Draft Letter to Giovanni Seppia, VP Implementation Operations

Dear Giovanni

**GNSO Council Feedback on** **Proposed Process** **for the Retirement of Non-Policy Recommendations**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the [Proposed Process for Retirement of Non-Policy Recommendations](https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmm.icann.org%2Fpipermail%2Fcouncil%2Fattachments%2F20231003%2F12d244b4%2FDraftProcesstoRetireRecommendations-25Sept20234-0001.pdf&data=05%7C01%7Csusan.payne%40comlaude.com%7C3f5676c941b94386fb3808dbdcad7a2e%7C442149eed2004029b9b18f029e916b85%7C0%7C0%7C638346410149284165%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=jx7TiGtMqMB4tAsy%2Fo7cXOeLYdFQTyL5tPh5jQ8dfaI%3D&reserved=0), which was recently shared with SOAC Leaders. The GNSO Council appreciates the steps Org has taken to seek to address the procedural gap of not having a process to retire previously approved, but no longer appropriate, recommendations, as identified by ATRT3.

Overall, the GNSO Council is supportive of the Proposed Process, subject to the following comment.

If we understand the proposed Process correctly, it appears that there is not envisaged to be an opportunity for even targeted community input until the proposed Step 3, and indeed that broad community consultation, in the form of a public comment period, would not occur until Step 5. Prior to this, therefore, would be:

1. a Staff-led exercise in Step 1, involving the assessment against a set of criteria. Those criteria include that there is a “Lack of broad community support as implementation work progresses”, without any formal process to test that assessment; and
2. Step 2, involving the preparation of an Issues Paper for consideration by the relevant Board Caucus Group or Committee. That Board Caucus or Committee can decide either to maintain the recommendation, in which case no further action on retirement would be taken, or to proceed with the retirement process.

The involvement of the community only after these first two steps must pose a risk that the Board Caucus or Committee makes its decision on whether or not to proceed based on incomplete information, i.e., without the benefit of having heard the perspective of the community. In particular, for example, the Board might decide not to proceed with retirement at Step 2 on a recommendation for which there is actually broad community support to proceed with retirement. We do appreciate that, at a later Step in the process, the matter will come back to the Board Caucus or Committee for further consideration, but believe that earlier community input on the Issues Paper, before it is taken to the Board Caucus or Committee might be beneficial.

Yours sincerely

Greg DiBiase

GNSO Council Chair