

**GNSO Working Group Survey Comments
From Responses Provided by SCI Members**

24 January 2013

Note: Only questions for which comments were provided are included below

Question 2. If you responded ‘no’ to the previous question, please explain what other measures should be taken in your view to get familiar with the relevant rules and procedures.

Comment 1: I joined as the Non Voting NCA mid-stream, but no information was provided to me with regard to the committee or rules.

Comment 2: The thing I find most disturbing is how hard it is to find the most current version of the g-council operational craft.

Question 4. If you responded ‘yes’ to the previous question, please rate each of the major components of the GNSO WG Guidelines – Other Comments:

Comment: Not in a position to judge.

Question 7. If you responded ‘yes’ to the previous question [Question 6 re: information missing or any areas that need improvement / changes in the Working Group Guidelines], please provide further details as to what you believe is missing or needs changing / improving. Open Ended Response:

Comment 1: Simplify the language. Avoid complex or little used words like "instantiation"....

Comment 2: Method for determining level of consensus is still a bit confusing. Suggest possible mechanism for better defining which level of consensus the WG has achieved at any given point in time through an objective measure. In general, there may be too many different categories of consensus defined. This gets confusing. Maybe limit it to 4 categories of level of consensus.

Question 8. Other than comments provided above, do you have any additional recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines?

Comment 1: Section 6 has substantial repetition but this is unavoidable if you provide a template, which is a good tool...

Comment 2: Generate form for Interim Status Report in the event of suspension of PDP. Generate form for Status Report on Termination of PDP. Chair of WG to be responsible for delivering these reports to CO.

Comment 3: since so few people actually read stuff. and among those who read so few understand, i am not sure what could be recommended. maybe a cartoon.

Question 9. One of the required elements for Working Group participation is the completion of a Statement of Interest (SOI). In your view, are the questions that need to be completed and information to be provided still relevant (see section 5.3.3. of the GNSO Operating Procedures)?

Comment: SOI is sufficiently important that the purpose should be defined and the questions should be incorporated in the main body of the WG guidelines. Question whether the WG guidelines should specify standards for disqualification from a poll of the WG similar to action taken by ICANN Board when certain directors stepped back from votes related to launch of new gTLDs due to conflict of interest.

Question 11. In your view, are there any questions missing from the SOI that should be included in order to ensure declare ‘specified interests, relationships, arrangements, and affiliations that may affect the judgments of Relevant Parties in the conduct of their participation within the GNSO’?

Comment: May wish to review this in light of conflict discussions at Board and Council level.

Question 12. If you responded ‘yes’ to the previous questions, please provide further details as to which questions should be included.

Comment: Required disclosure of relationships between gTLD applicants and registry services providers. Applicants should disclose their back-end providers. Registry services providers should disclose which gTLD applicants/operators they serve.

Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to share with the SCI? If yes, please specify.

Comment 1: In general, there is not a lot of communication provided to assist newcomers to committees. Accordingly, it takes additional time to begin to understand the scope of work undertaken and appropriate protocols to begin to make a meaningful contribution.

Comment 2: WG guidelines should deal with conflict of interest issues. This has to be evaluated in light of the charter. It is likely that before any consensus call on any particular issue, the Chair should ask individual members of the WG to declare any potential conflict of interest related to the particular issue being called.. In other words,

the SOI is general as to WG participation, but any particular consensus call may have specific conflict considerations.

Comment 3: i think it is a fine questionnaire for anyone who wasn't part of the WG Sub Group. bet you can guess who filled in this form.

Comment 4: applicability of the WG guidelines to Standing Committees and Cross Community WGs to be discussed