## Public Comment on Draft Recommendations

In general there was strong support throughout the community for much of this recommendation

* There was some concern with the term “facilitators”, and poor experiences with facilitators in other venues. Other methodologies may be of benefit.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Strong support for wider and more balanced participation in the GNSO policy development processes.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* There was support in At-Large, NCSG and SSAC for generalizing the recommendation on support for those who do not have industry financial backing. The rationale is that many segments of the ICANN community have business activities in the ICANN-related ecosystem, and it is thus to their business and financial advantage to have employees and associates participate in ICANN activities. Those with a strong interest in ICANN, but who lack business-related funding opportunities are at a distinct disadvantage, and this has the potential to negatively impact the ICANN multi-equal stakeholder model. ICANN currently funds travel costs for many (but not all) AC and SO members, for selected At-Large RALO leaders, and more recently, for GNSO Constituency and Stakeholder Group leaders.[[3]](#footnote-3)
* Poor participation in policy development processes is not just the lack of participation noted by the independent expert report, but a lack of participation from within the communities that are well represented within ICANN and the GNSO. PDPs rely far too much on a very small and possibly shrinking group of volunteers.[[4]](#footnote-4)
* Inter-sessional face-to-face meeting may be needed at times, but ICANN should also explore other alternatives such as using regional hubs and engagement center facilities.[[5]](#footnote-5)
* A target of “equitable” participation may not be possible for a number of reasons. A better target may be an “opportunity for equitable participation”.[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Allowing comments to critique staff summaries is reasonable but should not increase the overall process time.[[7]](#footnote-7)
* The recommendation related to the Board creating or altering policy should not presume that such action is acceptable or desirable.[[8]](#footnote-8)
* Focus should be on using volunteer time effectively.[[9]](#footnote-9)
1. ATRT meeting with the GNSO Council in Buenos Aires, GNSO comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ATRT meetings with the GNSO Council and ALAC, GNSO, ALAC and Egyptian comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ATRT meetings with the ALAC, NCSG and SSAC in Buenos Aires, ALAC comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. ATRT meetings with the GNSO Council and ALAC, GNSO and ALAC comment submission, Discussions with Michael O’Connor [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. GNSO comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Comment submission from Becky Burr, Paul Diaz and Chuck Gomes. Registry Stakeholder Group comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Comment submission from Becky Burr, Paul Diaz and Chuck Gomes. Registry Stakeholder Group comment submission. GNSO comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Comment submission from Becky Burr, Paul Diaz and Chuck Gomes. Registry Stakeholder Group comment submission. GNSO comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. GNSO comment submission [↑](#footnote-ref-9)