**Gomes Suggestions for GNSO Review Working Party Discussion 30 Dec 2015**

Note: Questions or suggestions below about possibly changing the categorization that staff calculated based on the survey input from Working Party members are not a result of miscalculations by staff. In fact, the categories chosen by staff seem very logical based on the survey results. But it seems worthwhile for the Working Party to discuss some of the categories chosen to explore whether, after more thorough and collective review, we may decide to leave the result as is or possibly change it based on our ‘collective wisdom’.

| **Rec.#** | **Recommendation** | **Topics for Discussion** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | That the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programmes with regard to GNSO Working Groups | * Should ease of implementation be ‘hard’ instead of ‘medium’?
* Should cost of implementation be ‘high’ instead of ‘medium’?
* Should the priority be ‘medium’ instead of ‘high’?
 |
| 5 | That, during each WG self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered. | The priority is presently shown as ‘low/med/high’. I think it would be most useful if we can decide on one priority level for each recommendation.* I suggest we choose ‘medium’ because there was an even split between low, medium & high.
 |
| 10 | That the GNSO Council develop criteria for WGs to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations. | This recommendation does not seem to me to be very difficult to implement. Nor does it seem to me that it would cost very much to do so. * Should ease of implementation be ‘easy’ instead of ‘high’?
* Should cost of implementation be ‘low’ instead of ‘medium’?

I am not sure why 45.5% of respondents chose ‘do not implement’ because this appears to me to be a useful recommendations that would be fairly easy to implement and not very costly. * I suggest we select a priority of ‘medium’.
 |
| 13 | That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in WG consensus-based decision making. | The priority is presently shown as ‘low/med’. * I suggest we choose ‘medium’ as priority. (Note the survey results were 40% low, 40% medium, 10% high & 10% do not implement.)
 |
| 19 | As strategic manager rather than a policy body the GNSO Council should continue to focus on ensuring that a WG has been properly constituted, has thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process. | It seems to me that this recommendation would be better color-coded as ‘orange’ instead of ‘green’ because it already happens to a certain degree. |
| 21 | That the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the policy-making process. | I support the decision to not implement this recommendation but I wonder what we should put in the priority column. Currently we show ‘do not implement’ as the priority. Should we put ‘N/A’ in the priority column or ‘low’? |
| 23 | In order to support ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, all Cs should have seats on the GNSO Council, allocated equally (as far as numerically practicable) by their SGs. | I support the decision to not implement this recommendation but I wonder what we should put in the priority column. Currently we show ‘do not implement’ as the priority. Should we put ‘N/A’ in the priority column or ‘low’? |
| 24 | That the GNSO Council and SGs and Cs adhere to the published process for applications for new Constituencies. That the ICANN Board in assessing an application satisfy itself that all parties have followed the published process, subject to which the default outcome is that a new Constituency is admitted. That all applications for new Constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making. | * Should ease of implementation be ‘hard’ instead of ‘medium’?

The priority is presently shown as ‘low/med/high’. * I suggest we choose ‘medium’ as priority. (Note the survey results were 30% low, 30% medium, 30% high & 10% do not implement.)
 |
| 28 | That section 6.1.2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures be revised, as shown in Appendix 6, to clarify that key clauses are mandatory rather than advisory, and to institute meaningful sanctions for non-compliance where appropriate. | Making the change in the Operating Procedures should be easy but instituting meaningful sanctions would likely be much more challenging. The ease of implementation is presently shown as ‘Easy/Medium’.* I suggest we show it as ‘Medium’.
 |
| 29 | That SOIs of GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all SGs and Cs include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN. | The priority is presently shown as ‘low/med’.* I suggest we choose ‘medium’ as priority. (Note the survey results were 36.4% low, 36.4% medium, 27.3% high & 0.0% do not implement.)
 |
| 31 | That the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in the GNSO Policy Development Process continue its two work streams as priority projects. As a part of its work it should consider how the GAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input. | The priority is presently shown as ‘low/med’.* I suggest we choose ‘medium’ as priority. (Note the survey results were 36.4% low, 36.4% medium, 27.3% high & 0.0% do not implement.)
 |
| 32 | That ICANN define “cultural diversity” (possibly by using birth language); and regularly publish this along with geographic, gender and age group metrics, at least for the GNSO Council, SGs, Cs and WGs. | I support the decision to not implement this recommendation but I wonder what we should put in the priority column. Currently we show ‘low’ as the priority. I am okay if we leave it that way or we could put ‘N/A’ in the priority column. I suggest we be consistent with what we put for recommendations 21 & 23. |
| 33 | That SGs, Cs and the Nominating Committee, in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council, should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants, as defined in ICANN Core Value 4. | It seems to me that this recommendation would be better color-coded as ‘orange’ instead of ‘green’ because it already happens to some degree.The ease of implementation is presently shown as ‘Easy/Hard’.* I suggest we show it as ‘Medium’. (Note the survey results were 45.5% low, 45.5% medium, 9.1% high & 0.0% do not implement.)
 |
| 35 | That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole, to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non- English speakers and those with limited command of English. | For priority we now show ‘do not implement’ because 40% chose that option compared to 30% low, 10% medium and 20% high. I am pretty sure that we do not want to say ‘do not implement’; that would mean we would need to color-code this as red.* I suggest we show this as a ‘medium’ priority.
 |
| 36 | That, when approving the formation of a PDP WG, the GNSO Council require that its membership represent as far as reasonably practicable the geographic, cultural and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole. Additionally, that when approving GNSO Policy, the ICANN Board explicitly satisfy itself that the GNSO Council undertook these actions when approving the formation of a PDP WG. | For priority we now show ‘do not implement’ because 45.5% chose that option compared to 18.2% low, 36.4% medium and 20% high. I am pretty sure that we do not want to say ‘do not implement’; that would mean we would need to color-code this as red.* I suggest we show this as a ‘medium’ priority.
 |