GNSO Review

LSE Report and Recommendations

Recommendation 1.
A centralised register of all GNSO stakeholders should be established, which is up-to date and publicly accessible. It should include the members of Constituencies and others involved in the GNSO task forces.

- How relevant/workable is this for organisations who are constituency members?
- What does it prove?
- Information on councillors and tasks force members exists and could be published
- Privacy issues mean no contact details or email addresses, all correspondence should be via GNSO secretariat

No Support as proposed, minor alterations to existing situation accepted

Recommendation 2.
GNSO Constituencies should be required to show how many members have participated in developing the policy positions they adopt.

- Irrelevant at this level
- Impractical with organisational members of constituencies
- Questionable or no, value add
- Emphasis on constituencies and their by-laws to achieve consensus on issues

No Support

Recommendation 3.

There needs to be greater coherence and standardisation across Constituency operations. For this to work effectively, more ICANN staff support would be needed for constituencies. (Paragraph 2.22)

- There is no 'one size fits all'
- Constituencies should determine their own rules and by-laws which should be publicly available.
- Staff support should be at the GNSO/Task Force level, not the constituency level.

No Support

Recommendation 4.

A GNSO Constituency support officer should be appointed to help Constituencies develop their operations, websites and outreach activity. (Paragraph 2.23)

- ICANN support should be at the GNSO/TF level (as above for Rec 3) unless constituencies request support with specific (short term) tasks.
- ICANN staff   support for outreach is supported, but this is nor seen as a specific constituency issue, although the constituencies could jointly provide materials with ICANN staff to facilitate this.

No Support

Recommendation 5.

Constituencies should focus on growing balanced representation and active participation broadly proportional to wider global distributions for relevant indicators.

Accepted in principle
- ICANN staff could help here with outreach activities
- Again there is 'no one size fits all' across constituencies
- 'Relevant indicators' appear questionable if applied across the board without building in ways to take account of differences

Support

Recommendation 6.

The basis for participation in GNSO activities needs to be revised, from Constituency-based membership to one deriving from direct ICANN stakeholder participation.

- Moving away from constituency based representation to direct stakeholder representation isn't supported.
- There are additional benefits from deriving policy based on stakeholder grouping, which would drive any discussions towards the formation of 'birds of a feather groupings e.g. constituencies
- Greater funding from large organisations would have to come with greater voting rights
- Capture!?

No Support

Recommendation 7.

The GNSO should improve the design and organization of the current website, develop a website strategy for continual improvement and growth over the next three years, and review usage statistics on a regular basis to check that traffic to the website is growing over time and understand more fully what external audiences are interested in.

• A helpful proposal that should be adopted

Support

Recommendation 8.

Document management within the GNSO needs to be improved and the presentation of policy development work made much more accessible.

 A helpful proposal that should be adopted, but is staff going to do this?

Support

Recommendation 9.

The GNSO should develop and publish annually a Policy Development Plan for the next two years, to act both as a strategy document for current and upcoming policy work, and as a communications and marketing tool for general consumption outside of the ICANN community. It should dovetail with ICANN's budget and strategy documents.

 Needs to fit within the overall Strategic Plan

• Needs to be driven by the constituencies

Support

Recommendation 10.

The GNSO and ICANN should work proactively to provide information-based incentives for stakeholder organizations to monitor and participate in GNSO issues.

- This recommendation should address ICANN not specifically the GNSO
- As mentioned earlier, outreach with staff support is recognised as a requirement

Supported but not a specific GNSO issue; this is not very clear

- **Recommendation 11.**

The position of the GNSO Council Chair needs to become much more visible within ICANN and to carry more institutional weight. (Paragraph 3.26)

- Supported in principle
- More institutional weight is supported but must be limited to progressing GNSO agreed positions, not personal views or steer from the chair.
- Not a board voting role.

Not supported this way. No additional institutional weight or girth.

Recommendation 12.

The policies on GNSO Councillors declaring interests should be strengthened. Provision for a vote of "no confidence' leading to resignation should be introduced for non-compliance.

- A helpful proposal that should be adopted

Support but not with simple majority; Appropriate procedures needed

Recommendation 13.

Fixed term limits should be introduced for GNSO Councillors either of two two-year terms (as applied in some Constituencies already) or perhaps of a single three-year term.

• Totally unacceptable as this challenges the ability to field the best councillors, particularly with geographic constraints

• There is no 'one size fits all' across constituencies, some will not only attract more members as its their core business, but will also find more people willing and able to devote large parts of their business life to working within the GNSO

• Each constituency should adopt the best process for them on a consensus basis

No Support

Recommendation 14.

The GNSO Council and related policy staff should work more closely together to grow the use of project-management methodologies in policy development work, particularly focusing on how targeted issue analysis can drive data collection from stakeholders (rather than vice versa).

A helpful proposal that should be adopted

Support, but the PDP process should not become more complex.

Recommendation 15.

The GNSO Council should rely more on face-to-face meetings supplemented by online collaborative methods of working. The Chair should seek to reduce the use of whole-Council teleconferencing.

Support

Recommendation 16.

The GNSO Councillors should have access to a fund for reasonable travel and accommodation expenses to attend designated Council meetings, instead of having to meet such costs from their own resources as at present.

A helpful proposal that should be adopted

Support

Recommendation 17.

The GNSO Council should make more use of Task Forces. Task Force participants should be more diverse and should be drawn from a wider range of people in the Internet community, and national and international policy-making communities.

- Some support in principle, but with the following caveats
  - tasks forces must not become too large
  - additional members must have the required skills and bring value add to the discussions over and above the GNSO representation
  - potential additional TF members must be nominated via a GNSO constituency
  - need to investigate ways of lightening the load of volunteers and GNSO task force members

Some Support – with qualifying detail

Recommendation 18.

An ICANN Associate stakeholder category of participation should be created, so as to create a pool of readily available external expertise, which can be drawn upon to populate Task Forces where relevant.

- Introducing a separate ICANN associate stakeholder category raises questions as to who would qualify here who couldn't become a constituency member under the current structure?
- Having an additional pool of rare expertise/skills would be useful, but whether this is the best way of achieving that is questionable
- Additional members must have the required skills and bring value add to the discussions over and above the GNSO representation

No Support as proposed, needs more specificity

Recommendation 19.

The current GNSO Constituency structure should be radically simplified so as to be more capable of responding to rapid changes in the Internet. The Constituency structure should be clear, comprehensive (covering all potential stakeholders) and flexible, allowing the GNSO to respond easily to the rapid changes in the make-up of Internet stakeholders. We suggest a set of three larger Constituencies to represent respectively Registration interests, Businesses and Civil Society.

- This recommendation is severely flawed. Squeezing existing constituencies into 3 larger groups will result in insurmountable problems in achieving consensus at the group level as representation would be so diverse within the groups
- Mixing suppliers (ISPs) and users (business) weakens the degree of diverse input required at the GNSO level to determine and balanced policy

No Support, ever. And no evidence to support the argument for simplilfication.

Recommendation 20.

A reorganization of GNSO Constituencies would also allow the Council to be made somewhat smaller (we suggest 16 members) and hence easier to manage

 Reducing the Constituencies is opposed to start with, his recommendation makes the situation substantially worse. Reduced and less representative participation.

- Results in more work on fewer people
- Disenfranchises parts of the existing structure

No Support

Recommendation 21.
The definition of achieving a consensus should be raised to 75 per cent. Weighted voting should be abolished. Both measures could help to create more incentives for different Constituencies to engage constructively with each other, rather than simply reiterating a "bloc' position in hopes of picking up enough uncommitted votes so as to win.

• Weighted voting currently skews most decisions towards those directly impacted by the decision, hence taking key decisions for the greater good of the Internet can be by-passed. In most business oriented arena's (particularly those that fall under regulation this would never be allowed.

• The current situation disenfranchises some parties, challenges the rationale for their participation and promotes an prevents the adoption of a level playing field

Support, but there needs to be a process of handling non-consensus.

•Recommendation 22.
The way in which the GNSO Council votes to elect two Directors to the ICANN Board should be changed to use the Supplementary Vote system. (Paragraph
• Weighted voting must be abolished first

Supported but after weighted voting is abolished to provide an equitable arrangement across all constituencies

Recommendation 23.
The amount of detailed prescriptive provision in the ICANN Bylaws relating to the operations of the GNSO should be reduced. ICANN Bylaws should outline broad principles and objectives for the GNSO but the detailed operational provision (including the section on the PDP) should be transferred to the GNSO Rules of Procedure. This would allow the GNSO to agree amendments and to introduce new innovations in its working methods and timelines in a more realistic and flexible way, while operating within ICANN's guiding principles.
Support

Recommendation 24.
Both ICANN and the GNSO Council should periodically (say once every five years) compile or commission a formal (quantitative and qualitative) assessment of the influence of the GNSO's work on developing policy for generic names. This should include an analysis of how the GNSO's influence with national governments, international bodies and the commercial sector might be extended.
Support, but should be part of regular gNSO reviews.