate and that the Policy should outline clear procedures for when and how such referrals should occur by the Ombuds in cases of criminal liability (BC).

Alternative Options to the Ombuds

The RySG expressed concern that the complaint procedure is lacking in specificity and fails to consider how ICANN might offer support to victims of harassment outside the formal Ombuds process (RySG).

The Australian government’s GAC representative also noted that the Policy focuses on the Ombuds and that multiple reporting channels should be made available in line with best practice, including anonymous reporting and the option for affected individuals to nominate support people from the community or organization (BA). This would be in line with a victim-centered approach, to prioritize the victim’s safety, well-being, and autonomy while avoiding re-traumatization (BA).

The BC suggests that the Ombuds' role is to inquire into complaints and to seek reconciliation and notes that "[g]iven the severe damage to personal reputation that may occur from an accusation of (inter alia) racial or sexual harassment that may ultimately be found without merit, there must be a fully balanced due process, including confidentiality and the rights of defense and appeal." They disagree with having the Ombuds act as "investigator, judge and jury, without the benefit of evidence or corroboration" and reiterate their past suggestion for an alternative process, wherein the Ombuds gathers facts and interacts with the involved parties and submits their report to a recognized, contracted expert in addressing harassment in international organizations, who would should determine whether a violation has occurred and may recommend to the Ombudsperson any appropriate action to take.

Independence of the Ombuds

ALAC notes that many Work Stream 2 recommendations for improving the ICANN Office of the Ombudsman remain incomplete in their implementation. It therefore questions how the community can be assured of the Ombuds' independence ("in addressing a potential conflict of interest in her/his duties to protect a victim and a duty to protect ICANN, the organization") until the Bylaws are updated appropriately (ALAC).

Likewise, the NCSG notes a concern about a lack of independence measures and remarks that the Policy does not establish a governance structure to ensure the Ombuds Office's independence.

PROCESS-RELATED SUGGESTIONS

Third Parties

Respondents highlighted confusion and concerns regarding III.B.5 of the complaints procedure, which states that regular updates would be provided to third parties and the respondent but not to the victim. The RrSG, BC, and Tucows questioned the meaning of a complaint being "open to third parties," seeking clarity on which third parties this would include and whether this refers to third parties "signing on" to a complaint or raising issues they have observed (BC, SW, RrSG). Groups also critiqued the exclusion of the victim from receiving updates, emphasizing that it undermines transparency and could violate the complainant's rights to information and privacy (RrSG, BC). Additionally, the use of the term "victim" was challenged as confusing and/or inappropriate at this stage, with suggestions to consistently use "complainant" (SW), particularly until allegations are proven (BC). Stakeholders called for revisions to address the role of third parties (SW) and the ambiguities around information provided to better protect the rights of all parties involved.

Corroboration

Clarity was requested on how the Policy handles cases involving third-party reports or misinterpreted situations, where an "innocent exchange" may be overheard/seen and

misconstrued, with recommendations to prioritize evidence and factual verification over subjective beliefs (BC).

The BC raised concerns about the lack of corroboration requirements in the Ombuds' decision-making process, questioning how the Ombuds could consider the "credibility" of every community members, as stated in III.B.5, and noting that this "suggests that only those known personally to the Ombuds, and/or who are well-known across the community [...] could be so assessed" and questioning how new or quieter members could be assessed. They also emphasized the need for clarity on whether witnesses could be called for defense purposes (BC).

Regarding factors for determining remedial action (III.B.7), the BC sought clarification on the handling of prior complaints by the complainant or against the respondent. Questions included whether patterns of spurious complaints would be considered and how dismissed or irrelevant prior complaints would be treated to prevent misuse of past allegations. The emphasis on evidence quality was linked back to concerns about corroboration and fairness in witness credibility assessments (BC).

Resolution and Appeals

Multiple groups identified gaps in the Ombuds' complaints procedure, including the absence of an appeals process for complainants, with the RySG noting that respondents may believe the Ombuds mishandled their complaint or acted contrary to Policy and the BC noting that determinations could significantly impact professional reputations and should have the right to appeal or defense. The RySG also noted the lack of clarity regarding the victim's role in determining the adequacy of resolutions, particularly in informal processes (III.B.6) (RySG) and recommended that clarity on these points be included either within the Policy or in an accompanying document.

Further, the lack of a clear right to defense or appeal for respondents was criticized, especially when the Ombuds' determinations could significantly impact professional reputations. Stakeholders called for guarantees of confidentiality, respondent involvement, and procedural fairness in cases referred to the ICANN Board for action (BC).

ALAC suggests that "more thought should be placed into fixing the situation instead of asserting power, including considering more amenable solutions and better options to be considered by ICANN" and that "efforts should be made to try and find more creative solutions to this issue than just banishment."

NCSG notes that "[w]hile offering a second chance to volunteers might be appropriate, repeated harassing behavior should result in expulsion rather than allowing resignation. ICANN should clearly define when it will expel volunteers and when it will not."

There is a suggestion with regard to III.B.9-10 that the Ombuds should be the final decisionmaker and that if a respondent does not comply with a decision, the Board

should enforce the Ombuds' decision rather than have the Ombuds "refer" the matter to the Board, with the potential for the Board to "end-run" the Ombuds' decisions (SW). It is noted that further clarity is needed on options available to complainants and respondents for situations where they believe the Policy did not sufficiently address the issue or where they believe the Ombuds did not treat them properly or fairly (SW).

With reference to the Ombuds referring the matter to the Board, the BC questions whether the respondent will be consulted and involved, whether "this is a decision which will affect their professional credibility and future in which they are denied any form of defense or appeal," and whether there is a "specification that any such discussions must be held in camera and confidentiality of both parties guaranteed."

An individual contribution (JL) was made outlining concerns with existing culture at ICANN, sharing personal experiences and proposing solutions involving public acknowledgement of the situation.

Retaliation

ALAC and an individual (ACS) raised concerns about addressing power dynamics in the reporting and resolution processes. ALAC emphasized the need for safeguards to protect victims from harm or retaliation, particularly in cases involving accused individuals in more senior positions, while also ensuring protections for those falsely accused.

The BC notes that the section on retaliation is confusing and should apply equally to both parties. They note that "retaliation" is undefined, and that it is unclear how, or by whom, this could be "strictly forbidden" and they propose clearer language.² Likewise, the BC notes that the Policy does not provide for a process where the complaint is not upheld and suggests that a record should be kept and both the complainant and any witnesses "clearly directed not to breach the privacy of the innocent respondent nor to engage in any 'retaliation'" (BC).

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ICANN POLICIES

The BC notes that the Community Anti-Harassment Policy must not overlap with, or contradict, the Expected Standards of Behavior and that the latter should govern behavior while the former should govern procedure (BC).

² Suggested revision: Refrain from retaliation and act in good faith. Retaliation is strictly forbidden against any person reporting conduct that they believe in good faith to be contrary to this Policy and any other person that participates in good faith in the related investigation. While the Ombuds' investigation is ongoing and the allegations unproven, retaliation against the respondent is also forbidden. Should the Ombuds conclude that the alleged conduct did occur, appropriate remedial action shall be taken as outlined below. Further, this Policy is not itself to be used for the purposes of retaliation. Persons who abuse this Policy by submitting vexatious and/or spurious complaints or reports shall be dealt with in an appropriate fashion with reference both to this Policy and the Expected Standards of Behavior. (BC)

The RySG asks for clarification on how the applicability of the Community Anti-Harassment Policy is impacted by each participant's waiver of liability upon registration for an ICANN meeting.³ The group requests that ICANN update the waiver language in order to make it clear that attendees are not accepting sole responsibility for damages caused by any person violating the Community Anti-Harassment Policy (RySG).

OTHER SUGGESTIONS

Multiple respondents called for training and awareness sessions to ensure participants are continuously educated about acceptable conduct and complaint procedures (SK). It was suggested that anti-harassment and bystander action training (available to all participants in ICANN community activities and promoted by all SOs/ACs) would help to reinforce a positive culture (BA).

A question was posed about how the Policy might influence the inclusivity and participation of underrepresented groups within ICANN's community (ACS).

It was suggested that there is an opportunity for positive leadership from the Board that may include having one or more named senior-level champion(s) for this work and/or an annual Board discussion on harassment and how it is being addressed (BA).

A flow chart to clearly outline the steps in the investigation process was suggested (BA).

It was suggested to add direct references to harassment and sexual harassment with examples on the ICANN Ombuds page under 'Examples of Ways the Ombuds may help' (BA).

Additionally, line edits were provided, such as changing Zoom to "video conferencing software" (RrSG) and adding "clarification of facts" to "obtain a response" (BC).

Section 5: Next Steps

All of the valuable input received during the Public Comment proceeding on the proposed revisions to the current Policy will be carefully reviewed and considered. This will involve a thorough review of the feedback to identify actionable recommendations, including potential refinements to various provisions, as well as clarifications of definitions, examples, and complaint procedures. The suggestions to enhance the

³ Upon registering for an ICANN event, each in-person participant must agree to the "Acknowledgment and In-Person Event Travel Waiver". That waiver states in Section E. Liability Waiver and Release, "In consideration for permission to attend the Event, I voluntarily agree to assume **all** of the risks associated with my participation in the Event, and **accept sole responsibility** for any injury, illness, damage, loss, claim, liability, or expense, of any kind, that I may experience or incur in connection with participation in the Event." It also states, "This Liability Waiver and Release shall not apply if any expense, loss, damage, personal injury, including loss of life, illness, disability, property damage or property theft or actions of any kind is a result of ICANN and/or gross negligence or willful misconduct." "I further agree to indemnify and hold ICANN and its affiliate harmless from any and against all claims, actions, suits, loss, procedures, costs, expenses, damages and liabilities, costs, including court costs and attorneys' fees, arising out of my onsite participation in the ICANN Event." (emphasis added) (RySG)

Policy's inclusivity, strengthen its alignment with global best practices, and address the community's priorities will also be closely considered.

After all recommendations have been taken into consideration, an updated Policy will be created that will reflect a balanced, thoughtful approach to all of the received comments. Further, the Board recognizes that there are still some outstanding Work Stream 2 recommendations relating to the Ombuds that might also be relevant to a revised Policy and are committed to ensuring such relevant recommendations are also considered in a further revised version. Any further revisions to the Policy will be communicated transparently to the community. ICANN remains committed to fostering a safe, respectful, and inclusive environment and will continue engaging the community to ensure this Policy meets the needs of all stakeholders.