**13.1 on GNSO and the wider ICANN community developing ways to make the GNSO PDP process more time-effective**

The future of the bottom-up multi-stakeholder model depends on a PDP that is timely —and– results in quality outcomes. PDP performance should be judged not only on time elapsed, but on participativeness, rigour and agreement.

However, right now, a main challenge is that the average time to complete a PDP can be a barrier to participation and can undermine the ICANN model.  Committing to participating in a PDP Working Group for a year or more is something individuals often can’t afford and commercial organizations cannot justify.  The anticipated time also makes the PDP an unattractive mechanism for addressing urgent, and creates incentives for parties to escalate these immediately to other structures, such as the Board or GAC. So while we believe the PDP should be judged on several criteria, time-effectiveness needs to be addressed.

At the same time, as with our comments on item 13.4 below, we are concerned that speed not be the main metric used to determine the performance of the GNSO.

We suggest this recommendation stress more that ‘time-effective’ encompasses efficient use of participants’ time – including work-planning, preparation for and chairing of calls and follow-up activities between WG meetings. We have made good progress on some of these activities – for example, ‘mind-mapping’ each WG’s PDP Charter to better plan its work sequence and dependencies – but we need to do more and better on how WG’s produce their work and, particularly, come to agreements on it. We appreciate the ATRT2’s focus on this issue and will do our best to implement its recommendations and continually improve.

Additionally we suggest that while a priority concern is time-effectiveness and the fact that the PDP takes too long in some cases, reference might be also made in your recommendations to other, more qualitative measures of the effectiveness of policy-making; deliberativeness, participation and support.