On 8/12/13 9:18 PM, "Alan Greenberg" <alan.greenberg@mcgill.ca>
wrote:

I was charged with drafting the starting point for
recommendations on
the GNSO PDP and Cross-constituency work.

For a bunch of reasons, I have not been able to put nearly
sufficient
effort into this.

The PDP recommendation is likely to change as our external expert
works, but based on the discussions that we had with groups at
Durban, greatly augmented by the PDP Chairs thread that I
forwarded,
some of the themes of our recommendation are already pretty
solid. I
have not addressed early GAC involvement, as this is partially
covered by Fiona's contributions and I thought it better to work
from
one document. I will, however give an early view of how I am
thinking
about things now.

We have usually used words like "the GAC must participate in GNSO
PDPs". I now think that wording it like this is setting an
operational methodology instead of first setting the setting the
goal.

It makes little sense (to me) to have a PDP deliver its
recommendations to the Board and then have the GAC re-open issues
that concern its members at the Board level. I think that the
goal is
ensuring that issues of interest to governments and the GAC are
known
to the PDP WG, and are fairly considered, and that as
recommendations
are formulated, there is a feedback loop involving the GAC.
Exactly
HOW to do that is not clear, but unless we set it as a target, we
will never achieve it.

There has been a lot of rhetoric about GAC members not being able
to
sustain the presumed level of effort that goes into GNSO PDP.
Before

we try to figure out mechanisms for achieving the above goal, we need
to recognize that:
- the efforts described above have occurred (in my recollections) for
only one or two PDPs, and then only for a few weeks (and due to Board
deadlines/ultimatums)
- most PDPs are about operational issues that have proven of no interest to the GAC
- the new gTLD PDP, which has received so much after0the0fact focus,
is never likely to be repeat for a whole bunch of reasons (including
having learned a bunch of lessons in the ensuing years).
- there WILL be PDPs of interest to the GAC coming up soon (RAA, son-of-Whois) and we really need to fix this problem quickly.

On the Cross-constituency issue, I re-wrote this document several times and am almost as unhappy with the final one as the earlier versions. One of the reasons was that although we often talk about
the need for more cross-const work, other than the specific GAC-GNSO
and some targeted GNSO-ALAC issues, iI found it hard to come up with
concrete examples. Mikey's note that I just forwarded covers one I missed.

Alan