RECOMMENDATIONS 20 & 21: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND INDUSTRY TRENDS	
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	
Part One – Which ICANN Objective does this meet	
Promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest. Also, evolve policy development and governance processes, structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive. See Strategic Plan main web page at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/strategic-engagement-2013-10-10-en.	
Alignment with Strategic Objectives	
Goal	- Shared understanding by Board, staff and stakeholders of the allocation of responsibilities for design, development and implementation of policy and operational processes. - Shared understanding of the roles, responsibilities and accountability of the Board, staff and stakeholders. - Board, staff, and stakeholders use best practices and exercises appropriate behavioral norms.
Project/Recommendation	Recommendation 20: That the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development. Recommendation 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.

SCOPE DESCRIPTION
Scope Statement
Recommendation 20:   1. The GNSO Review Working Group to review if/how the GNSO Council has done this to date, if at all.   2. Based on the outcome of the review, the GNSO Review Working Group to work with staff to develop a light-weight process for the GNSO Council to participate in the development of ICANN's Strategic Objectives and guidance for planning future policy development that aligns the Strategic Objectives with GNSO resources.   Recommendation 21:   1. Staff to work with the GNSO to institute methods of information sharing of highly relevant research related to gTLDs to help the GNSO community members increase their knowledge base and ability to analyze potential impact. These could, for example, include regular staff briefings, implementing the recommendations of the DMPM Working Group, and CCT-RT data.   2. The GNSO Review Working Group to develop a timeline for reporting on a recurring basis. This timeline could include regular reporting/updating to the GNSO Council at every ICANN meeting as a status report to the GNSO, and as an item on the GNSO Council meeting agenda.
Out of Scope
The above scope is sufficiently clear.

Assumptions
None.

Deliverables
None.

OPTION ANALYSIS

None were considered or were necessary to be considered.

SOLUTION

Recommendation 20: The GNSO Council does not currently have a formal mechanism to review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development. There is, however, a vehicle that could be adapted for this purpose.

The GNSO Review Working Group discussed several options for how the GNSO Council could review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives. One option that was discussed was to expand the charter of the GNSO Council Standing Committee on ICANN's Budget and Operations (SCBO), that was chartered in December 2017 to "coordinate and facilitate dialogue to fully understand ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes, in particular in preparation for the annual budgetary comments cycle as it relates to the GNSO Council's remit." The GNSO Review Working Group noted that the Standing Committee cannot initiate any action or decision on its own, unless specifically instructed by the GNSO Council – any and all recommendations are submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration. As currently chartered, the Standing Committee provides a mechanism for the GNSO Council to provide input on ICANN's annual budget from the Council's perspective as manager of the GNSO's policy development process and a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community. While it is still in an early stage, the SCBO could potentially be the structure through which the GNSO Council develops input on ICANN's Strategic Plan, once Strategic Planning for the next cycle begins. The scope of the SCBO could be expanded, so that it is also responsible for annually reviewing ICANN's Strategic Objectives and ensuring that the planning of future GNSO activities is in alignment with these Strategic Objectives. If this additional responsibility was to be added to the Standing Committee's charter, the analysis of Strategic Objectives would complement existing responsibilities related to analyzing the annual budget. However, several Working Group members disagreed with this approach to expand the SCBO's charter, and preferred not to recommend a single option to the GNSO Council.

Instead, the GNSO Review Working Group noted that there are several options for the GNSO Council to fulfill this recommendation to review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives. Some members of the Working Group pointed to the Strategic Planning Session that was held in Los Angeles in January 2018 as an example of a way the Council could annually address ICANN's Strategic Objectives. Alternatively, a strategy session could be planned at an ICANN meeting. Another option could be for the Council to task an existing group (such as the SCBO) or create a stand-alone Work Team to develop recommendations for consideration by the Council. Other options include tasking staff with developing recommendations that then could be addressed by the Council and ICANN's Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives (MSSI) team. After extensive discussion the GNSO Review Working Group decided that it would recommend that the decision concerning the process to implement this recommendation should be left to the GNSO Council.

Recommendation 21: There are a number of initiatives underway within the ICANN organization to collect data and analyze trends in gTLDs to support decision-making by the ICANN organization and the ICANN community, including the GNSO. This data can be leveraged by Policy Development Process Working Groups and the GNSO Council to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the

Deleted: T

Deleted: ¶
¶

Deleted: ¶
¶

Deleted: Standing Committee

policy-making process.

The gTLD Marketplace Health Index is an ongoing project producing statistics and examining trends related to the health and diversity of the generic top-level domain (gTLD) marketplace. ICANN will continue to publish these statistics semi-annually to track progress against its goal for the domain name marketplace to be robust, stable and trusted. The project has created a set of beta metrics that will be used as a basis for further development of metrics in the future. The December 2017 Beta Report (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gtld-marketplace-health-index-beta-14dec17-en.pdf) features 26 beta metrics and 267 individual data points under three goals: Robust Competition; Marketplace Stability; and Trust. The current timeline for planned work on this project is available under section 2.3 of the Accountability Indicators webpage (https://www.icann.org/accountability-indicators).

ICANN's Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) project (https://www.icann.org/octo-ssr/daar) is a system for studying and reporting on domain name registration and security threat (domain abuse) behavior across top-level domain (TLD) registries and registrars. The overarching purpose of DAAR is to report security threat activity to the ICANN community, which can then use the data to facilitate informed policy decisions. The data collected by the DAAR system can serve as a platform for studying or reporting daily or historical registration or abuse activity. ICANN Office of the CTO (OCTO) will be working with the ICANN community to determine the best way to share the statistics and analyses derived from data that DAAR collects.

The Identifier Technologies Health Indicators (https://www.icann.org/ithi) is a project organized by the ICANN Office of the CTO (OCTO) to develop metrics to quantify and measure the state of the unique Internet identifiers that ICANN helps coordinate. The primary targets of this work are the operational communities – Domain Names, Numbering Resources, and Protocol Parameters. Specific metrics are still being developed, but this initiative will likely produce data that can inform GNSO activities.

ICANN has recently collected a significant amount of data and commissioned additional studies to support the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT) Review. Studies include Phase I and Phase II Assessments of the Competitive Effects Associated with the New gTLD Program, Wave 1 and Wave 2 Global Consumer Research Studies, Wave 1 and Wave 2 Global Registrant Surveys, an Application Process Survey, and the AMGlobal Report "New gTLDs and the Global South: Understanding Limited Global South Demand in the Most Recent New gTLD Round and Options Going Forward." A full list of studies, research, and material supporting the CCT-RT's work is available at https://community.icann.org/x/0o5YAw. In addition, the ICANN community recommended a list of metrics and definitions that would inform this review and the ICANN board approved these metrics. ICANN staff is responsible for collecting data necessary to produce these metrics, which will be part of the recurring CCT Review. A full list of the metrics is available at https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics. Many of these data sources and research efforts are relevant to the GNSO could inform policy work.

Currently the GNSO Council requests and receives updates on data collection initiatives on an as-needed basis. GNSO Policy Development Process Working Groups take into account inputs from these data sources as they are relevant to each Working Group charter. For example, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group considered the AMGlobal Report "New gTLDs and the Global South: Understanding Limited Global South Demand in the Most Recent New gTLD Round and Options Going Forward" in its deliberations on providing support for applicants from developing countries in the New gTLD Program.

As the GNSO maintains open channels of communication with relevant data collection projects, and has access to the outputs of these projects via reports and public websites, it is not anticipated that a formal mechanism

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control

for input is needed at this time. As each data collection project runs on a different timeline, it may be more beneficial for the GNSO to review these inputs and request updates, as needed, when the data is released, rather than setting rigid timelines for reporting from these groups.

Working Group Determination:

Recommendation 20: That the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.

After extensive discussion the GNSO Review Working Group decided that it would recommend that the decision concerning the process to implement this recommendation should be left to the GNSO Council. Furthermore, the Working Group notes that there are several existing options available to the Council to implement this recommendation, including – but not limited to – during an annual strategic planning session either at, or outside, of an ICANN meeting; tasking an existing or new Work Team with developing recommendations for Council consideration; or tasking ICANN staff with developing recommendations that might be addressed in a joint meeting of the GNSO Council and ICANN's Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives (MSSI) team.

Recommendation 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 th policy-making process.

Given that there are already a number of data sources available and research initiatives underway that provide information about trends in gTLDs, the Working Group does not anticipate a need for additional data collection and analysis efforts. The GNSO Council already maintains ties with the coordinators of these efforts and receives updates when they are timely. This approach allows the Council to receive information as it becomes available rather than setting rigid timeframes for updates. Should the Council decide that a different approach is needed, it may consider setting up a regular review of data and analysis at set intervals.

Finally, the GNSO Review Working Group determined that existing processes and procedures are in place that address the implementation of these recommendations and thus no new work it required.

KEY DEPENDENCIES
The GNSO receives data and updates as they become available from research efforts underway. If priorities in the Strategic Plan or budget resources change, research efforts described above may be impacted.

RISK IDENTIFICATION
N/A

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
It is not clear to staff whether a KPI applies in the implementation of these recommendations.

NECESSARY TO PROCEED

Deleted: during,

Deleted: The Working Group recommends that the charter of the GNSO Council Standing Committee on ICANN's Budget and Operations be revised to include an annual review of ICANN's Strategic Objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.¶

Next Phase Activities/Resources
None.

Attachments, as applicable:

- None