

Independent Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization - Draft Report

Public Comment Input Template

The Report Summary (Section 1, pages 4-20) offers a brief overview of Westlake’s work and outlines 36 proposed recommendations. Please refer to the specific recommendation and relevant section of the Draft Report for additional details and context about each recommendation.

The purpose of the Public Comment posting is to request community feedback on the Draft Report published by Westlake Governance, the independent examiner appointed by the Structural Improvements Committee of the ICANN Board for the review of the Generic Names Support Organization (GNSO). The Draft Report can be found at www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gnso-review-draft-29may15-en.pdf.

The following template has been developed to facilitate input to this Public Comment. Use of the template is not required but is strongly encouraged to ensure that comments are appropriately applied. This template provides the opportunity for general input on the proposal as well as specific comments by section. Please note that there is no obligation to complete all of the sections – commenters may respond to as many or as few as they wish.

Following completion of the template, please save the document and submit it as a pdf attachment to the Public Comment proceeding: comments-gnso-review-01jun15@icann.org. In cases where comments are being submitted on behalf of a group, to facilitate development of group comments, a PDF version of the template is provided for sharing with the group; once the group comments are finalized, please enter them into the template rather than sending them as a Word or PDF file.

A. Please provide your name:	Paul Diaz
B. Please provide your affiliation:	gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)
C. Are you providing input on behalf of another entity (e.g. organization, company, government)?	Yes
D. If you answered ‘yes’ to the previous question, please list the entity on whose behalf you are submitting these comments.	gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)

All of the Independent Examiner’s recommendations have been classified into four topical themes: Participation and Representation; Continuous Development; Transparency; and Alignment with ICANN’s Future. Please refer to the specific recommendation and relevant section of the Draft Report for additional details and context about each recommendation.

Please add your comments into the designated areas within the following table:

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
1	Participation & Representation	Develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programmes with regard to GNSO Working Groups (WGs) (as noted in the WG participation recommendations under section 5.4.5).
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #1 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support It is important that the metrics identify how WG participants are impacted by the issues related to specific WGs and specific areas of expertise they bring to the table correlated to geographic, gender and cultural factors.</p>		
2	Participation & Representation	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #2 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support It is very important for recruiting programs to be continually evaluated and adjusted to ensure that the benefits warrant the costs. Any recruitment program must recognize the narrow nature of policy developed by the GNSO, and must also recognize the associated challenges. In most cases those most active in policy development activities have an interest in the outcome.</p>		
3	Participation & Representation	Review the level, scope and targeting of financial assistance to ensure volunteers are able to participate on a footing comparable with those who participate in GNSO as part of their profession.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #3 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: It Depends The intent of this recommendation is good but it is also extremely challenging because of the extremely diverse circumstances of Internet users around the world. Here are some factors that should be considered: 1) Telecommunications infrastructure is not comparable from locale to locale; 2) facilitating fully comparable opportunities for everyone may be cost prohibitive in some cases; 3) is remote participation considered to be comparable to in-person participation? It is important to understand what benefits would be achieved by providing financial assistance to those with no interest in a policy process. Is it the intention that funding could be provided to those with specific expertise that could be of value to the process.</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
4	Participation & Representation	Explore a tailored incentive system to increase the motivation of volunteers. (For example, this may include training & development opportunities or greater recognition of individuals).

INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #4 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:

It Depends

It is not clear that external incentives will motivate the types of volunteers who are needed in WGs. Working groups need people who can contribute different points of view on the relevant issues. If incentives are successful at increasing representation of stakeholders who are impacted by the issues under consideration or who have specific areas of experience and expertise needed by the WG, that would be a desirable outcome. But if such people do not have the time available to actively participate in a WG, the incentives might not matter. Training and development of potential participants could serve as an incentive for greater WG participation by lowering barriers. Recognition of individual contributions is always a good idea. The RySG believes that this recommendation should be further developed.

More guidance about proposed “incentives”, financial or otherwise, would be helpful. Board-like support (with travel and associated expenses) is one but is not inconsequential. Stipends would also cast doubt on whether participants are still “volunteers.” Importantly, how would “the community” (and/or ICANN staff) assess we’re getting a good return on such investment? This could become politically messy. Regardless, it does not appear that any such provisions were made in the FY16 Budget, so any of this probably couldn’t happen for 12 months (at least).

Provided that WGs have adequate representation from impacted parties in the GNSO and that WGs are not overrepresented by academic stakeholders, the RySG would like to point out that academic institutions may be a good source of interested parties for WG volunteers. Students in certain disciplines (e.g., international law, computer science, management, public policy, etc.) might be motivated to join WGs and thereby add new blood to the process. They might also be interested in additional training, with issuance of certificates, which could be helpful for such participants in future jobs. Passing of initial training courses for such a GNSO/ICANN ecosystem newcomers might be an initial test to be included in PDP development groups for apprentices from academic institutions to improve speed and quality of the process.

5	Participation & Representation	Continue initiatives that aim to reduce the barriers to newcomers.
---	--------------------------------	--

INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #5 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:

Support

This should be a continuous improvement goal for the GNSO. The biggest barriers to newcomers are likely already known so it would be helpful to summarize those and search for cost-effective ways to reduce them. It should be kept in mind though that some barriers are beyond GNSO control (e.g., excessive workload) so efforts should be focused on those barriers where the GNSO may be able to impact.

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
<p>ICANN and the GNSO should always strive to reduce perceived and actual barriers to entry for newcomers to participate in the ICANN community. That said, there is very little information in the report setting forth those barriers. In addition, barriers to entry can also be largely social in nature, as in any group of people who are experienced in working on projects together as well as those that have experience and expertise on the particular issues involved. Some barriers to entry are also inherent in the nature of the work being done by the applicable working group. For example, knowledge of the subject matter and willingness to compromise to find solutions could be considered natural barriers to entry, but by themselves should never be discouraged. The RySG supports barrier reductions that can be accomplished through cost effective outreach efforts provided that the above natural barriers to entry which are beneficial to the operation of the GNSO and the policy development process in general are maintained.</p>		
6	Participation & Representation	That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including diversity statistics).
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #6 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The RySG requests that more information be provided about the type of diversity statistics referred to in this recommendation. If Westlake has specific statistics in mind, they should communicate them; if not, it might be a good idea for the GNSO to form a group to recommend statistics.</p> <p>Given the fluid nature of volunteer availability and interest, it is not clear if aggregated snapshots (measured monthly or quarterly?) would be instructive - unless the goal is to underscore that some issues have limited community interest.</p>		
7	Participation & Representation	That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (Cs) explore and implement ways to engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English, as a means to overcoming language barriers.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #7 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The goal behind this recommendation is good. If financial resources and volunteer resources were unlimited, it would be easy to fulfill this recommendation. Unfortunately, they are not, so this recommendation needs to be balanced with that in mind. In addition to procuring direct translation services, ways should be explored to use SG and Constituency language expertise to fulfill this recommendation.</p> <p>ICANN has come a long way in providing non-English support, but is the community prepared to devote a large share of the annual budget for translation services? How would we measure the ROI, especially considering text translations do not appear to significantly increase the volume of non-English public comments?</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
8	Continuous Development	That WGs should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed, and that the current Policy and Implementation Working Group specifically address the role of WGs in responding to policy implementation issues.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #8 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The Policy & Implementation WG already addressed this in its Final Report to the GNSO Council in June 2015, affirming this recommendation.</p>		
9	Continuous Development	That a formal Working Group leadership assessment programme be developed as part of the overall training and development programme.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #9 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support This recommendation has been made for years. There are at least two impediments to implementing it: 1) costs; 2) availability of trainees. Providing online training can mitigate both impediments.</p>		
10	Continuous Development	That a professional facilitator/moderator is used in certain situations (for example, when policy issues are complex, where members of the WG are generally inexperienced and/or where WG members have interests that conflict), and that the GNSO develop guidelines for the circumstances in which professional facilitators/moderators are used for Working Groups.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #10 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support More clarity around what is meant by professional facilitator/moderator is required. It would appear that in this recommendation it is someone that has experience chairing a working group. An independent facilitator/moderator may be useful in working groups where the working group members are split on certain issues.</p> <p>A “facilitator” could be effective when policy issues are still being sorted at the Council level, i.e., not yet approved as a PDP. Time and again we’ve heard/seen that Councilors do not fully grasp all of the pros & cons of certain proposals; the community would benefit if issues were better understood at the start, more fully addressed in Issues Reports, and had the benefit of well-informed Council review & debate BEFORE launching a PDP.</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
11	Continuous Development	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #11 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		
12	Participation & Representation	That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcribing service in audio conferences for prioritised PDP WGs.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #12 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Most calls are recorded and have transcription available after the fact. It would be useful to understand the reason for recommending real-time transcription. The RySG suggests that information be obtained on how translation and/or real time transcription is handled on other teleconference calls, for instance in the GAC or ALAC.</p>		
13	Continuous Development	That ICANN evaluate one or more alternative decision support systems and experiment with these for supporting WGs.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #13 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: It Depends It is unclear what is meant by this recommendation. Additional explanation is requested along with specific examples of possible “alternative support systems.” In the ICANN Meeting Strategy WG we heard consultants make this same claim, but they never elaborated on what that could mean. It is difficult to support this recommendation until Westlake provides a more fulsome explanation.</p>		
14	Continuous Development	That the GNSO further explores PDP ‘chunking’ and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #14 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		
15	Continuous Development	That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #15 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
16	Continuous Development	That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #16 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Is it the intention that the policy impact assessment will be conducted as it relates to all interested parties, or the impact of ICANN, or public interest. More definition should be given to this recommendation.</p> <p>We've been talking about Policy Impact Assessments for years, but staff and/or their consultants have not clarified what that would entail. At the least, the directly impacted parties (Registries and Registrars for most policy work) must be actively consulted. Further, if the assessment is that the negatives outweigh the positives of the policy's implementation, what are the next steps? Another PDP to unwind/fix the first? How long would that take?</p>		
17	Continuous Development	That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation becomes standard at the completion of the WG's work; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #17 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Self-evaluation for Working Groups should be used cautiously in cases where financial incentives were provided for some working group members (Please see comments to the item 3). In such cases, conflicts of interests should be identified and taken into consideration when applying self-evaluations.</p>		
18	Continuous Development	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #18 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		
19	Participation & Representation	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #19 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
<i>Click here to enter comments.</i>		
20	Alignment with ICANN's Future	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #20 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:</p> <p>Support</p> <p>What would doing this mean? The Strategic Objectives are at a very high level while policy development tends to be at a very low, almost operational level. It seems like a good idea to regularly confirm that policy development efforts are in alignment with the strategic plan, or at least not inconsistent with strategic objectives. The GNSO Council's role is more tactical than strategic. That doesn't mean that strategic thinking shouldn't be applied.</p>		
21	Alignment with ICANN's Future	The GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast their likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the policy-making process.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #21 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:</p> <p>It Depends</p> <p>To the extent it is possible to predict in advance what stakeholder groups may be impacted by future policy development efforts, that would be very helpful. It is probably more likely though to be able to do that after specific policy issues are identified. Certainly, this seems like a very good recommendation to be implemented in Issue Reports.</p> <p>It would make more sense to commission an analysis that is specific to the policy development process, rather than a wide-ranging analysis that may serve no purpose.</p>		
22	Continuous Development	<p>That the GNSO should review and implement a revised training and development programme encompassing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skills and competencies for each Council member - Training and development needs identified - Training and development relevant to each Council member - Formal assessment system with objective measures - Continual assessment and review.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #22 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:</p> <p>Support</p> <p>This is an excellent recommendation but to ensure its implementability it is essential to fulfill it in cost-effective and flexible ways. As noted earlier in our comments, remote online training could be both cost-effective and could provide the flexibility that trainees would need.</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
23	Participation & Representation	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 due process. Subject to the application meeting the conditions, the default outcome should be that a new Constituency is admitted.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #23 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The recommendation should include an explicit call on the Board to respect all due process and not impose its views on internal stakeholder group or constituency business.</p>		
24	Transparency	That all applications for new constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #24 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		
25	Participation & Representation	That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #25 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The transparency of applications that is recommended in #24 would also help those that are considering applying for a constituency.</p>		
26	Transparency	That GNSO Council members, Executive Committee members of SGs and Cs and members of WGs complete and maintain a current, comprehensive SOI. 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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #26 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The RySG suggests that the following be added at the end of the first sentence of this recommendation: "that is posted on the GNSO website." Otherwise, some may assume that their SOI could be posted anywhere. Regarding the second half of the third sentence of the recommendation (...the participant's</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
<p>interest or position must be disclosed), more detail should be provided about what and how it must be disclosed.</p> <p>On a more minor point, references to statements of interest are inconsistent throughout the document: SoI, SOI, Statement of Interest.</p>		
27	Transparency	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).
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #27 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		
28	Transparency	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #28 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Not Sure Who would decide what the key clauses are? How would sanctions be enforced?</p>		
29	Continuous Development	That new members of WGs and newcomers at ICANN meetings be surveyed to determine how well their input is solicited and accepted by the community, and that the results be published and considered by the GNSO Council at its next meeting.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #29 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support This recommendation is possibly more suited to working group participation than to ICANN meetings.</p> <p>How would this be accomplished with newcomers at ICANN meetings? Surveys could be used but they are sometimes overused and hence can be ineffective. One different idea would be to use other mechanisms to obtain feedback from new members to WGs and newcomers at ICANN meetings such as focus groups.</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
30	Continuous Development	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #30 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support Click here to enter comments.</p>		
31	Continuous Development	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #31 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: Support The RySG contacted the GNSO GAC Liaison on this recommendation and he expressed support for it.</p>		
32	Participation & Representation	That ICANN define “cultural diversity” and that relevant metrics (encompassing geographic, gender, age group and cultural, possibly by using birth language) be monitored and published.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #32 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: It Depends Considering the diversity of the ICANN community, it seems like it would be good to have such metrics. But they should be used with caution, understanding that it may be impossible in some cases to have broad demographic representation. The RySG is an example of this; members must have a gTLD registry agreement with ICANN and to date there have not been many gTLD registries from at least two of ICANN’s geographic regions.</p>		
33	Participation & Representation	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #33 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION: It Depends While we do not dispute this goal it should not be at the expense of skillset and ability to participate.</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
34	Participation & Representation	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. This should be the norm for PDP WG meetings even if at first all the WG's members come from the "traditional" regions of North America and Europe.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #34 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:</p> <p>Not Sure</p> <p>Should volunteers in a WG all be inconvenienced even if there are no volunteers from underrepresented regions? That sounds like a sure way to decrease the number of volunteers. Why not recommend adjustments in meeting times once volunteers are found from underserved regions and then tailor the times to meet their needs?</p> <p>Start time rotation for meetings between different time zones should be used in accordance with the time zones of the currently active WG participants to avoid unnecessarily poor timing of WG meetings for others. If there are no active participants from certain time zones, there is no need to make time adjustments for them.</p>		
35	Participation & Representation	That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole, to identify and develop ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non-English speakers and those with limited command of English.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #35 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:</p> <p>Support</p> <p>This recommendation should be a guideline or goal; in some instances it is virtually impossible to meet the full spectrum of demographic, cultural and gender diversity in order to have a fully functional WG with active participation.</p>		
36	Participation & Representation	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.
<p>INDICATE YOUR SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION #36 BY SELECTING APPLICABLE OPINION:</p> <p>Not Sure</p> <p>Because circumstances vary so much from WG to WG, the qualification of 'reasonably practicable' is important to include. How would 'reasonably practical' be defined? How would it be measured? What if a judgment is made that 'reasonably practical' measures were not taken to obtain diverse WG</p>		

Rec #	Theme Topic	Proposed Recommendation
		membership? Should the efforts of volunteers over many months be rejected if it was not possible to get participants that meet diversity goals?

Other Comments:

Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the Independent Review of the GNSO Draft Report? If yes, please enter your comments here:

The RySG thanks Westlake Governance, ICANN staff and the GNSO Review Working Party for all the time and effort that went into this review and commits to continuing participation as the review continues.

Finally, the RySG would like to respond to the many comments about the GNSO structure. We first want to say that we believe the current GNSO structure is working very well regarding the GNSO's primary function of policy development. In our assessment, the policy development process and the working group model that is part of it are working very well and the structure seems fine with regard to the Council's policy development management role. At the same time we recognize that the current structure has not worked well for tasks that involve voting in the Non-contracted Party House such as selection of one of the ICANN Board seats, so we support exploring solutions to solve those problems. We are not yet convinced that such solutions will require complete structural change but we might be open to some structural change provided the voting balance between contracted and non-contracted parties is maintained so that we avoid regressing to the situation experienced in the original DNSO where contracted parties were required by contract to implement consensus policies but did not have meaningful influence in the development of those policies.

Save your document and then send as a pdf attachment to:
comments-gns0-review-01jun15@icann.org