AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ALAC Statement on the Draft Report: Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization

Introduction

Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC member of the European Regional At-Large Organization (EURALO), ALAC Vice Chair, and ALAC Liaison to the GNSO composed an initial draft of the ALAC Statement.

On 16 July 2015, the first draft of the Statement was posted on the At-Large Draft Report: Review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization Workspace.

On that same day, Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC, requested ICANN Policy Staff in support of the ALAC to send a Call for Comments on the Statement to all At-Large members via the ALAC-Announce Mailing List.

On 01 August 2015, a version incorporating the comments received was posted on the aforementioned workspace and the Chair requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote on the proposed Statement from 01 August 2015 to 06 August 2015.

The Chair then requested that a Statement be transmitted to the ICANN public comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this topic, with a note that the Statement is pending ALAC ratification.

On 10 August 2015, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 11 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. You may view the result independently under: https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=4957Q4MLHiPcrIA6IXwairsm.

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.

Please provide your name: Please provide your affiliation:

Are you providing input on behalf of another entity (e.g. organization, company, government)?

   Yes

   No

If yes, please explain:

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.

Recommendation #1 (Participation and 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).

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #1:

Recommendation #2 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #2:

Recommendation #3 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #3:

Recommendation #4 (Participation and 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).

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #4:

Recommendation #5 (Participation and Representation)

Continue initiatives that aim to reduce the barriers to newcomers.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #5:

Recommendation #6 (Participation and Representation)

That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including diversity statistics).

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #6:

Recommendation #7 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #7:

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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #8:

Recommendation #9 (Continuous Development)

That a formal Working Group leadership assessment programme be developed as part of the overall training and development programme.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #9:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #10:

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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #11:

Recommendation #12 (Participation and Representation)

That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcripting service in audio conferences for prioritised PDP WGs.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #12:

Recommendation #13 (Continuous Development)

That ICANN evaluate one or more alternative decision support systems and experiment with these for supporting WGs.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #13:

Recommendation #14 (Continuous Development)

That the GNSO further explores PDP 'chunking' and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #14:

Recommendation #15 (Continuous Development)

That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #15:

Recommendation #16 (Continuous Development)

That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #16:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #17:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #18:

Recommendation #19 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #19:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #20:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #21:

Recommendation #22 (Continuous Development)

That the GNSO should review and implement a revised training and development programme encompassing:
- 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #22:

Recommendation #23 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #23:

Recommendation #24 (Transparency)

That all applications for new constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #24:

Recommendation #25 (Participation and Representation)

That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #25:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #26:

Recommendation #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).

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #27:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #28:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #29:

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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #30:

Recommendation #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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #31:

Recommendation #32 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #32:

Recommendation #33 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #33:

Recommendation #34 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #34:

Recommendation #35 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #35:

Recommendation #36 (Participation and 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.

Choose your level of support of this recommendation:

   Support   Do not support   Not sure   It depends

Enter comments to Recommendation #36:

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:

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