Subject: Re: Feedback Request: Policy & Implementation Working Group (PIWG)
Date: Monday, September 15, 2014 at 7:22:19 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond
To: Glen de Saint Géry, ICANN At-Large Staff
CC: gnso-policyimpl-chairs (gnso-policyimpl-chairs@icann.org) (gnso-policyimpl-chairs@icann.org), gnso-secs@icann.org

Dear Glen,

with apologies for coming back to you *after* the 12 September deadline, I wanted to share the feedback received from the ALAC on the work below.

Following up on my message to you a few days ago relating to the feedback to ALAC recommendations which the PIWG has shared with us, ALAC members are pleased with the progress of the working group. Whilst the charts shared are somewhat cryptic without accompanying text, Alan Greenberg has been able to share some more insights into their meaning.

Overall, the recommendation is: keep on working in the same direction. The ALAC looks forward to your future reports and once more thanks members of the working group for their hard work.

Kindest regards,

Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond
ALAC Chair

On 28/08/2014 19:43, Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond wrote:

> Dear Glen,
>
> thank you for your kind email. I will ask At-Large Staff to create a WIKI page to collect At-Large feedback and revert back to you before 12 September.
> Kind regards,
>
> Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond
> ALAC Chair
>
> On 28/08/2014 10:54, Glen de Saint Géry wrote:
>
> > Dear Olivier,
> >
> > One of the questions that the Policy & Implementation Working Group (PIWG) was tasked to consider is: "Under what circumstances, if any, may the GNSO Council make recommendations or state positions to the Board on matters of policy and implementation as a representative of the GNSO as a whole?" In consideration of this question, the PIWG is currently developing possible recommendations for new processes in addition to the existing Policy Development Process (PDP) by which the GNSO Council can provide input on behalf of the GNSO community on policy and related questions brought to its

attention by the ICANN Board, other ICANN Supporting Organizations and/or Advisory Committees (SO/ACs) and by GNSO participants. As these proposed mechanisms are likely to be of great interest to the GNSO community, the PIWG would very much like to seek your group's feedback on the attached flow charts outlining these potential processes. We have not yet developed detailed descriptions of these processes so we are not looking for feedback at that level (although that would be accepted) but rather, we would like to know whether or not you think we are headed in a constructive direction in considering new processes like these.

Attached are flow charts that show the two additional processes: a proposed GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) and a proposed GNSO Input Process (GIP). They are intended to supplement the existing mechanisms by which the GNSO Council performs its work and manages that of the GNSO community. The processes are intended to add to the flexibility and responsiveness of the GNSO and the Council. They represent our attempt to balance the need for such nimbleness with the need for codified processes that will allow the GNSO and the Council to deal with requests other than on an ad-hoc basis. The possibility of a "fast track" PDP is also included in some of the flow charts to try to address situations where policies already adopted by the ICANN Board may need clarification or updating.

The flow charts are organized as follows:

1. An overview of the GNSO Process Options including the new processes
2. An outline of the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) without a Fast Track PDP option and with voting thresholds as follows: i) to initiate a GGP, the same as required to initiate a PDP; ii) to approve GGP recommendations, supermajority as currently defined for the GNSO Council
3. An outline of the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) with a Fast Track PDP option and with voting thresholds as follows: i) to initiate a GGP, supermajority as currently defined for the GNSO Council; ii) to approve GGP recommendations, supermajority as currently defined for the GNSO Council
4. An outline of the GNSO Input Process (GIP).

Note that flowcharts 2, 3 & 4 contain boxes that are colored in orange. These indicate that those are specific areas that the WG will further review and discuss once a more detailed description of these processes is available. If you already have any specific input you would like to provide on these areas (or any other), you are more than welcome to do so, but please note that there will of course be further opportunities to provide input as further details are developed by the WG.

The PIWG will be grateful if your group could provide its feedback to us by Friday 12 September 2014. At a minimum we would like to know whether you think the PIWG is heading in the right direction with regard to its

consideration of recommending two new processes similar to the GGP and GIP shown in the flowcharts. In addition, feedback would also be welcome at your option regarding the orange colored boxes in the flow charts.

We will be happy to address any questions that your members may have in the meantime. Your questions and your feedback may be provided via your WG representative(s) or via email in response to this message.

Best regards,

J. Scott Evans & Chuck Gomes (Co-Chairs), Michael Graham & Olevie Kouami (Co-Vice-Chairs)

--
Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond, PhD
http://www.gih.com/ocl.html