ICANN | GNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization

GNSO Review Working Party
Feasibility Assessment and Prioritization
of Recommendations by Independent Examiner

Executive Summary

Building on its extensive work during the entire course of the review of the GNSO, which commenced in March 2014, the GNSO Review Working Party has worked diligently to discuss, dissect and evaluate the 36 recommendations included in the Final Report issued by the independent examiner in September 2015. Through this process, we carefully considered each of the recommendations in detail and evaluated them based upon several criteria:

- ease or difficulty of implementation,
- cost of implementation,
- whether it is aligned with the strategic plan of the GNSO,
- whether it impacts existing or other work,
- whether the Working Party required additional information, and,
- whether the recommendation was a low, medium, or high priority.

We categorized each of the recommendations in two parts. Part One addressed whether we agreed (13 recommendations), did not agree (3 recommendations), agreed with modifications (6 recommendations) or work was already underway in the GNSO (14 recommendations). Part Two prioritized the recommendations as high, medium or low in terms of the impact it could have on the GNSO relative to other factors. The Stats sheet provides a summary of the total recommendations under this two part approach.

We believe this is the most effective way to present our careful review of all 36 recommendations in a manner that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board (OEC) can use to form its opinion on which recommendations to move into implementation. This approach is reflective of lessons learned from past reviews and important process improvements, such as prioritizing recommendations and considering how outcome and impact resulting from implemented recommendations will be measured and evaluated in the future. The detailed report is provided on the attached spreadsheet.

How to Read the Spreadsheet

We have organized the spreadsheet to coincide with our two part approach. The recommendations have been color coded for ease of reference.

Green: we agreed with the recommendation.
Orange: work is already underway regarding this recommendations.
Yellow: we agreed with some part of it or the intent, but have proposed a modified version of the recommendation (the modified language is listed next to the original).
Red: we do not agree and recommend it not be implemented.

The spreadsheet is sorted by priorit+A2y (column E) so you will see the recommendations we believe to be a high priority first, medium in the second tier and low or do not implement toward the bottom. The recommendations are further sorted by the score assessed by the Working Party (column F) after reviewing their feedback on the criteria noted above. The score was determined by assigning a score of "1" to each category that met the criteria (easy to implement, low cost, alignment with strategic plan, no impact on other work or groups, no additional information needed, and high priority). The score was then tallied. The results ranged from 1 to 6 (for example, 6 met the most critiera and should be given higher priority during the implementation phase). Finally, the recommendations are sorted numerically if the ranking (high/med/low/do not implement and score) is the same.

The spreadsheet provides our comments, as well as our indication of how we graded the recommendation on the criteria outlined above.

We hope this level of detail and organizational structure will help the GNSO Council and the OEC to understand how we arrived at our recommendations and provide an easy way to comment or propose any adjustments on the 36 recommendations provided during the independent review.

What We Propose As Next Steps

Once approved by GNSO Council, we propose submitting to the OEC as presented, along with suggested ways to measure performance of the recommendations (which is currently in drafting). We propose that the OEC move forward with those recommendations color coded green or yellow (incorporating our proposed revisions) and reinforce those in orange within existing work. We propose they do not proceed with those color coded red as do not implement. We also propose that the Working Party continue to work with the OEC to develop implementation plans and more detailed benchmarks of performance as a liaison with the GNSO for the process.

Additionally, throughout this process, members of the community have expressed concerns over the selection of the independent examiner, the scope of the independent review and the methodology used. While these factors were outside the scope of our work, we have recognized these concerns, and, up to this point, focused on evaluating the recommendations as presented. The OEC has indicated to us, as a liaison to the GNSO regarding the Independent Review, that if additional recommendations which were not observed or noted by the independent examiner are desired by the GNSO, that we may use this opportunity to provide such additional feedback. We plan to complete an assessment of the Review process, including performance of the Independent Examiner, effectiveness of the Working Party model, efficiency of the review process and staff facilitation. The results of this assessment and resulting recommendations will be shared with the OEC to inspire further process improvements.

At the start of the Review, we had contemplated conducting a GNSO Self-Review as part of this process. At this juncture, we seek direction from Council. Specifically, should the GNSO Review Working Party conduct a self-review and supplement the independent examiner's recommendations or should its work conclude with the presentation of this report and allow a follow-on group to form to work toward implementation?

Background Information

The objective of the GNSO Review[1] is to examine organizational effectiveness of the GNSO, including its structure components (GNSO Council, GNSO Working Groups, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies). Involvement of the GNSO community as well as input and participation from the broader community are important components of this review process. As discussed in GNSO Council meetings, the Structural Improvements Committee of the Board (SIC), now the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) has requested that a GNSO Review Working Party be assembled to function as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner and the SIC, to provide input on review criteria and the 360 Assessment, coordinate interviews and objectively supply clarification and responses to the draft findings and recommendations. Once the Final Report was issued and the Board takes action on it, as appropriate, the GNSO Review Working Party is expected to coordinate with the GNSO community to prepare an Implementation Plan and champion implementation of improvement activities.

Responsibilities and Scope of Work for the Review Working Party

1. Function as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner and the SIC;
2. Provide input on review criteria and the 360 Assessment[2];
3. Serve as additional conduit for input from, and requests to, GNSO constituencies/stakeholder groups, Council;
4. Act as sounding board: offer objective guidance, reactions and comments to any preliminary conclusions and assessment and helping to ensure the draft report issued by the independent examiner accurately reflects the GNSO structure, scope and dynamics;
5. Coordinate with the GNSO community to prepare an Implementation Plan and champion implementation of improvement activities;
6. Perform support communication/awareness activities to encourage participation.

[1] GNSO Review is mandated by ICANN's Bylaws.

[2] 360 Assessment is an online mechanism to collect and summarize feedback from members of the GNSO community — a "self-review" relative to objective and quantifiable criteria. Interested members of other ICANN organizations, Board and

Links:

Final Report

ICANN Bylaws

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
6	That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including diversity statistics).			High	6	Easy	Low	Yes	No	No	High
26	That GNSO Council members, Executive Committee members of SGs and Cs and members of WGs complete and maintain a current, comprehensive SOI on the GNSO website. Where individuals represent bodies or clients, this information is to be posted. If not posted because of client confidentiality, the participant's interest or position must be disclosed. Failing either of these, the individual not be permitted to participate.			High	6	Easy	Low	Yes	No	No	High
27	That the GNSO establish and maintain a centralised publicly available list of members and individual participants of every Constituency and Stakeholder Group (with a link to the individual's SOI where one is required and posted).			High	5	Medium	Low	Yes	No	No	High
8	That WGs should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.	Agree but work is already done elsewhere. Chuck: The already approved Policy & Implementation WG recommendations cover this. Ongoing GNSO action item: ensure it happens in all future policy implementation efforts.		High	4-5	Easy/Med	Low	Yes	Yes	No	High
15	That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.	Already being done. Chuck: GNSO action items: ensure that efforts to improve the timeliness of PDPs continue.		High	4	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	High
16	That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process.	Already in the PDP manual. Have no analytical framework to do this. What is being measured? Chuck: GNSO action items: i) Develop an analytical framework for assessing policy impacts; ii) determine what should be measured and corresponding metrics.		High	3-4	Medium	Low/Med	Yes	Yes	No	High

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
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); and that these evaluations are analysed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP Charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.	Define at the start of implementation, the assessment period is established. How should GNSO council evaluate implemented policies? Aligns with dmpm. Chuck: The Working Party supports this recommendation. GNSO action items: i) Change the PDP Guidelines to make post-implementation policy effectiveness evaluation an ongoing rather than a periodic process and to include an assessment period at the start of the implementation process; ii) develop guidelines for how implementation of policies should be evaluated.		High	3	Med/Hard	Medium	Yes	Yes	No	High
5	That, during each WG self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.			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 basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.			Med	5	Easy	Low	Yes	No/No opinion	No	Medium
29	That SOIs of GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all SGs and Cs include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN.			Med	4-5	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 be developed.		Med	4	Easy	Low	Yes/No	Yes/No	No	Medium
12	That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcripting service in audio conferences for WG meetings.	Connect with work already done with ALAC		Med	4	Easy	High	Yes	No	No	Medium
33	That SGs, Cs and the Nominating Committee, in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council, should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants, as defined in ICANN Core Value 4.	WP believes work is already being done but improvements/metrics need to be made in this area		Med	4	Medium	Low	Yes	No	No	Medium

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
1	That the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programmes with regard to GNSO Working Groups (WGs).	Need strategic goals, objectives, and KPIs - themes around problems that we want to solve. Should measure the shared effectiveness between ICANN and community.		Med	3	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
11	That the face-to-face PDP WG pilot project be assessed when completed. If the results are beneficial, guidelines should be developed and support funding made available.	Has been done for two years. Need to evaluate. Chuck: GNSO action items: i) Develop guidelines; ii) encourage support funding in the ICANN budget.		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 SGs and Cs adhere to the published process for applications for new Constituencies. That the ICANN Board in assessing an application satisfy itself that all parties have followed 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. May need to be easier to find. Stephanie thinks that this is not being done and this should be done at the start. Chuck: Some in the Working Party believe this is already being done; some disagree. 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 due diligence on the part of the GNSO. GNSO action items: i) Determine whether new Constituency application processes are clearly posted and easily accessible, ii) determine what steps are taken to ensure compliance with those processes and whether those steps are adequate; iii) determine if all Constituency applications, including historic ones, are publicly posted along with full transparency of the decision-making process; iv) determine whether or not there is a presumption that a new Constituency should be admitted if all requirements are met and if such a presumption is appropriate; v) determine what process the Board uses to evaluate new Constituency applications and whether they are ensuring process compliance; vi) make recommendations for any modifications to the process, if any.		Med	3	Hard	Low	Yes	Yes/No	No	Medium

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
31	That the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in the GNSO Policy Development Process continue its two work streams as priority projects. As a part of its work it should consider how the GAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.	Ongoing work. Chuck:: The Working Party encourages the ongoing work of the Consultation Group and suggests that it consider whether 'the GAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.' GNSO action item: Send a letter to the GAC expressing appreciation for the work of the Consultation Group, encourage continuation of the group and ask whether it might be worthwhile for the GAC to consider appointing '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 first test this with the GNSO GAC liaison.)		Med	3	Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Med
35	That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership specifically 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.	Agree with the intent, but not the WG approach. The metrics used to measure diversity should be specified with more consideration to what can actually be defined and measured. Chuck: What is wrong with the WG approach? What would be an alternative way of fulfilling the intent of this recommendation?	That 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
2	That the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programmes to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP WGs, given the vital role volunteers play in Working Groups and policy development.	Create in-depth program should be developed; stronger volunteer drive that includes metrics to capture volunteers based on outreach efforts		Med	2	Hard	High	Yes	Yes	No	Medium
9	That a formal Working Group leadership assessment programme be developed as part of the overall training and development programme.	Refine 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 reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in WGs.	Overlap with other rec; GNSO Council should not determine how finances are allocated to WG members; what are cost barriers (time and costs?)?; training (wiki for example); identify cost barriers.	That the GNSO Council reduce time barriers to volunteer participation and consider ways enhance participation remotely without the need for travel expenditures.	Med	1-2	Hard	High	Yes	Yes	Yes/No	Medium
7	That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (Cs) engage more deeply with community 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 discussions with reps from SGs and Cs together and see what needs are before the WP makes a recommendation.	That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (Cs) strive to overcome language barriers by participating in the WG established under Recommendation 35.	Med	1	Hard	High	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
13	That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in WG consensus-based decision making.	WP believes in continuous improvement; 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 manager 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 due 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.	Guidance already exist; assistance is already made available. Chuck: The Working Party believes that guidance already exists and that assistance is already made 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: i) Evaluate the effectiveness and accessibility of guidance for new Constituency applications; ii) recommend improvements to the guidance and the available assistance as appropriate.		Low	3-5	Easy/Med	Low/Med	Yes	No	No	Low
4	That the GNSO Council introduce non-financial rewards and recognition for volunteers.	No financial rewards - such as travel funding.		Low	4	Easy	Low	No opinion	No	No	Low
28	That section 6.1.2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures be revised, as shown in Appendix 6, to clarify that key clauses are mandatory rather than advisory, and to institute meaningful sanctions for non-compliance where appropriate.			Low	4	Medium	Low	Yes	No	No	Low
34	That PDP WGs rotate the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish 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	4	Easy	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Low

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
30	That the GNSO develop and implement a policy for the provision of administrative support for SGs and Cs; and that SGs and Cs annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of administrative support they receive.	First part is done, but not the second. Chuck: The Working Party believes that there is already a procedure for providing some forms of administrative support to SGs and Cs but that there is not a procedure for SGs and Cs to evaluate the effectiveness of the support provided. GNSO action items: i) Identify and review the existing procedures for SGs and Cs to obtain administrative support; ii) evaluate the adequacy & effectiveness of the existing procedures including whether additional forms of support might be beneficial; iii) 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 strikes a balance between ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development.	Modify rec - input from 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 require 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.	Reword recommendation so that it corresponds to the process that Council goes through in terms of approving a PDP, forming a working group, etc. and that Council review accomplishment toward achieving diversity and proper representation of all stakeholders; begin data collection as soon as possible. The metrics used to measure diversity should be specified with more consideration to what can actually be defined and measured.	That, 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. When approving GNSO Policy, the Board should take into consideration if reasonable measures were taken to achieve such diversity.	Low	1-2	Hard	High	Yes/no opinion	Yes	No	Low
22	That the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework, which its members should utilise to identify development needs and opportunities.	Reword recommendation: develop a framework to identify training needs on policy development process so 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

Feasibility Assessment of Final Recommendations from the GNSO Review
24-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/Score [2]		Working Party Responses Provided in Survey (Survey Monkey) [1]					
Rec	**Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation**	**Comments & Notes from GNSO Review Working Party**	**GNSO Review WP Recommendation Language (yellow recs only)**	**WP Revised Priority**	**WP Revised Score [3]**	**WP-Ease of Implementation**	**WP-Cost of Implementation**	**WP-Align with Strategic Plan**	**WP-Impact Groups/Work [4]**	**WP-Additional Info? [5]**	**Survey Priority**
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.	This recommendation is not well phrased and does not compare 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
32	That ICANN define "cultural diversity" (possibly by using birth language); and regularly publish this along with geographic, gender and age group metrics, at least for the GNSO Council, SGs, Cs and WGs.	Do not implement - too broad.		N/A - Low		Medium	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Low
23	In order to support ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, all Cs should have seats on the GNSO Council, allocated equally (as far as numerically practicable) by their SGs.			N/A - Low		Hard	Low	Yes	Yes	No	Do not implement

Footnotes

(1) Prepared by Staff based on a survey completed by GNSO Review Working Party members. This included 13 responses (11 were complete and 2 were incomplete). However, the number of responses to any given question may vary.

The intent of the survey was to aggregate feedback from individual Review Team members to facilitate further analysis and discussion.

(2) Using the aggregation and categorization that resulted from the survey responses, the Working Party further analyzed and discussed each recommendation.

The outcome was the final determination of category (color designation) and Priority.

(3) to implement, low cost, alignment with strategic plan, no impact on other work or groups, no additional information needed, and high priority). The score was then tallied. The results ranged from 1 to 6 (for example, 6 met the most critiera and should be given higher priority during the implementation phase).

(4) The Working Party considered whether the recommendation had impact on other groups besides the GNSO and whether additional alignment would be needed.

(5) The Working Party considered whether additional information was needed in order to evaluate the recommendation.

	Priority				
Category	**High**	**Medium**	**Low**	Total	
Agreed	3	7	3	13	*36%*
Work already underway	4	7	3	14	*39%*
Agreed with modifications	0	3	3	6	*17%*
Did not agree	0	0	3	3	*8%*
	7	17	12	36	*100%*
	19%	*47%*	*33%*	*100%*	