

After Action Report on the Standing Committee on Budget and Operations

17 September 2018

Status of This Document

This is the final version of the After Action Report of the GNSO Council's Standing Committee on Budget and Operations.

Preamble

The objective of this After Action Report is to document the activities, deliberations, and comment submissions of the GNSO Council's Standing Committee on Budget and Operations in the first and second trimesters of 2018. The GNSO Council is to consider whether this Standing Committee shall continue for future budgetary cycles and, if so, whether amendments to its charter are required.

Table of Contents

1 AFTER ACTION REPORT	3
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.2 PUBLIC COMMENTS SUBMITTED	3
1.3 TIMELINES	4
1.4 QUESTIONS CONSIDERED BY SCBO MEMBERS.....	4
2 ANNEX A - CHARTER	7
3 ANNEX B – SG/C INPUT TO REPORT	14

1 After Action Report

1.1 Introduction

The Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operations (SCBO) was formed in December 2017 to assist the GNSO Council in formulating public comments and other submissions that related to ICANN's fiscal year budgeting process. Its [charter](#) (attached in Annex A) was adopted by the GNSO Council on 21 December 2017. The task of the SCBO is to coordinate and facilitate dialogue to fully understand ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes, in particular in preparation for the annual budgetary comments cycle so far as it relates to the GNSO Council's remit.

[Membership](#) of the SCBO was initially open only to GNSO Council members as appointed by their respective GNSO Stakeholder Group or Constituency. Members developed the Terms of Reference for the SCBO, within which it was identified that other members of the GNSO may be able to contribute meaningfully to the SCBO's work. Accordingly, from January 2018 onwards GNSO SG/Cs could optionally appoint to the SCBO subject matter experts to feed into the work of the SCBO. Throughout the first and second trimesters of 2018, subject matter experts have participated in the calls and mailing list of the SCBO on equal footing with the GNSO Council members.

The SCBO's [wiki page](#) contains details of membership composition, the SCBO's charter, the audio recordings of all meetings held, and the comments that the SCBO has produced. It should be noted that the calls of the SCBO are not transcribed, as there is no budget to do this.

1.2 Public Comments Submitted

The intent behind launching the SCBO was to ensure that the GNSO Council was well-positioned to produce accurate, detailed, and meaningful comments on matters that had significant financial implications for the PTI/IANA and/or ICANN org. In this spirit, in the first and second trimesters of 2018 the SCBO has drafted comments on behalf of the GNSO Council related to the ICANN's fiscal year budgetary process for the PTI/IANA and ICANN org, and, unique to FY19, two comments related to ICANN's Reserve Fund. These draft comments were all subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council and then submitted:

- [Draft PTI and IANA FY19 Operating Plans and Budgets](#)
- [ICANN Reserve Fund – Public Comment on Rationale and Target Level](#)
- [ICANN's Draft FY19 Budget and Operating Plan](#)
- [ICANN Reserve Fund – Proposed Replenishment Strategy](#)

1.3 Timelines

The following table outlines the typical timeline and duration of key milestones of the budgetary process for PTI/IANA and ICANN Org. The intent is to provide the GNSO Council with a tool for resource planning in coming years. Actual fiscal year budget timelines, which may vary from year to year, will continue to be tracked by the SCBO, should it continue:

Budget Process Timeline and Duration

Step	Date/Duration	Action By	Note
FYXX Planning Kickoff Webinar	August	ICANN Org	FYXX Planning Process and Timeline
PTI & IANA OP&B DRAFT Submitted to PTI Board & ICANN BFC	End of August	PTI Board	At Least 9 Months Before Next Fiscal Year (Input to ICANN OP&B Per Bylaws)
PTI & IANA Public Comment Period	Mid-September	Community	45 Days (52 Days Minus 7 Days ICANN Meeting)
PTI & IANA Staff Report on Public Comment Published	Mid-December	ICANN Org	Staff Report Published
PTI Adopted	Early January	PTI Board	
ICANN Public Comment Period	Mid-November	Community	53 Days (8 weeks)
Staff Report on Public Comment Published	Early March	ICANN Org	Staff Report Published
ICANN Proposed OP&B Submitted to ICANN Board	Early April	ICANN Board	At Least 45 Days Before Next Fiscal Year (Per Bylaws)
ICANN Board Adopts	Mid-April	ICANN Board	Target to allow for EC Review Period

**Timeline is one month earlier than FY19 dates

1.4 Questions Considered by SCBO Members

The SCBO engaged in an extended period of reflection in the second trimester of 2018 in order to understand its effectiveness and to identify any areas of improvement. GNSO SGs/Cs, through their members appointed to the SCBO, were asked to review the SCBO's charter and to suggest edits (if applicable) and to review its work.

Please note: that the views expressed in this section are only of the SCBO members and subject matter experts from their respective groups who participated in the process of reflection. Actual submissions can be found in Annex B of this report.

1) Should the SCBO continue to exist?

Yes. Participants of the SCBO agreed that the GNSO Council should continue to support the SCBO and empower it to submit input into the annual ICANN budgetary process so far as it pertains to the GNSO Council's remit in managing the policy development process. There was also agreement that the enhanced collaboration with SGs/Cs helped refined draft comments at the Council level versus more specific comments that would be submitted by other groups.

2) Does the charter need to be amended? If so, how?

No. At this time, the SCBO agreed that the current charter sufficiently documents the operating activity and scope of the SCBO. However, the members of the SCBO agreed that suggested changes would certainly be welcomed from the GNSO Council.

3) Was there adequate representation from the Council?

Yes. For the FY18 budget cycle, a total of six Council members participated throughout the year. High attendance is always an issue for Working Groups in general, but members of the SCBO maintained a high level of commitment in participating in the SCBO's activities, meeting up to four times per month in some months, in addition to high volumes of email traffic. Attendance tracking of Council members and subject matter experts can be found [here](#).

Council leadership, designated as Observers, also participated in the activities of the SCBO, with the Council Chair being the most active. The SCBO found this participation to be particularly helpful in helping guide the group on changes to draft statements that could easily find consensus. Where no consensus was found within the SCBO, it was subsequently determined that many positions were submitted via their respective SGs/Cs.

4) Was participation from SG/C subject matter experts who were not Council members helpful?

Yes. There were a total of seven subject matter experts that volunteered for the effort across two stakeholder groups. The overall average attendance percentage of the subject matter experts exceeded the average attendance percentage of Council members across the twelve tracked meetings. Much of the subject matter expert's input brought to the SCBO institutional knowledge that would otherwise not have been available without prior research. The subject matter experts were also able to provide the SCBO with insight into how positions on issues were being formulated from their respective SGs/Cs.

5) Should the Council submit comments without objection or create a motion for adoption?

With one objection, there was no strong position on this matter. Some respondents noted that when the public comment forum opens for the draft budget, the time it takes to formulate draft comments at the SCBO level, and to submit a draft to the Council within the documents and motion deadline, makes this deadline extremely challenging to meet. In February 2018, for instance, the SCBO had four calls, exchanged 168 emails, and made over 500 edits in the Google Doc of the SCBO's draft budget comment in the rush to find consensus. In this spirit, the process of submission without objection is the most agile approach, and perhaps should be maintained and only addressed if the GNSO Council is confronted with it becoming an issue. One objection

to the above response was received, with this respondent advising that Councilors should always review comments prior to being submitted by the GNSO Council.

6) Should proposed comments be more precise?

Yes. The SCBO believes the Council's comments on the budget would be more impactful if comments were more precise and offered granular recommendations on behalf of the entire GNSO on the matters that are of importance for the GNSO directly.

7) Should collaboration with the ccNSO be established?

The SCBO has no strong opinion with regard to collaboration with the ccNSO. Theoretically, it might be valuable, however, it is hard to assess if it would be beneficial practically. Time constraints given the tight budget cycle might also make this difficult. One option to consider is for the Chair of the SCBO and the Chair of the SPOC, and any members or subject matter experts of the SCBO that may be available to meet informally independent of their respective groups to exchange ideas and report back to their respective groups.

8) Was collaboration with ICANN's Finance team useful and are changes required should the SCBO continue?

The SCBO has found collaboration with ICANN's Finance team to be invaluable. We have appreciated how promptly the Finance team has responded to the SCBO's questions and investigations into the budget, and we hope very much that this collaboration can continue.

9) How do we better understand when the GNSO Council should be making comments vs. comments submitted from SGs/Cs and avoid overlap or competing positions?

One respondent did not support the GNSO Council taking such a role; their comments raised concerns about the GNSO Council analyzing or commenting on SG/C comments submitted directly into the ICANN Budget processes. Concerns referenced included the issues of time demands for the Council and also disruption to the autonomy of the bottom-up process of the SGs/Cs. Another respondent's more general comments supported this concern. The comment recognized that GNSO Councilors are obviously highly influential in their own communities and will reflect concerns about how the budget supports the GNSO policy work, and also acknowledged the Council's particular focus on budget issues that affect the work of the GNSO Council and the Council's role in the empowered community. Only two relevant comments were received regarding this question.

2 Annex A - Charter

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

SC Name:	GNSO Council Standing Committee on ICANN's Budget and Operations	
Section I: Standing Committee Identification		
Chartering Organization(s):	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council	
Charter Approval Date:	21 December 2017	
Name of committee Chair/Co-Chairs:	Ayden Férdeline	
Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):	Heather Forrest	
Committee Workspace URL:	https://community.icann.org/display/GCSCOIBOP	
Committee Mailing List:	http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-sc-budget/	
GNSO Council Resolution:	Title:	Adopt the charter for the GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations (SCBO) on an interim basis
	Ref # & Link:	https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171221-1
Important Document Links:	Not applicable	
Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables		
Mission & Scope:		
<p>The task of the Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operations (SCBO) is to coordinate and facilitate dialogue to fully understand ICANN's strategic and operational planning and budgetary processes, in particular in preparation for the annual budgetary comments cycle as it relates to the GNSO Council's remit.</p> <p>The committee's scope of activities will encompass monitoring relevant information and formulating proposed positions that are submitted to the GNSO Council for approval with regards to ICANN's Budget and Operating Planning cycle as it relates to its remit in managing the GNSO's policy development process and the GNSO's role as a Decisional Participant in the</p>		

Empowered Community. The standing committee cannot initiate any action or decision on its own, unless specifically instructed by the GNSO Council – any and all recommendations will need to be submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration. While GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies (SGs/Cs) file their own comments specific to their respective SG/C, interested subject matter experts may be invited to contribute to the input for the GNSO Council as recommended by the standing committee.

Membership of the committee is open only to GNSO Council members as elected by their respective Stakeholder Group, although participants from GNSO SG/Cs with relevant expertise (who may not be GNSO Council members) may be welcomed. Any formal decisions, however, are expected to be taken by the members of the standing committee.

In achieving its objective, the standing committee will undertake, but is not limited to, the following activities:

- Disseminate and summarize information relevant to ICANN’s operational plan and budget;
- Formulate and prepare comments to be submitted as part of ICANN’s and IANA-PTI’s fiscal year budget cycle;
- Monitor and disseminate information pertaining to ICANN’s quarterly review as it pertains to actual spend versus planned budget;
- Inform or advise the GNSO Council should a rejection of the ICANN Budget be triggered;
- Organizing GNSO focused strategy and operations sessions at ICANN events as required.

Objectives & Goals:

To develop, at a minimum, draft comments and recommendations on issues relating to ICANN’s Draft Budget and Operating Plan for each fiscal year’s planning cycle as it pertains to the scope of the GNSO Council.

Deliverables & Timeframes:

Deliverables will mostly take the form of draft correspondence and/or comments, which if adopted by the GNSO Council, can be submitted to the relative public comment forum. All other deliverables will take the form of status reports or summaries of ICANN budget and finance related activities.

The standing committee shall respect the timelines and deliverables as posted on ICANN’s Public Comments web pages. Because the draft of comments coming from the standing committee are ultimately adopted (either by motion or absence of objection) by the GNSO Council prior to formal submission, the standing committee will also respect the GNSO Council meeting schedule, as well as, its motions and documents deadline dates in preparation for meetings.

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

Members of the standing committee will be comprised of volunteers from the GNSO Council and nomination of the chair will be determined by said committee. Each Stakeholder Group is expected to designate at least 1 Council member and 1 alternate to this effort. Membership to the standing committee will be based on a Council member's term. Constitution of the Committee will be reviewed at each AGM (Annual General Meeting) as Council member terms expire and new members are elected by their respective Stakeholder Groups. The Standing Committee may decide to solicit additional volunteers throughout the year as needed. Members will be listed on the community wiki.

GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency members that have specific interest and expertise in budget and strategic plan can follow the deliberations and are encouraged to sign up as participants. The standing committee may decide to invite the input from participants as deemed appropriate (e.g. in mailing list discussions and/or calls), but formal decisions will only be taken by Council members to the committee. It is expected that SG/C leadership will inform their respective member's interest in participating to the GNSO Secretariat. Participants will also be documented on the wiki.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

The SCBO will be a standing committee. This standing committee will be formally chartered by the GNSO Council via an approved motion and Council membership will be confirmed within the GNSO Council by each Stakeholder Group within three weeks after the end of the AGM (Annual General Meeting). After charter adoption and conclusion of AGMs, the GNSO Secretariat should circulate a 'Call For Volunteers' to SG/C leadership to confirm continuing interest by existing participants or solicit for new interest.

Review of Standing Committee Charter and Activities:

A review of this charter and activities is expected to take place at each AGM, or shortly thereafter or when considered necessary, for instance when the general ICANN process will change and affects the charter of the standing committee.

Staff Support:

The ICANN staff assigned to the standing committee will fully support the work of the standing committee as requested by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.

Staff assignments to the standing committee:

- GNSO Secretariat
- ICANN policy staff members

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:

Each member of the SCBO is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision-Making Methodologies:

The standing committee's decisions will only be limited to consensus on which input and/or recommendations to put forward to the GNSO Council for formal consideration (for example, in the form of a draft of public comment). As noted below, any formal decisions are expected to reflect the consensus of the members of the standing committee. In making an assessment of whether consensus has been achieved, the chair is expected to factor in whether adequate input has been received from both houses of the GNSO Council as well as follow the standard methodology for decision-making as outlined in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

The Chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus**.
- **Consensus** - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. *[Note: For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of 'Consensus' with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP originated Working Group, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term 'Consensus' as this may have legal implications.]*

In cases of **Consensus**, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present any **Minority View** recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of **Minority View** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s).

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

- i. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.
- ii. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
- iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.
- iv. In rare case, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
 - A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
 - It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **Consensus** and **Strong support but Significant Opposition** or between **Strong support but Significant Opposition** and **Divergence**.

Based upon the SCBO's needs, the Chair may direct that members do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls were taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire standing committee and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all standing committee members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the standing committee. Member(s) of the standing committee should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the standing committee discussion. However, if disagreement persists, members may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a standing committee disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair, copying the standing committee explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the CO liaison(s). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s) must explain their reasoning in the response. If the CO liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the complainants' position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.
3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 below).

Note 1: Any standing committee member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single standing committee member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.

Note 2: It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this process.

Status Reporting:

The Chair of the standing committee will report regularly through email to the GNSO Council and provide a full report at the GNSO meetings held during the ICANN meetings regarding the activities of the standing committee.

Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:

{Note: the following material was extracted from Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7 of the Working Group Guidelines and may be modified by the Chartering Organization at its discretion}

The standing committee will adhere to [ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior](#) as documented in Section F of the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles, January 2008.

If a committee member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first to the Chair and Liaison and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to some but are not necessarily intended as such. However, it is expected that committee members make every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior as referenced above.

The Chair is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the standing committee. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the Chartering Organization. Generally, the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed.

Any committee member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the committee should first discuss the circumstances with the standing committee Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the committee member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative.

In addition, if any member of the committee is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked.

Closure:

The standing committee will close upon an approved motion by the GNSO Council if it determines that it is no longer effective or required.

Section V: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description
v0.6.2	5 Dec 2017	Import of draft into standard GNSO template and content edits
V1.0	21 Dec 2017	Update of header after GNSO Council approach

Staff Contact:	Marika Konings	Email:	Policy-Staff@icann.org
-----------------------	----------------	---------------	--

3 Annex B – SG/C Input to Report

The following are comments submitted from SGs/Cs as input into the SCBO report. Content was extracted from emails sent to the mailing list and formatted only for a consistent look.

NCSG – Submitted 15 August 2018:

Should the SCBO continue to exist?

The NCSG supports the continuation of the SCBO.

Does the charter need to be amended? If so, how?

The NCSG suggests no alterations to the current charter.

Was there adequate representation from the Council?

While the NCSG is satisfied that the membership composition of the SCBO should in theory allow for adequate and broad representation from the GNSO Council, in practice the number of members dialling into calls has been low. It would be advantageous if all members attended at least 80% of all scheduled calls.

Was participation from SG/C subject matter experts who were not Council members helpful?

Yes. The NCSG is of the position that participation from various SG/C subject matter experts has enriched the work and inputs of the SCBO.

Should the Council submit comments without objection or create a motion for adoption?

The NCSG has no strong position on this matter, but we note that the submission of comments absent objections is a more agile approach.

Should proposed comments be more precise?

Yes. The NCSG believes the Council's comments on the budget would be more impactful if comments were more precise and offered granular recommendations on behalf of the entire GNSO on the matters that are of importance for the GNSO directly. In making repeated references to differing opinions and the perspectives of the various SGs and Cs, the Council diminishes its ability to advance meaningful comments.

Should collaboration with the CCNSO be established?

The NCSG has no strong opinion with regard to collaboration with the ccNSO. Theoretically, it might be valuable, however, it is hard to assess if it would be beneficial practically.

Was collaboration with ICANN's Finance team useful and are changes required should the SCBO continue?

The NCSG has found collaboration with the Finance team to be invaluable. We have appreciated how promptly the Finance team has responded to the SCBO's questions and investigations into the budget, and we hope very much that this collaboration can continue.

How do we better understand when the GNSO Council should be making comments vs. comments submitted from SGs/Cs and avoid overlap or competing positions?

The NCSG has no input at this time.

ISPCP – Submitted 31 August 2018:

The ISPCP supports the continuation of this committee. It is open to amendments to charter or representation as long as those do not affect/undermine/supersede the ability of the SG/Cs to provide their inputs in their own rights.

BC – Submitted 08 September 2018:**Should the SCBO continue to exist?**

BC: Yes, within its current ToR

Does the charter need to be amended? If so, how?

The Current ToR seems adequate and focused.

Was there adequate representation from the Council?

Yes.

Was participation from SG/C subject matter experts who were not Council members helpful?

Speaking as SG/C SMEs we found the opportunity to lend input and analysis useful and also helpful to reflect back into our own work on the overall ICANN budget. The BC members and councilors supported the BC SME engagement.

Should the Council submit comments without objection or create a motion for adoption?

This is a matter for the BC Councilors and other Councilors to consider. However, the BC does not support an automatic approval. Review and agreement by whatever mechanism the gNSO Council agrees on is in the hands of the GNSO Councilors. The BC Councilors will address BC views, if this is further discussed.

Should proposed comments be more precise?

This is difficult to comment on, as if the group continues, it will then define how best to draft its comments. In many cases, general comments, with examples are more helpful than precise comments that are difficult to understand without examples.

Should collaboration with the CCNSO be established?

This is very worthwhile to consider. The CCNSO however is different from the GNSO Council so it has a holistic approach to analyzing the ICANN Budget, and the BC budget committee always follows closely the analysis of the CCNSO on the overall budget. If the proposal is to focus on which elements are relevant to both Councils regarding support to the Councils' work, this collaboration could be useful. However, for the GNSO, as analysis of the ICANN budget/strategic plan is spread across the SO and AC sub groups, this would need to be taken into consideration.

Was collaboration with ICANN's Finance team useful and are changes required should the SCBO continue?

Just continue present engagement. The Finance Team has been very responsive to any questions submitted and accepted invitations to all working calls.

How do we better understand when the GNSO Council should be making comments vs. comments submitted from SGs/Cs and avoid overlap or competing positions?

This is a bit tricky, as at least in the BC, the overall ICANN budget/Strategic Plan analysis and comments rests with the processes of the BC, led by the Vice President of Finance and Operations but supported by a working group in the BC. Issues specific to the policy development process are informed by the Councilors and Vice Chair, Policy Coordination and are incorporated into the fuller BC analysis and comments but also deserve to have the visibility within the GNSO Council given the priority of GTLD policy to the BC. The BC prefers that the GNSO policy Council focus on its role and purpose and comments that are about how policy coordination/development is served by ICANN, but strongly supports that that these comments/concerns be reflected by its participants in the overall ICANN budget working group through the SMEs from each of the SGs/Constituencies.

RrSG – Submitted 08 September 2018:

The RrSG has no objections to the continued existence of this group.