**ICG Guidelines for the Decision Making (Draft)**

1. **Purpose**

The objective of this document is to assist the ICG (IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group) to optimize productivity and effectiveness in the process of making decisions.

ICANN Board Liaison and ICANN Staff Laison Expert are not taking part in the decision making.

1. 1. **Individual/Group Behavior and Norms**

The ICG should operate under the principles of transparency and openness, which means, *inter alia*, that mailing lists are publicly archived, meetings are normally recorded and/or transcribed, and SOIs (Statement of Interest) are required from ICG members and shall be publicly available.

ICG members should make every effort to respect the principles outlined in the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Framework, see <http://www.icann.org/transparency/acct-trans-frameworks-principles-10jan08.pdf>for further details [[1]](#footnote-1), taking into account that this accountability is under full review by ICANN within the global multistakeholder community.

If an ICG member feels that these standards are being abused, she/he should appeal to the chair or one of the vice-chairs. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior .If such abuse is demonstrated the chair of the ICG in full consultation and collaboration with the two vice chairs needs to consider the matter and takes necessary action, as appropriate to properly handle the case.

ICG Members should participate faithfully in the ICG’s process (e.g., attending meetings, providing timely input or monitoring discussions and fully collaborate with each other to achieve the established objectives).

Public comments received as a result of a public comment forum held in relation to the activities of the ICG should be duly considered and carefully analyzed. In addition, the ICG should provide its rationale for including or not the different comments received and, if appropriate, how these will be addressed in the report of the ICG.

1. **ICG Decision-Making Venues**

The ICG should make decisions on its public mailing list or during meetings. Meetings will be conducted face-to-face or through conference call. In order to initiate a recommendation (see 4.) a quorum of ICG members shall provide an opinion. A quorum is a super majority: 2/3 of ICG members physically present at the meeting or remotely participating in the discussion and shall include at least one member of each 13 ICG community (foot note list them )(<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/coordination-group-2014-06-17-en>; 2/3 of the members as described above

* 1. **Methodology for Making Decisions**
1. **Administrative Decisions**

The ICG may encounter instances where it needs to select person(s)/officer(s) as applicable for particular tasks. For example, the ICG may need to select secretarial support, speakers for particular events, liaisons to particular groups or the media, or chairs or vice chairs. In some cases, it may become obvious through discussion that all interested ICG members (those who have expressed an opinion) agree on a particular selection. In those cases, a chair, vice chair, or designee may approve a particular selection on the basis of the obvious agreement of all of those who expressed an opinion.

In other cases where multiple different opinions have been expressed, a chair, vice chair, or designee may choose to run a vote to make the selection. When a vote is conducted, a quorum of voters is required and final decisions should be made with a quorum as defined under 3.

 **b. All Other Decisions**

In case that ICG encounter instances where it needs to make decisions unrelated to person(s)/officer(s). The most obvious example is the decision to send the final transition proposal to NTIA, but there will undoubtedly be other intermediate decisions as well.

The mechanism that allows the ICG to come to a final decision regarding a certain topic is based on the following principles:

* The aim of the discussion should be to reach a conclusion that no ICG member opposes.
* Reasons for opposition should be stated, along with specific alternatives which would overcome the opposition; allowing the communities and the ICG wherever possible to understand concerns, assess their extent, and identify compromise solutions.
* After enough9 to be specified for each case according to its complexity and scope) time for discussion and consultation needed to address the specific issue has passed for the ICG to consider and attempt to accommodate objections, the ICG should reach a conclusion if at most a minority disagrees and their objections have been documented. but at least 2/3 of the members prewsnt physical or attending/participating remotely agree and no ICG community as a whole is firmly and formally opposed

Following these basic principles, the chair will be responsible for designating each ICG position as having one of the following designations:

* + - **Recommendation by consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings.
		- **Recommendation** - a position where only a minority disagrees and their objections have been documented, but at least 2/3 of the members present physical or participating remotely must agree and no ICG community as a whole is opposed.

Notice that a document is presented as a stable draft for approval, preferably not less than a calendar week/five worling days should be given.

An effort should be made for cases in which the viewpoint. of minority deviating from the recommendation to be separately expressed and documented in the report.

**The fundamental objective of the ICG is to reach at least the Recommendation designation in favor of forwarding the Proposal for the IANA Stewardship Transition to the NTIA.**

The recommended method for discovering the recommendation level designation should work as follows:

1. The chair and/or vice chairs should establish a time frame for discussion about a particular issue. If that time frame expires and new issues are still being raised, the chair and/or vice chairs may extend the time frame for discussion, as the case may be. The above-mentioned time frame(s) should be clearly included in the summary of the discussions
2. After the group exhaustively discussed all aspects of the issue for which all questions were raised, the chair and/or vice chairs make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group with a clear timescale to review. In establishing timescale, account should be taken of the related period required for community discussion
3. If any objections is raised concerning the designation, the chair and/or co-chairs should reevaluate and possibly publish an updated evaluation.
4. In rare cases, the chair and/or co-chairs may choose to conduct a poll in order to evaluate a designation. Polls should include qualitative questions to the extent possible; that is, they should require participants to explain their reasoning and should not only be used to obtain a quantitative assessment of opinions. Some of the reasons for using a poll might be:
* A decision needs to be reached within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of further iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
* It becomes obvious after sufficient discussion time that it is impossible to arrive at a recommendation designation.

Decsion resulting from the poll should would only be valid if 2/3 OF the ICG decides in favour of the subject which was put to the poll process and subject to the decision not overriding the representatives of an operational community that is significantly and directly affected by the decision.

Recommendation calls should always be available to the entire ICG and, for this reason, should be published on the designated mailing list to ensure that all ICG members have the opportunity to fully participate in the process. It is the role of the chair, in full consultation and collaboration with vice chairs, to designate that a recommendation has been achieved and to announce this designation to the ICG. Members of the ICG should be given the opportunity to raise objections to the designation done by the chair as part of the discussion, per the methodology outlined above.

Any ICG member who believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted should discuss the circumstances with the ICG chair/vice chairs. The chair, in full consultation with vice chairs, needs to carefully examine the case with the view to find a satisfactory solution for the matter through all appropriate means. The conclusions of this discussion should be documented.

1. Other best practices that can be considered include the ‘Statement on Respectful Online Communication’, see [http://www.odr.info/comments.php?id=A1767\_0\_1\_0\_C.](http://www.odr.info/comments.php?id=A1767_0_1_0_C) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)