

Discussion Paper on Options for Implementation of the Adopted GNSO Review Recommendations

Status of This Document

This Discussion Paper has been developed by ICANN Policy Support Staff and provided as input to the GNSO Council as it considers next steps in relation to the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations.

Preamble

On 14 April 2016 the GNSO Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis. As part of this motion the GNSO Council requested that ICANN policy staff prepare a Discussion Paper that outlines the possible options for dealing with the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations following adoption by the ICANN Board, while taking into account applicable best practices and lessons learned from past reviews.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. BACKGROUND	5
2. OVERVIEW OF REVIEW STRUCTURES TO DATE	8
3. GUIDANCE ON NEXT STEPS	12
ANNEX 1: GNSO REVIEW BACKGROUND	15

Executive Summary

As mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, organizational reviews are performed on a five-year cycle. In 2014 ICANN engaged Westlake Governance Limited as the independence examiner to conduct an independent review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), as mandated by ICANN's [Bylaws](#). The GNSO Review Working Party was formed to serve as a liaison between the GNSO, the Independent Examiner and the ICANN Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC).

The independent examiner submitted a Draft Report for [public comment](#) on 01 June 2015. The [Final Report](#) of the independent examiner was published on 15 September 2015 and contained 36 recommendations in the areas of: participation and representation, continuous development, transparency, and alignment with ICANN's future. The GNSO Review Working Party subsequently assessed these recommendations for priority and feasibility. Following approval by the ICANN Board of Directors, the GNSO is expected to develop a plan that outlines how it expects to implement these recommendations as well as the associated timeline, which needs to be approved by the GNSO Council as well as the ICANN Board.

On 14 April 2016 the GNSO Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis. In this motion the GNSO Council requested that ICANN policy staff prepare a Discussion Paper (this paper) that outlines the possible options for dealing with the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations following adoption by the ICANN Board, while taking into account applicable best practices and lessons learned from past reviews.

This Discussion Paper provides an overview of the GNSO reviews to date, analyzes the structures of the entities that were involved in each review, and discusses the pros and cons of the various potential implementation mechanisms. In this analysis staff notes the challenges and advantages for each structure, and suggests an approach that could take advantage of the benefits from both.

From this analysis, staff suggests that a model that has been tested and used in other circumstances could be used for the entity tasked by the GNSO Council to develop the implementation plan of the 2014 GNSO review recommendations. That model could be the GNSO Working Group. The Working Group Guidelines provide a template for the charter and guidelines for membership as well as decisionmaking. It is now a very familiar structure in ICANN and the GNSO and helps to set expectations for participants as well as scope and outcomes. Such a structure would not preclude the Working Group from forming Work Teams or Sub Groups if deemed necessary to carry out its work, but decision-making could rest with the Working Group and follow the Working Group Guidelines.

Concerning membership, staff suggests that the GNSO Council considers not following the standard open model, but instead adopt a hybrid structure, whereby each Stakeholder Group and/or Constituency could provide primary and alternate representatives as Working Group members, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees could be invited to provide observers, and the community could be invited to be participants, but would not be given the

status of members. GNSO Review Working Party members should be encouraged to participate in the Working Group as their experience with this GNSO Review exercise may be useful to the implementation phase.

1. Background

1.1. 2006 GNSO Review

As mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, organizational reviews are performed on a five-year cycle. The last review of the GNSO took place in 2006, with the [Report](#) issued by the independent examiner, the London School of Economics (LSE Public Policy Group), in September 2006. The work of the independent examiner was then considered by the ICANN Board of Directors Governance Committee, which issued its report on 03 February 2008. The Board endorsed the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee in June 2008. The [February 2008 Board Governance Committee \(BGC\) Report on GNSO Improvements](#) [PDF, 193 KB] outlined five target areas as shown in the [graphic](#) [PNG, 45 KB]. The improvement implementation work continued through 2012.

The 2008 review resulted in the GNSO Improvements Implementation Program. As reported on the [GNSO Improvements Portal](#), the GNSO Improvements Implementation Program had its origins in community preparation and planning activities that began in May 2008. In June 2008 ICANN published the GNSO [Improvements Top Level Plan](#) that described the structure and charters of the two steering committees to be tasked with implementation. On 25 July 2008 the Working Group on GNSO Council Restructuring, a group that was formed at the request of the Board¹, produced its [Report](#) to the Board, which included general concepts and principles regarding the future structure, composition and operation of the GNSO Council. It also provided recommendations for specific voting mechanisms and voting thresholds including initiating a Policy Development Process (PDP).

After the completion of this structural aspect of the review the program moved substantially forward at the Mexico City ICANN meeting (March 2009), at which time five work teams under the auspices of the two steering committees -- the Operational Steering Committee (OSC) and the Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) -- were officially inaugurated. After completing its fourth year of implementation, the program substantially developed the structures (as envisioned by the Working Group report above), policies, procedures, and disciplines designed

¹ The group consisted of GNSO community representatives from each constituency, a NomCom appointee, and a representative from each of the Advisory Committees that had liaisons to the GNSO. The members were: Avri Doria (NomCom Appointee representative), Chuck Gomes (gTLD Registries Constituency representative), Alan Greenberg (At-Large Advisory Committee), Tony Holmes (Internet Service and Connection Providers Constituency representative), Steve Metalitz (Intellectual Property Constituency representative), Milton Mueller (Non-Commercial Users Constituency representative), Jonathon Nevett (Registrar Constituency representative), Philip Sheppard (Commercial and Business Users Constituency representative), and Bertrand de La Chapelle (Governmental Advisory Committee).

to achieve long-term improvement in all five target areas.² The ICANN Board formally acknowledged the accomplishments of the Program and thanked the community for its work efforts in its [23 June 2012 resolution](#).

1.2. 2014 GNSO Review

The most recent GNSO review was initiated in July 2014 by ICANN with the assistance of the GNSO Review Working Party, which was comprised of GNSO community members in accordance with ICANN's Bylaws. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) -- formerly the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) -- of the ICANN Board is responsible for review and oversight of policies relating to ICANN's ongoing organizational review process, as mandated by ICANN's Bylaws. The ICANN Board appointed Westlake Governance as the independent examiner for the GNSO review.

Each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency appointed representatives to serve on the Working Party. The GNSO Review Working Party provided input on the review criteria, 360 assessment, and served as a conduit for input from GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies as well as the GNSO Council. The GNSO Review Working Party offered guidance to the independent examiner to ensure the draft report accurately reflected the GNSO structure, scope and dynamics.

The scope of the GNSO review was to assess the extent to which the improvements resulting from the 2008 review have been implemented and whether they successfully addressed the concerns that led to the review, and to consider whether the GNSO, as it is currently constituted, can respond to its changing environment. The independent examiner was not asked to assess various options and alternatives pertaining to the structure of the GNSO, but its inquiry into the effectiveness of GNSO operations led to structural considerations. The Draft Report was put out for [public comment](#) on 01 June 2105, and subsequently Westlake published its [Final Report](#) on 15 September 2015, with a [correction](#) to Recommendation 1 issued on 5 October 2015, with 36 recommendations. The recommendations were organized into the following themes:

1. Participation & Representation;
2. Continuous Development;
3. Transparency; and
4. Alignment with ICANN's future.

The GNSO Review Working Party reviewed the recommendations and conducted a [Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis](#), which it submitted to the GNSO Council on 28 February 2016. In its analysis document, the Working Party recommended to adopt all but three recommendations (21, 23, 32).

² See the target area graphic at: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/improvements/gns0-improvements-430x336-11jul12-en.png>.

On 14 April 2016 the GNSO Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis. In its adoption the GNSO Council amended the Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis to support the implementation of recommendation 21, to which the Working Party in turn agreed.

In addition, the GNSO Council requested that ICANN policy staff prepare a Discussion Paper that outlines the possible options for dealing with the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations following adoption by the ICANN Board, while taking into account applicable best practices and lessons learned from past reviews.

2. Overview of Review Structures to Date

2.1. 2006 GNSO Improvements Implementation Structure

The Working Group on GNSO Council Restructuring later formed the Planning Team that established the improvements implementation structure. The purpose of the Planning Team was to propose a work structure for implementing the non-contentious operational changes recommended by the Board Governance Committee Working Group on GNSO Improvements. This work structure was also used to implement all recommendations as appropriate once the full plan was adopted by the Board.

2.1.1. Steering Committees and Work Teams

Per the Planning Team recommendation, the improvements implementation structure was comprised of two steering committees:

- **GNSO Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC):** Provide oversight of efforts to enhance the policy development process including serving as the coordinating body for separate Work Teams tasked with developing a proposal for a new working group model and a new policy development process. These Work Teams were responsible for making recommendations concerning structure, processes and methods involved in the transition to a GNSO Working Group model.
- **Operations Steering Committee (OSC):** Provide oversight of efforts focused on recommendations concerning restructuring activities, constituency enhancements, and communications. This committee also tasked Work Teams to develop proposals to implement recommendations related to these three areas.

The Work Teams: The Steering Committees served as the coordinating body for these separate Work Teams. The following reasons were given for the Work Team structure: 1) recommendations span a significant list of topic areas, and dividing the work into teams may reduce the volume of work asked of each individual participant; and 2) successful implementation of certain recommendations may benefit from special expertise and experience.

Steering Committee Membership:

The Steering Committee was comprised of the following members:

- GNSO Council Chair or Vice Chair;
- One representative from each constituency (need not be a Council member);
- One Nominating Committee appointee to the GNSO;
- Optional liaisons or appointed representatives from the ALAC and the GAC;
- Work Team Chairs;
- GNSO Secretariat; and

- One ICANN policy staff representative.

Work Team Membership:

The Work Teams were composed of participants drawn from the GNSO Council, the GNSO constituencies and the larger ICANN/Internet community. They included:

- A minimum of one GNSO Councilor and preferably two Councilors to serve as liaisons between this team and the Council;
- A limit of three GNSO Councilors to maintain separation between the team's work and the Council's oversight role;
- One representative from each Constituency;
- Representatives (optional) from each Advisory Committee and Supporting Organization;
- Members from the community who are not associated with a Constituency or Advisory Committee (other than Nominating Committee appointed Councilors); and
- Initial/interim chair of the team from the associated Steering Committee,

Decisionmaking:

The Steering Committees, unless otherwise determined by their members, made decisions using a "full consensus of the members" process. This reflected the fact that the recommendations of this previous review were much broader than the current 2014 review, and affected many parts of the GNSO structures.

Work Teams functioned on the basis of "rough consensus" meaning that all points of view were discussed until the Chair could ascertain that the point of view is understood and has been covered. That consensus viewpoint was reported to the Steering Committee via a Work Team Report. Anyone with a minority view was invited to include a discussion in the Work Team Report. The minority view included the names and affiliations of those contributing to that part of the report. In producing the Work Team Report, the Chair was responsible for indicating each position as having one of the following designations:

- Unanimous consensus position ;
- Rough consensus position where a small minority disagrees but most agree ;
- Strong support, but significant opposition; and
- Minority viewpoint(s)

2.2. 2014 GNSO Review Working Party Structure

The Structural Improvements Committee of the Board (SIC) – which later became the OEC – 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. The structure of the GNSO Review Working Party was broadly similar to the GNSO Working Group structure, but did not follow the comprehensive [Working Group Guidelines](#) concerning chartering, scope, membership, and decisionmaking.

Membership:

Each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency was contacted and asked to consider designating a representative to join the GNSO Review Working Party. The names of the proposed candidates were submitted to the GNSO Secretariat. Other GNSO Review Working Party members could be appointed by Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as observers, although none decided to do so. The membership of the GNSO Review Working Party was comprised of up to three members from each Stakeholder Group, up to two members from each Constituency, up to two Nominating Committee appointees, and Supporting Organization/Advisory Committee observers. There were a total of 20 [members](#), although a small core group tended to be most active.

Decisionmaking:

The GNSO Review Working Party [Charter](#) did not describe the decisionmaking process. However, the Working Party did use various tools and methods to gather the members' views, and to determine levels of agreement, such as surveys and spreadsheets.

2.3. Pros and Cons of Review Structures

GNSO Improvements Implementation:

Although the structure of Steering Committees and Work Teams did allow for concurrent work, as described above, there were several disadvantages to this structure. First, it was overly bureaucratic. Each of the Work Teams had its own decision-making processes, but decisions were duplicated at the Steering Committee level. Second, communication and coordination were challenging. For example, although Work Teams were producing recommendations in different areas, these recommendations might have dependencies, which might not be discovered until the Work Team final reports when it was too late to reconcile them. The structure also likely resulted in redundancies among the various recommendations. Third, the bureaucratic and complicated structure resulted in volunteer frustration and drop out, which further slowed progress. In the end, many of the same volunteers were stretched among several Work Teams, or some Work Teams had only a very small number of volunteers at the end to finalize the work, which meant that the community was less well represented, and work took longer to complete.

GNSO Review Working Party:

With a core group of active members and only 21 members total, as well as a relatively streamlined structure, the GNSO Review Working Party was able to coordinate fairly closely. As there were no sub teams, communications also were simpler, as was decisionmaking. Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies were well represented, but there was no ability for the community to participate and as noted above not all members were active. The structure of the GNSO Working Party was not the same as a standard GNSO structure, such as a Policy Development Process Working Group. Thus, there was no standard format for the charter, the scope, or decisionmaking. While this lack of a standard structure may not have hindered the group's work, and all of the work was made very transparent via its wiki and web site, it is

possible that adopting in full the Working Group structure and [Guidelines](#) may have provided a more useful structure for the Working Party's work.

The following table lists the pros and cons of each structure.

Pros

	GNSO Improvements Implementation	GNSO Review Working Party
Structure	Ability to address multiple work tracks simultaneously; inclusive of community participation	Streamlined structure (only 21 members, a core active group, and no sub teams) enabled close coordination and communication
Membership	Steering Committee included representatives from all Constituencies while Work Teams included the full community	Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies were all represented
Decisionmaking	Well defined	Used various tools to address varying points of view and determine levels of agreement

Cons

	GNSO Improvements Implementation	GNSO Review Working Party
Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureaucratic • Lack of coordination • Communication challenges • Volunteer fatigue and frustration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacked a standard GNSO structure (such as a Working Group) • Not all members were active
Membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stretched among Work Teams • Volunteer drop out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited pool that did not include the community
Decisionmaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplicative • Uncoordinated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal decisionmaking rules or process

Staff suggests that the structure for the entity that the GNSO Council will establish to carry out the 2014 GNSO Review implementation could benefit from the current Working Group structure, with its extensive guidelines, while taking advantage of the benefits of each of the previous structures. The Working Group model also would not preclude the Working Group from forming Work Teams or Sub Groups if deemed necessary, but decision-making would rest with the Working Group and follow the Working Group guidelines, via full consensus or consensus (note, the GNSO Council could require that the Working Group can only put forward recommendations that have attained full consensus or consensus support).


Concerning membership, the GNSO Review Working Party had the advantage of confirmed members from each Stakeholder Group and Constituency, with alternates. However, without the possibility for community participation it is possible that type of structure may not be sufficient to develop the implementation plan for the 2014 GNSO Review recommendations in a timely manner. The GNSO Council could instead consider a hybrid structure, whereby each Stakeholder Group and Constituency could provide primary and alternate representatives as Working Group members, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees could be invited to provide observers, and the community could be invited to be participants, but would not be given the status of members. The community then could participate in the work, but would not

be part of any consensus call. GNSO Review Working Party members, particularly the core active group, should be encouraged to join the Working Group to provide their in-depth expertise.

3. Guidance on Next Steps

The GNSO Council will first need to determine the appropriate mechanism to develop the implementation plan and, following approval of the plan by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board, carry out this plan. The GNSO Council is expected to agree on the entity to be used to develop the implementation plan and this entity will then need to be chartered and convened. The implementation plan that is to be developed for GNSO Council and ICANN Board approval is expected to include a feasibility timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome. The GNSO Council will decide on the optimal structure of this entity and request staff to initiate a Call for Volunteers as necessary.

The following is a suggested timeline:



3.1. Proposed Implementation Entity

The following is the staff's suggested proposal for the implementation entity for GNSO Council consideration.

Structure:

As noted above, the Steering Committee and Work Team approach posed challenges for participation, communication and coordination, and decisionmaking. The streamlined structure of the GNSO Review Working Party had advantages, but was not a standard GNSO structure. Staff suggests that based on past experience it will be important to choose a standard GNSO structure, and recommends using the Working Group model to form a GNSO Review Implementation Working Group. The Working Group Guidelines provide a template for the charter and guidelines for membership as well as decisionmaking. This is now a very familiar structure in ICANN and the GNSO, and thus will help to set expectations for participants as well as scope and outcomes. Such a structure would not preclude the Working Group from forming Work Teams or Sub Groups if deemed necessary, but decision-making would rest with the GNSO

Review Implementation Working Group and follow the Working Group guidelines. Furthermore, the GNSO Council would serve as the oversight body and ultimate approver of the implementation plan as well as actual implementation of the recommendations through tested mechanisms such as a Council liaison to the WG as well as regular updates that ensure the progress of the WG.

Chartering:

The template for the Charter could follow that which is in the Working Group Guidelines, but consideration will need to be given to how guidance from the Board is factored in, either as part of the adoption of the recommendations and/or throughout the process. To develop the charter, the GNSO Council could convene a small Drafting Team, if deemed necessary, or alternatively request that staff prepare a first draft based on the approach outlined in this discussion paper. The scope of the Charter would be to first develop the implementation plan for the 2014 GNSO review recommendations, followed by the execution of this implementation plan after GNSO Council and ICANN Board approval. The execution may result in proposed changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures and/or ICANN Bylaws.

Membership:

Concerning membership, as noted above the GNSO Council could consider a hybrid structure for the GNSO Review Implementation Working Group, whereby each Stakeholder Group and Constituency could provide primary and alternate representatives as Working Group members, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees could be invited to provide observers, and the community could be invited to be participants, but would not be given the status of members. The community then could participate in the work, but would not have decisionmaking authority. Members of the GNSO Review Working Party, particularly those who were part of the core active group, should be encouraged to join the Working Group so that they can lend their in-depth expertise.

Decision-making:

With respect to decision-making, the Working Group could follow the Working Group guidelines, but given the importance of the decisions, it may be worth specifying that only recommendations that attained full consensus or consensus support are to be transmitted to the GNSO Council for approval. It should be noted that in the previous review, when the PPSC and OSC were introduced, there was concern that some recommendations might get passed up to the Board without unanimous support, and thus both Steering Committees operated under full consensus and took the final decisions. This also is the decisionmaking model for the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI), the entity currently tasked with considering revisions to the current GNSO Operating Procedures. However, it is important to highlight that the recommendations of the previous review were much broader and affected many parts of the GNSO structures which is not expected to be the case here. Furthermore, ultimate approval would lie with the GNSO Council for any recommendations and as such, limiting recommendations to be transmitted to only those that would have full consensus or consensus support would avoid that any recommendations not having consensus support would need to be considered by the GNSO Council.

Future Considerations:

With respect to the role of the SCI, it is important to note that it was created as a result of the 2006 GNSO Review and consequent Improvements Implementation Process. Its original [charter](#) stated, “The GNSO Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation (SCI) will be responsible for reviewing and assessing the effective functioning of recommendations provided by the Operational Steering Committee (OSC), Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) and Policy Development Process Work Team (PDP-WT) and approved by the GNSO Council.”³ Its scope is thus limited to considering the GNSO Operating Procedures in their current state. Nevertheless, at the end of the 2014 GNSO review implementation the GNSO Council may consider whether to charter a new entity, or to re-charter the SCI following an analysis of the type of entity and scope of review that will be needed for the final implemented mechanisms and procedures resulting from this 2014 GNSO Review. This entity (whether new or reconstituted) would oversee the consequences arising from the implementation of the 2014 GNSO Review and/or address recommendations for future changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. Also, to avoid potential overlap in relation to work by the SCI under its current Charter and the proposed new GNSO Review Implementation Working Group (particularly on issues that may affect similar parts of the GNSO Operating Procedures), the GNSO Council may wish to consider pausing the efforts of the SCI once it has completed its current assignments, until such time as the implementation of the 2014 GNSO Review is complete.

3.2. For discussion

As the Council reviews this discussion paper and considers potential next steps, it may wish to examine the following questions:

- Is the proposed structure in this discussion paper, a GNSO Review Implementation Working Group, the optimal vehicle to develop the implementation plan and subsequently execute on the implementation plan, or are there other options that should be considered?
- Are there other safeguards that should be considered to ensure that some of the cons identified in relation to the other structures that have been used in the context of a GNSO Review are mitigated?
- What can be done to ensure sufficient participation and community engagement throughout this process, considering workload and other priorities?
- What steps can be taken to effectively engage with the ICANN Board and OEC throughout the implementation process?

³ The Charter was later updated to charge the SCI with “reviewing and assessing the effective functioning of the GNSO Procedures and Working Group Guidelines”, to more accurately reflect the fact that the approved PPSC and OSC recommendations had subsequently been codified as the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Annex 1: GNSO Review Background

As mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, organizational reviews are performed on a five-year cycle. The last review of the GNSO took place in 2006, with the report issued by the independent examiner, The London School of Economics (LSE Public Policy Group), in September 2006. The work of the independent examiner was then considered by the Board Governance Committee, which issued its report on 3 February 2008. The Board endorsed the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee in June 2008. The [February 2008 Board Governance Committee \(BGC\) Report on GNSO Improvements](#) [PDF, 193 KB] outlined five target areas as shown in the [graphic](#) [PNG, 45 KB]. The improvement implementation work continued through 2012.

The most recent GNSO review was initiated in July 2014 by ICANN with the assistance of the GNSO Review Working Party, which was comprised of GNSO community members in accordance with ICANN's Bylaws. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) -- formerly the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) -- of the ICANN Board is responsible for review and oversight of policies relating to ICANN's ongoing organizational review process, as mandated by ICANN's Bylaws. The OEC is the entity that will accept the final report, GNSO recommendations, and implementation plan, as well as prepare the recommendations for Board action. The ICANN Board appointed Westlake Governance as the Independent Examiner for the GNSO review.

The scope of the GNSO review was to assess the extent to which the improvements resulting from the 2008 review have been implemented and whether they successfully addressed the concerns that led to the review, and to consider whether the GNSO, as it is currently constituted, can respond to its changing environment. The Independent Examiner was not asked to assess various options and alternatives pertaining to the structure of the GNSO, but its inquiry into the effectiveness of GNSO operations led to structural considerations. The Draft was put out for [public comment](#) on 01 June 2015, and subsequently Westlake published their [Final Report](#) on 15 September 2015, with a [correction](#) to Recommendation 1 issued on 5 October 2015, with 36 recommendations. The recommendations were organized into the following themes:

1. Participation & Representation;
2. Continuous Development;
3. Transparency;
4. Alignment with ICANN's future.

1.1 GNSO Review Working Party

The GNSO Review Working Party was formed to serve as a liaison between the GNSO, the independent examiner (Westlake) and the ICANN Board's OEC. Each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency appointed representatives to serve on the Working Party. The GNSO Review Working Party provided input on the review criteria, 360 assessment, and served as a conduit for input from GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies as well as the GNSO Council. The GNSO Review Working Party offered guidance to the independent examiner to ensure the draft report accurately reflected the GNSO structure, scope and dynamics.

A Draft Report was submitted for [public comment](#). The [Final Report](#) of the Independent Examiner was published on 15 September 2015 and contained 36 recommendations in the areas of: participation and representation, continuous development, transparency and alignment with ICANN's future. The GNSO Review Working Party reviewed the recommendations and conducted a [Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis](#). The GNSO Review Working Party examined each recommendation with regard to: easy (or difficulty) of implementation, projected cost of implementation, its alignment with the GNSO's strategic plan, whether it impacts existing work, or is already part of an existing organizational improvement effort. The GNSO Review Working Party submitted its Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis to the GNSO Council on 28 February 2016. In its analysis document, the Working Party recommended to adopt all but three recommendations (21, 23, 32). On 14 April 2016 the GNSO Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis. In its adoption the GNSO Council amended the Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis to support the implementation of recommendation 21, to which the Working Party in turn agreed.

1.2 GNSO Working Party Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis

The Independent Examiner's Final Report contained 36 recommendations. The GNSO Review Working Party grouped the recommendations as follows:

- Working Party suggestions adoption of this recommendation (coded green);
- Working Party is in agreement and flags that work is already underway (coded orange);
- Working Party agrees with intent and suggests modification to recommendation language (coded yellow); and
- Do not implement (coded red).

The Working Party also sorted the recommendations by priority and attributed a score to each: 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 determined by assigning a score of "1" to each category that met the criteria. The score was then tallied. The results ranged from 1 to 6 (for example, 6 met the most criteria and should be given higher priority during the implementation phase). Finally, the recommendations were sorted numerically if the ranking (high/med/low/do not implement and score) is the same. As noted above, in its analysis document, the Working Party recommended to adopt all but three recommendations (21, 23, 32), but later agreed to support the implementation of recommendation 21 per the GNSO Council motion.

1.3 GNSO Review Working Party Suggested Next Steps

The GNSO Review Working Party provided additional guidance concerning the independent examiner's recommendations and the Working Party's approach to assessing and prioritizing at a [Webinar](#) held for the GNSO Council on 12 April 2016. In its Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis, the GNSO Review Working Party proposed that the OEC move forward with those recommendations color-coded green or yellow (incorporating its proposed revisions) and reinforce those in orange within existing work. The Working Party also proposed that the OEC should not proceed with those color-coded red (indicated as "do not implement"). In addition,

the Working Party proposed that it 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.

On 15 May 2016, the OEC considered all relevant documents, including the Final Report and the GNSO Working Party's Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis of the GNSO Review Recommendations and recommended to the Board to adopt the Final Report's recommendations, with the exception of recommendations 23 and 32.