Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
26-Feb-2016

See **Executive Summary** tab for an overview of the approach used to evaluate and prioritize recommendations issued by the Independent Examiner.
See **Footnotes** tab for additional details and explanations.

Legend:
- Working Party suggests adoption of this recommendation
- Working Party is in agreement and flags that work is already underway
- Working Party agrees with intent and suggests modification to recommendation language
- Do not implement

				Working Party Revised Priority/Scores [1]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Mapping) [2]						Feedback Received During Webinar - April 12th 2016				
Rec	Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party	GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow rows only)	WP Revised Priority	WP Revised Score [3]	WP Ease of Implementation	WP Cost of Implementation	WP Align with Strategic Plan	WP Impact Groups/Mass [4]	WP Additional Info? [5]	Survey Priority					
8	That the SIGO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including participation by region).			High	6	Easy	Low	Yes	No	No	High					
26	That SIGO Council members, Executive Committee members of SOs and Cs and members of WGs complete and maintain a current, comprehensive SOI on the SIGO website. Where a member refuses to complete or divest, this information is to be posted. If not posted because of silent confidentiality, the participant's interest or position must be disclosed. Failing either of these, the individual should be prohibited from voting.			High	6	Easy	Low	Yes	No	No	High					
27	That the GNSO establish and maintain a centralized publicly available list of members and individual participants of every Constituency and Stakeholder Group (with a link to their SOI where such actions are required and posted).			High	5	Medium	Low	Yes	No	No	High					
8	That SIGO Council have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.	Again that work is already done elsewhere. **Change:** The already approved Policy & Implementation WG recommendations cover this. Ongoing GNSO action item: ensure GNSO reports to all future policy implementation WGs.		High	0-5	Easy/Med	Low	Yes	Yes	No	High					
15	That the GNSO continues current PDP improvements Project initiatives to address weaknesses of the PDP.	Already being done. **Change:** GNSO action items: ensure that efforts to improve the timeliness of PDPs continue.		High	0	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	High					
16	That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be developed as a standard part of any policy process.	Already in the PDP manual. Must be analytical rather than just on-line. What is being measured? **Change:** GNSO action items: 1) Develop an analytical framework for assessing policy impacts; 2) determine what should be measured; 3) implement the process.		High	3-0	Medium	Low/Med	Yes	Yes	No	High					
18	That the GNSO Council evaluate post-implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis (rather than periodically as stated in the current GNSO Operating Procedures). Such evaluations should be analysed by the GNSO Council to monitor and response the drafting and scope of future PDP Charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.			High	3	Med/Hard	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	High					
5	That, during each WG self-assessment, some consideration be added how their input has been solicited and used.			Med	5	Easy	Low	Yes	No	No	Medium					
17	That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation be incorporated into the policy development process; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a tool for continual process improvement to the PDP.			Med	5	Easy	Low	Yes	Yes/No opinion	No	Medium					
29	That SIGO, GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all SOs and Cs include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN.			Med	0-5	Easy	Low	Yes/no opinion	No	No	Medium					
10	That the GNSO Council develop criteria for WGs to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations.	What does it mean to "engage"?; could be costly; develop criteria such as using an internal facilitator; should review existing pilot program already underway and that additional criteria may be premature.		Med	6	Easy	Low	Yes/No	Yes/No	No	Medium					
12	That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing real time transcripting service in audio conferences for WG meetings.	Connect with work already done with SSAC		Med	4	Easy	High	Yes	No	No	Medium					
33	That SOs, Cs and the Nominating Committee, in the selection of their respective representatives to the GNSO Council, should aim to maximize the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants, as defined in ICANN Core Value 4.	WP between work is already being done but improvements/metrics need to be made in this area		Med	6	Medium	Low	Yes	No	No	Medium					
1	That the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of outreach and participation programs with regard to GNSO Working Groups (WGs).	Need strategic goals, objectives, and KPIs. Develop measurable problems that we want to fix. Need to measure outcomes and effectiveness between ICANN and community groups (WGs).		Med	3	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium					
11	That the Board fix how PDP WG pilot project be reviewed when completed, if the results are positive, that the tools be developed and support funding made available.	Has been done for two years. Need to evaluate.		Med	3	Easy	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium					
14	That the GNSO further explores PDP "chunking" and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.	Allow GNSO flexibility to determine when chunking (or phases) is appropriate; needs refinement.		Med	3	Medium	Low	Yes/no opinion	Yes	No	Medium					
24	That the GNSO Council and SOs and Cs adopt as the published process for applications for new Constituencies: "that the ICANN Board in its review of applications for new Constituencies follow 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.	Partly done. Only need to be more in line Employee Works that this is not being done and this should be done at the start. **Change:** Work with Employee Works to ensure this is being done; more changes. If it is being done, it should be done at the beginning of the process. Regardless, the Working Party believes that this recommendation will require some changes to the GNSO and ICANN Action Items: 1) Determine whether new Constituency applications processes are clearly posted and easily accessible; 2) determine what steps are taken to ensure compliance with the published processes and whether these are adequate; 3) determine if all Constituency applications, including historic ones, are publicly posted along with full transparency of the decision making process; 4) determine whether or not there is a presumption that a new Constituency should be admitted if all criteria are satisfied and if this is appropriate; if determined what process the Board uses to evaluate new Constituency applications and whether they are ensuring process compliance; 5) make recommendations for any modifications to the process, if any.		Med	0	Hard	Low	Yes	Yes/No	No	Medium					
31	That the EAC-GNSO Consultation Group on EAC Early Engagement in the GNSO Policy Development Process be made a part of the GNSO process as priority projects. (as a part of this work it should consider how the EAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG at each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.	Ongoing work. **Change:** The Working Party encourages the GNSO to continue its work on this issue. It also suggests that it consider whether The EAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input." (An alternative approach here may be to find out this with the GNSO EAC liaison.)		Med	3	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Med					
35	That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership 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.	Agreed. Need to find out the WG approach. The WG's charge to measure diversity should be specified with more consideration to what can actually be defined and measured. **Change:** Work to bring with the WG approach? What would be an alternative way of fulfilling the intent of this recommendation?	Task the GNSO Council establish a WG to recommend ways to reduce barriers to participation by non-English speakers and those with limited command of English. To the extent practicable, the members of the WG should be diverse and reflect demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity.	Med	3	Hard	High	Yes	No	No	Medium	**Denise Michel:** We do not know where the ITAMS currently stand on diversity. Metrics needed at SG/C, WG, Council levels on what people feel are the key metrics that matter on supporting diversity commitment. This data needs to be collected and published. We don't know where we stand within the GNSO on diversity. What does the GNSO community think? Need to have a discussion around these questions, discussions, action. ICANN already has commitment. WG is not a good idea at this point. Every structure within the GNSO can take on responsibility to determine what their own diversity issues are, and increase their own diversity. Too many challenges to create a WG. Task the GNSO Council to develop metrics and work with the community on tagging PDPs. First step is ask staff and various groups to provide basic data. The Council directs staff to collect data from the SG/C and report back to Council and the Council will discuss with the community what next steps may be.	**Paul McGrady (in AC Chat):** How would the data be sourced? Under what privacy policy? Why would we put together a WG that reflects the current users of the Internet if the goal is to increase involvement from those not currently using it? What is the actual relationship between GNSO participation and access to use of the Internet?	**Susan Payne (in AC Chat):** @Glenn I think the revised language is preferable to the original recommendation - but agree with Denise about concerns on setting another WG		
2	That the GNSO develop and have more effective outreach to underrepresented and broaden participation in PDP WGs, given the vital role volunteers play in Working Groups and policy development.	Create in-depth programs should be developed, with ongoing commitment of resources, to recruit & cognizant volunteers based on outreach efforts.		Med	2	Hard	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium					
9	That a formal Working Group leadership training program be developed and made a part of the overall training and development programme.	Better recommendation to note that it should develop a needs assessment for WG leaders.		Med	2	Medium	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	Medium					
3	That the GNSO Council initiate an annual survey of barriers to volunteer participation in WGs.	Overlap with other WG; GNSO Council should not determine how finances are allocated to WGs; Survey should be done by Inter-and cross-ITU training bodies to accurately identify cost barriers.	That the GNSO Council initiate Inter-barriers to volunteer participation and consider ways to reduce participation barriers without the need for cost-related expenditures.	Med	1-2	Hard	High	Yes	Yes	Yes/No	Medium					
7	That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (CIs) engage more deeply with their respective members whose first language is other than English, as a means to overcoming language barriers.	Include summaries in multiple languages; combine with other similar recs; further research needed; work with ICANN and ITU. Together and on their own, SGs and CIs can behave the WP makes a recommendation.	That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (CIs) strive to overcome language barriers by participating in the WG established under Recommendation 35.	Med	1	Hard	High	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	**Chuck Gomes:** Working Party meeting may need to be adjusted as it refers to the WG mentioned under recommendation 35, which was removed impromptu during webinar feedback.				
13	That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in WG continuous listed-deliberations.	WP between in continuous improvements; no specific tool is being recommended; tool must meet need that is currently not being met.		Med	1	Medium	Medium	No opinion	No opinion	Yes	Medium					
19	As strategic 'oversight' 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 clear process.	Work is already being done		Low	5	Easy	Low	Yes	No	No	Low					
25	That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency.	Guidelines already exists; assistance is already made available. **Change:** The Working Party believes that the GNSO Council's current commitment to actively make available but suggests that the effectiveness and ease of finding the guidance and obtaining assistance be evaluated to see if improvements may be in order. GNSO action items: 1) Determine the ease of accessibility of guidance for new Constituency applications; 2) recommend improvements to the guidance and the available assistance as appropriate.		Low	3-5	Easy/Med	Low/Med	Yes	No	No	Low					
6	That the GNSO Council introduce non-financial rewards and recognition for volunteers.	No financial rewards - such as travel funding.		Low	6	Easy	Low	No opinion	No	No	Low					
28	That section 5.1.2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures be amended to add a new bullet 5: to clarify that the Council's role is monitoring rather than advisory, and to evaluate meaningful sanctions for non-compliance where appropriate.			Low	6	Medium	Low	Yes	No	No	Low					
34	That PDP WGs retain the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people unable to participate from anywhere in the world.	Some groups already do this, but it's not a standard. Add some language to flag that this should be tested for effectiveness.		Low	6	Easy	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Low					
30	That the GNSO Council develop and implement a policy for the provision of administrative support for SOs and CIs, and that SOs and CIs annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of administrative support they receive.	Not sure is done, but not the issue. **Change:** The Working Party believes that there is already a procedure for providing some support to Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups but that there is not a procedure for SOs and CIs to evaluate the effectiveness of the support provided. GNSO action items: 1) Identify and review the existing procedures for SOs and CI to evaluate administrative support; 2) evaluate the adequacy & effectiveness of the existing procedures including whether additional forms of support might be beneficial; 3) develop recommendations for improvements to the procedures and new types of support, if any.		Low	3	Medium	Medium	Yes	No	No	Low					
20	That the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives with a view to planning future policy development that supports the achievement of ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.	Already we - have been GNSO should go into the Strategic Planning process.	That the GNSO Council should participate in developing ICANN's Strategic Objectives and plan future policy development that aligns the Strategic Objectives with GNSO resources.	Low	3	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Low					
36	That, when approving the formation of a PDP WG, the GNSO Council requires 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.	Research recommendation on what it corresponds to the process that Council goes through in terms of approving a PDP. Forming a working group, etc. and that Council review the membership to ensure that it includes a large-scale available but suggests that the effectiveness and ease of finding the guidance and obtaining assistance be evaluated to see if improvements may be in order. GNSO action items: 1) Determine the ease of accessibility of guidance for new Constituency applications; 2) recommend improvements to the guidance and the available assistance as appropriate.	First, when approving the formation of a PDP WG, the GNSO Council strive for its membership to be diverse and reflect demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole. Second, the Board should take into consideration if reasonable measures were taken to achieve such diversity.	Low	3-2	Hard	High	Yes/no opinion	Yes	No	Low	**Paul McGrady:** In favor as PDPs are in English and convenient to specific timezones, there are systems in place that may discourage diverse participation. Actions such as translations of calls need to be put in place to encourage diverse participation.	**Paul McGrady:** So long as PDPs are in English and convenient to specific timezones, there are systems in place that may discourage diverse participation. Actions such as translations of calls need to be put in place to encourage diverse participation.	**Phil Corwin (in AC Chat):** I share Paul's concern. While we should strive for WGs to be diverse, I wouldn't want to see years of work rejected by Board based on something other than the quality of the report and recommendations.		
22	That the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework, which its members should utilize to identify development needs and opportunities.	Research recommendation: develop a framework to identify training needs on policy development and ensure that members have appropriate skills and background to participate effectively in the policy development process. This training is not intended to address technical issues.	That the GNSO Council develop a technical competency-based expectation of its members and provide training on the policy development process.	Low	1	Hard	High	No opinion	Yes	No	Low					
21	That the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of how its policies have impacted on the Internet's ability to grow and to ensure that affected parties are well represented in the policy-making process.	This recommendation is not well phrased and vague, not compared to what is in the Final Report; additionally, the GNSO Review Working Party does not feel that it is appropriate to implement the recommendation at this time		N/A - Low		Medium	High	Yes/No	Yes	No	Do not implement	**Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:** Feedback from the GAC is that this recommendation should not be rejected. The demand for such studies exists. The question should be on how to better prepare for and set the scene for these studies to take place.	**Denise Michel:** Interprets this recommendation as asking for the GNSO to be better informed on policy discussions. GNSO should consider working with staff to ensure that adequate briefings are provided on work being done, as opposed to the GNSO undertaking or commissioning the work itself. General information about the elements of the PDP is quite regardless of what PDP happens to be taking place at any time. It would be valuable general information and knowledge sharing for the GNSO community.	**Glenn Mansfield:** Agree with Denise that there is a lot of information out there which may generate empirical data that will help inform the community. Concern with the recommendation is that it effectively creates a commitment on the part of the GNSO Council, which was not supported by the study conducted by Westlake. Recommendation is too broad and too vague to be useful. Work is already underway for future PDP work. There have been a number of studies in the past that have informed PDPs. Could be helpful to also consider the recommendations of the GNSO Data and Metrics for Policy Development doc.	**Donna Austin (in AC chat):** There is a considerable amount of data being collected to inform the CCT RT that could serve as a baseline for future collection. I'm not sure this is a GNSO task to collect, but perhaps should have access to such information when considering new policy efforts etc.	**Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:** This question has to be addressed during a structural review, which needs to take place in the near future.	
32	That GNSO Action "cultural diversity" calendar by using both languages and regulars (weekdays) this along with geographic, gender and age group indices, is held for the GNSO Council, SOs, CIs and SGs.	Do not implement - too broad		N/A - Low		Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Low	**Denise Michel:** Do the GNSO SG/CIs collect information on the age, gender and geographic locations of their members? This information may be helpful in determining the baseline degree of diversity, and provide a better understanding for any requirements in improvements in diversity.	**Jon Ebadi (in AC Chat):** @Denise: I believe the NCSG actually makes it a point to not ask for the age or gender of its members. Some may not appreciate being asked to identify self pre-set (predetermined set of) options on gender.				
23	That the Independent ICANN Ombudsman Review, which is based from outside the GNSO Council, allocates equally (as far as commonly practicable) to Inter SOs.	Do not implement. Ombudsman Review Working Party does not feel that it is appropriate to implement the recommendation at this time		N/A - Low		Hard	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Do not implement	**Jon Ebadi:** A list of the feedback provided to Westlake, including having GNSO SG or constituency representatives connect to make the opposite direction of this recommendation. **(in AC Chat):** The summary of comment for Westlake at ICANN 53 arranged by staff can be found here: https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-gnso-review-v1jun14wg/60302.html	**Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:** This question has to be addressed during a structural review, which needs to take place in the near future.				