



**REVIEW OF**

**GENERIC NAMES SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION**

*Final Report*

Westlake Governance Limited

September 2015

## CONTENTS

---

### CONTENTS 2

<b>SECTION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Background .....	4
1.2 Assessment and Recommendations: The Working Group Model.....	5
1.3 Assessment and Recommendations: The PDP .....	7
1.4 Assessment and Recommendations: Restructuring GNSO Council.....	9
1.5 Assessment and Recommendations: Enhancing Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies .	10
1.6 Assessment and Recommendations: Communications and Coordination .....	12
1.7 Assessment and Recommendations: Changing Environment.....	13
Annex: Recommendations Grouped by Theme.....	16
<b>SECTION 2: CONTEXT FOR THIS REVIEW</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 Previous Reviews.....	21
2.2 Current Review .....	22
2.3 Approach.....	22
2.4 Scope of Review .....	23
<b>SECTION 3: REVIEW METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1 Previous Review .....	24
3.2 Scope of the Westlake Review Team work.....	24
3.3 Structure of our Report.....	29
3.4 Interaction with ICANN staff and the Working Party .....	29
<b>SECTION 4: ADOPTING A WORKING GROUP MODEL</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1 BGC Recommendations .....	31
4.2 Major accomplishments and milestones .....	32
4.3 Summary of the Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness .	32
4.4 Basis for Westlake’s assessment .....	33
<b>SECTION 5: REVISE THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDP)</b>	<b>50</b>
5.1 BGC Recommendations .....	50
5.2 Major accomplishments and milestones .....	51
5.3 Summary of the Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness .	52
5.4 Basis for Westlake’s assessment .....	53
<b>SECTION 6: RESTRUCTURE THE GNSO COUNCIL</b>	<b>71</b>
6.1 BGC Recommendations .....	71
6.2 Major accomplishments and milestones .....	72
6.3 Summary of the Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness .	73
6.4 Basis for Westlake’s assessment .....	74
<b>SECTION 7: ENHANCE CONSTITUENCIES</b>	<b>84</b>
7.1 BGC Recommendations .....	84
7.2 Major accomplishments and milestones .....	85
7.3 Summary of Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness .....	86

7.4	Basis for Westlake’s assessment .....	86
<b>SECTION 8: IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION WITH ICANN STRUCTURES</b>		<b>105</b>
8.1	BGC Recommendations .....	105
8.2	Major accomplishments and milestones .....	105
8.3	Summary of Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness .....	106
8.4	Basis for Westlake’s assessment .....	106
<b>SECTION 9: CHANGING ENVIRONMENT</b>		<b>111</b>
9.1	Purpose of this Section .....	111
9.2	Introduction .....	111
9.3	Demographic structure of the Internet .....	112
9.4	Diversity .....	113
9.5	Internationalised domain names .....	119
9.6	New gTLDs .....	119
9.7	GNSO Structure .....	120
9.8	Conclusion .....	126
<b>SECTION 10: APPENDICES</b>		<b>129</b>
	Appendix 1: Acknowledgements .....	130
	Appendix 2: Survey quantitative summary results .....	131
	Appendix 3: Interviewees .....	157
	Appendix 4: Recommendations from prior reviews .....	159
	Appendix 5: PDP Timelines .....	179
	Appendix 6: GNSO Operating Procedures – proposed revision of Section 6 .....	180
	Appendix 7: About Westlake Governance Limited .....	186

## SECTION 1: REPORT SUMMARY

---

### 1.1 Background

This review was initiated in 2014 by ICANN with the assistance of a working party comprised of GNSO community members in accordance with ICANN's bylaws. It follows a series of other reviews, some of the GNSO explicitly and others of ICANN's policy-making structures in general, including a programme of improvement of the GNSO initiated by the ICANN Board after the Board Governance Committee (BGC) considered the recommendations of previous reviews in 2008.

Following more recent changes, the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC)<sup>1</sup> of the ICANN Board is now responsible for review and oversight of policies relating to ICANN's ongoing organizational review process, as mandated by ICANN's Bylaws. In relation to this review, the SIC:

- Confirmed the appointment of Westlake Governance as Independent Examiner,
- Will accept the final report and the implementation plan, and
- Will prepare recommendations for Board action.

The scope of this review is two-fold: to assess the extent to which the improvement programme has been implemented and successful at addressing the concerns that led to it, and to consider the extent to which the GNSO as currently constituted is in a position to respond to its changing environment. The Westlake Review Team has not been asked to assess various options and alternatives pertaining to the structure of the GNSO, but inquiry into the effectiveness of GNSO operations naturally leads to structural considerations. We note also that the existing GNSO structure of two Houses and four Stakeholder Groups (SGs) allows for considerable flexibility.

Input to the review has comprised:

- An online questionnaire (the 360°) about the GNSO as a whole and its component parts
- A similar questionnaire about specific Working Groups
- Reviewing material about previous reviews, plans and other information, most of which was available on the ICANN website

---

<sup>1</sup> Name changed to The Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) in July 2015

- Interviews with a range of stakeholders from the GNSO and wider ICANN community
- Feedback on an earlier working text presented in summary at ICANN52 and provided to the GNSO Review Working Party for comment.

As we developed our recommendations, four main themes became evident:

- Participation & Representation
- Continuous Development
- Transparency
- Alignment with ICANN's future

In total, the Westlake Review Team has provided 36 recommendations. To assist understanding of how each recommendation contributes, we have included an Annex to this Summary listing each recommendation under its theme.

### **1.1.1 BGC Recommendations to the ICANN Board**

In its 2008 synthesis of prior reviews, the Board Governance Committee Working Group (BGC WG) made recommendations in the following areas and the Board adopted these recommendations. (We refer to these throughout our report as 'BGC recommendations'. It should be noted that, while referred to as 'recommendations,' they were approved):

- Adopting a Working Group model for policy development
- Revising the policy development process (the PDP)
- Restructuring the GNSO Council
- Enhancing and supporting stakeholder groups and constituencies
- Improving communications and coordination with other ICANN structures

The Review Team has assessed the extent to which the recommendations adopted by the Board have been implemented. The BGC recommendations are listed below in highly summarised form and numbered as BGC1 – BGC18, together with our view on whether they have been implemented, and our recommendations for further work.

## **1.2 Assessment and Recommendations: The Working Group Model**

Westlake's view of the implementation of the BGC recommendations is:

BGC Recommendation	Implemented?
BGC1: Working Groups (WGs) should become the foundation for consensus policy work in the GNSO. WGs should be open to everybody.	Yes
BGC2: Council and Staff should develop operating principles for WGs	Yes
BGC3: ICANN should provide staff support to WGs	Yes

Westlake's view is that these have all been implemented effectively. WGs do exist and they do create policy. In the 360° survey, almost 80% agreed that WGs are effective and that they listen to feedback. Comments about staff support were uniformly positive.

However, there are some negative outcomes in the implementation of WGs:

- Comparatively few volunteers do most of the work
- Volunteers are strongly weighted toward North America and Europe
- Participants are approximately 80% male

We found no evidence that WGs are not open to everyone, but the openness has not resulted in effective involvement of a broad section of the community. We found little deliberate obstruction to broader participation in WGs, but we have identified several unconscious biases that tend to perpetuate the status quo.

Our recommendations are:

- ❖ **Recommendation 1:** That the GNSO 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).
- ❖ **Recommendation 2:** That the GNSO 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 3:** That the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in WGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 4:** That the GNSO Council introduce non-financial rewards and recognition for volunteers.

- ❖ **Recommendation 5:** That, during each WG self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.
- ❖ **Recommendation 6:** That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including diversity statistics).
- ❖ **Recommendation 7:** That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (Cs) engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English, as a means to overcoming language barriers.
- ❖ **Recommendation 8:** That WGs should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.<sup>2</sup>

### 1.3 Assessment and Recommendations: The PDP

Westlake's view of the implementation of the BGC recommendations is:

BGC Recommendation	Implemented?
BGC4: Revise the rules for the PDP to align with contractual requirements	Yes
BGC5: Implement PDP self-assessment	Incomplete
BGC6: Align PDPs with ICANN's strategic plan	No

The WG PDP is seen as successful if long-winded. About half the 360° respondents agreed that policy recommendations are timely. There were comments about the frustratingly (to some) long time that a PDP can take, and many to the effect that the duration of the PDP may be necessary to achieve consensus.

A Data and Metrics Working Group has been set up as a non-PDP WG to consider how to assess the PDP process itself. However, this does not cover the outcome of the policy, which in our view is essential to inform future policy development.

There is no evidence of a GNSO-wide plan that aligns its policy development work with ICANN's strategic plan.

---

<sup>2</sup> We understand that GNSO Council has now adopted the recommendations of the Working Group under which Implementation Review Teams will become standard practice.

Our recommendations are:

- ❖ **Recommendation 9:** That a formal Working Group leadership assessment programme be developed as part of the overall training and development programme.
- ❖ **Recommendation 10:** That the GNSO Council develop criteria for WGs to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations.
- ❖ **Recommendation 11:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 12:** That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcribing service in audio conferences for WG meetings.
- ❖ **Recommendation 13:** That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in WG consensus-based decision making.
- ❖ **Recommendation 14:** That the GNSO further explores PDP 'chunking' and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.
- ❖ **Recommendation 15:** That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.
- ❖ **Recommendation 16:** That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process.
- ❖ **Recommendation 17:** That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation be incorporated into the policy development process; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.
- ❖ **Recommendation 18:** 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.



## 1.4 Assessment and Recommendations: Restructuring GNSO Council

Westlake's view of the implementation of the BGC recommendations is:

BGC Recommendation	Implemented?
BGC7: Council to do strategy and oversight	Yes
BGC8: Council to assess and analyse trends	No
BGC9: Council to improve project and document management	Partial
BGC10: Council membership restructure	Yes
BGC11: Council term limits	Yes
BGC12: Council and GNSO-wide SOIs	Yes
BGC13: Councillor training	Needs improvement

The Council is performing a strategy and oversight role as recommended by the BGC. It publishes a list of projects but there is no evidence of resource planning or management. Term limits and SOIs have been implemented.

Councillor training was highlighted in comments on the 360° survey, in respect of technical expertise, project management and governance. There is no means to measure the level of competence and skills of incumbents, or the effectiveness of the training undertaken.

Our recommendations are:

- ❖ **Recommendation 19:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 20:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 21:** That the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the policy-making process.

- ❖ **Recommendation 22:** That the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework, which its members should utilise to identify development needs and opportunities

## 1.5 Assessment and Recommendations: Enhancing Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies

For the purposes of this subsection, the term “Constituency” is taken to include the RrSG and the RySG, which do not have Constituencies.

The Westlake Review Team’s view of the implementation of the BGC recommendations is:

BGC Recommendation	Implemented?
BGC14: Clarify and promote the option to form new constituencies	Yes but ineffective
BGC15: Constituency operating rules and participation	No
BGC16: Provide dedicated staff support to constituencies	Partial

Action was taken as a result of the BGC recommendation about the formation of new Constituencies, but this has not been effective. Only one new Constituency has been formed, with a great deal of difficulty, and several other groups have tried and failed to create new Constituencies.

In addition, the Review Team notes a view expressed by a former Constituency Chair at ICANN53 that their Constituency rejects the necessity or desirability of multiple Constituencies. This is clearly at odds with previous review recommendations and the ICANN Board’s stated position. This view and the record of unsuccessful applications to date reinforce our observation that BGC14 has not been implemented effectively.

We consider a further barrier to the introduction of new Constituencies in one Stakeholder Group is a lack of equity in the distribution of Council seats within that SG. We believe there should be an equal distribution of Council seats among each Constituency within SGs.

In relation to BGC15, Constituency operating rules exist, but attempts to broaden participation have been ineffective.

ICANN Core Value 4 reads:

*Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.*

The constituency structure is intended to provide functional diversity. ICANN's regional structure provides a way of measuring geographic diversity, but it is not a proxy for cultural diversity, which is not defined by ICANN.

ICANN does not collect the information necessary to measure diversity of participation. Observation, and collecting such information as is available, shows that participation is highly male-dominated and very strongly North American- and European-dominated. There are very few participants from Asia (other than Australia and New Zealand) despite that continent representing a very large and increasing proportion of Internet users. Barriers that are perceived to exist, which constrain participation by under-represented groups, include the exclusive use of English by WGs, being consistently outvoted over time-zones for calls and a predominantly Western-style assertive mode of interpersonal interaction in meetings.

Secretariat support where provided by ICANN is rated to be of high quality, but it is not provided to all constituencies.

Our recommendations are:

- ❖ **Recommendation 23:** In order to support ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, all Cs should have seats on the GNSO Council, allocated equally (as far as numerically practicable) by their SGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 24:** 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 the published process, subject to which the default outcome is that a new Constituency is admitted. That all applications for new Constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making.
- ❖ **Recommendation 25:** That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency.
- ❖ **Recommendation 26:** That GNSO Council members, Executive Committee members of SGs and Cs and members of WGs complete and maintain a current, comprehensive SOI on the GNSO website. 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.

- ❖ **Recommendation 27:** 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).
- ❖ **Recommendation 28:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 29:** That SOIs of GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all SGs and Cs include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN.
- ❖ **Recommendation 30:** 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.

## 1.6 Assessment and Recommendations: Communications and Coordination

Westlake’s view of the implementation of the BGC recommendations is:

BGC Recommendation	Implemented?
BGC17: Improved Communication with ICANN Board	Yes
BGC18: Improved Communication and Coordination with other ICANN structures	In Progress

The BGC WP recommended that the GNSO Council should improve the level of its communication with its nominee members of the ICANN Board. We received no comment on this from any respondent and have therefore concluded that it is no longer a matter of concern.

In relation to other ICANN structures, several respondents expressed frustration with the relationship between PDP WGs generally and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). The concern was that the GAC appeared not to participate in the full PDP, but was reported to intervene at a very late stage, sometimes disrupting a process that was near to consensus, or even lobbying Board members to make late changes to a finalized new policy. This appeared to compromise the agreed bottom-up consensus-driven approach to developing policy. Against this, we were advised of the difficulty that the GAC faces in that no member can express a binding view on behalf of the others.

To address this we have recommended closer liaison between the GNSO and GAC and that the GAC appoint a non-voting liaison to each relevant PDP WG. In this way, informal GAC input can occur through the PDP, without it being seen as binding commitment on behalf of the GAC members.

Our recommendation is:

- ❖ **Recommendation 31:** 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.

## 1.7 Assessment and Recommendations: Changing Environment

Besides assessing the effectiveness of previous review recommendations, we have considered the changing environment as it affects the GNSO, for instance:

- Demographic structure of the Internet
- Diversity
- IDNs
- gTLD expansion

The Westlake Review Team has assessed the extent to which the GNSO displays the agility to respond to these challenges and new developments.

Among the changes in the GNSO's broader environment, probably the most significant in the last decade is the dramatic shift in the "centre of gravity" of Internet usage – from mainly Anglophone and generally richer economies to non-Anglophone Asian, African and Latin American nations.

The GNSO remains dominated by participants from largely Anglophone, developed nations. The make-up of the current GNSO Council does not demonstrate a focus by SGs or Cs on achieving geographic, gender or cultural diversity. As a result the issues they consider tend to be those of interest to developed wealthy economies.

Because of the imbalance in the GNSO's composition, it was seen by some to be poorly equipped to identify and develop policies or consider issues relating to gTLDs that are of significance to less developed economies. Several obstacles exist that create barriers to participation for a large percentage of Internet users:

- People whose first language is not English, and those from developing regions, find it difficult to engage with the GNSO.
- Richer economies are better able to support a volunteer structure: experienced participants are overwhelmingly North American, Western European or Australian/New Zealanders.
- Complexity deters newcomers.
- “Unconscious biases” that may exacerbate these factors include matters such as language, colloquial usage, use of acronyms and time of day for WG calls. (Recent studies of obstacles to achieving diversity in companies have highlighted the importance of these “unconscious biases” that inhibit changes without people being generally aware that they are having this impact.)

In order to ensure its continuing relevance and ability to identify the policy issues that matter, we consider that the GNSO must address these barriers to participation from developing and non-Anglophone regions. It must ensure that the demographic make-up of the GNSO Council and the GNSO community reflects the demographics of Internet users worldwide far more closely than it does at present.

Many people commented on the GNSO’s structure and complexity and argued that these needed to change. We do not consider that the GNSO’s structure is perfect, or that it cannot be improved, but, having analysed the issues in some detail, our view is that the structure of the GNSO is not the main cause of its most pressing challenges. We consider that if the GNSO collectively decided that structural change was desirable and a priority, it would be within its mandate to agree what changes to make and propose them to the board.

We note that the current structure and processes of the GNSO have been in place for only about three years. From the Westlake Review Team’s professional experience of structural change in many organisations of differing types, this represents only a relatively short time for them to become firmly established and for people to be fully familiar with them.

Our recommendations are:

- ❖ **Recommendation 32:** That ICANN define “cultural diversity” (possibly by using birth language); and regularly publish this along with geographic, gender and age group metrics, at least for the GNSO Council, SGs, Cs and WGs.

- ❖ **Recommendation 33:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 34:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 35:** That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole, to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non- English speakers and those with limited command of English.
- ❖ **Recommendation 36:** 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.

When the GNSO Council has addressed the issues we have identified and our recommendations, it might decide to review its structure, both to assist in effective implementation and in response to the widespread comments around issues associated with the GNSO's current structure. However, we believe that any future review of structure should be broader than a single Supporting Organisation or Advisory Committee and should include a strategic review of the effectiveness of ICANN as a whole, which the structure should be refined to support.

While a broader review is beyond our scope, we consider it relevant because this issue has been raised previously. In September 2012, the ALAC published its White Paper on Future Challenges – *"Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected"*.<sup>3</sup> Among its recommendations were that ICANN:

*Transform the roles of the GAC and the ALAC from purely advisory to involvement in policy. This measure shall not be implemented separately from, nor before, a coordinated reform of structures affecting all Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees.*

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/future-challenges-white-paper-17sep12-en.pdf>

## Annex: Recommendations Grouped by Theme

### Theme 1: Participation and Representation

- ❖ **Recommendation 1:** That the GNSO 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).
- ❖ **Recommendation 2:** That the GNSO 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 3:** That the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in WGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 4:** That the GNSO Council introduce non-financial rewards and recognition for volunteers.
- ❖ **Recommendation 5:** That, during each WG self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.
- ❖ **Recommendation 6:** That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including diversity statistics).
- ❖ **Recommendation 7:** That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (Cs) engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English, as a means to overcoming language barriers.
- ❖ **Recommendation 11:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 12:** That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcribing service in audio conferences for WG meetings.
- ❖ **Recommendation 13:** That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in WG consensus-based decision making.



- ❖ **Recommendation 23:** In order to support ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, all Cs should have seats on the GNSO Council, allocated equally (as far as numerically practicable) by their SGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 25:** That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency.
- ❖ **Recommendation 32:** That ICANN define “cultural diversity” (possibly by using birth language); and regularly publish this along with geographic, gender and age group metrics, at least for the GNSO Council, SGs, Cs and WGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 33:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 34:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 35:** That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole, to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non- English speakers and those with limited command of English.
- ❖ **Recommendation 36:** 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.

## Theme 2: Continuous Development

- ❖ **Recommendation 8:** That WGs should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> We understand that GNSO Council has now adopted the recommendations of the Working Group under which Implementation Review Teams will become standard practice.

- ❖ **Recommendation 9:** That a formal Working Group leadership assessment programme be developed as part of the overall training and development programme.
- ❖ **Recommendation 10:** That the GNSO Council develop criteria for WGs to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations.
- ❖ **Recommendation 14:** That the GNSO further explores PDP 'chunking' and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.
- ❖ **Recommendation 15:** That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.
- ❖ **Recommendation 16:** That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process.
- ❖ **Recommendation 17:** That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation be incorporated into the policy development process; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.
- ❖ **Recommendation 18:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 22:** That the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework, which its members should utilise to identify development needs and opportunities.
- ❖ **Recommendation 30:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 31:** 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.

### Theme 3: Transparency

- ❖ **Recommendation 19:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 24:** 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 the published process, subject to which the default outcome is that a new Constituency is admitted. That all applications for new Constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making.
- ❖ **Recommendation 26:** That GNSO Council members, Executive Committee members of SGs and Cs and members of WGs complete and maintain a current, comprehensive SOI on the GNSO website. 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 27:** 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).
- ❖ **Recommendation 28:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 29:** That SOIs of GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all SGs and Cs include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN.

### Theme 4: Alignment with ICANN's future

- ❖ **Recommendation 20:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 21:** That the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the policy-making process.

## SECTION 2: CONTEXT FOR THIS REVIEW

---

ICANN is an internationally organized, non-profit corporation responsible, among other matters, for allocation of certain naming and addressing resources on the Internet and for management of a root server to deliver some of those resources.<sup>5</sup> ICANN uses what it describes as a “bottom-up, consensus-driven multi-stakeholder model”<sup>6</sup> to develop policy around allocation of domain names.

At ICANN’s inception in 1999, it was structured into supporting organisations – groups of stakeholders interested in one or another of the resources over whose allocation ICANN sets policy – and advisory committees that provide a mechanism for specific sectors, e.g. national governments or root server operators, to provide input on the policy process. The ICANN Board considers policies proposed after due process by supporting organisations, balances all input including public comment and approves policies, or takes other action as it sees fit.

The ICANN supporting organisation originally intended to bring together all stakeholders with an interest in domain names was called the Domain Name Supporting Organisation (DNSO). This was subsequently replaced by the GNSO and the CCNSO, both of which have been part of ICANN for over a decade.

ICANN is committed to reviewing its structures. ICANN’s bylaws provide<sup>7</sup> that the Board arrange for each supporting organisation and its council and each advisory committee<sup>8</sup> to be reviewed by an independent entity every 5 years. In addition, ICANN exists in a changing environment (see for instance the move to an “Affirmation of Commitments” with the US government in 2009) that causes aspects of its performance to be reviewed.

---

<sup>5</sup> ICANN website, glossary entry for “ICANN”, visited 13 April 2015.

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/welcome-2012-02-25-en> visited 13 April 2015.

<sup>7</sup> ICANN Bylaws, Article IV, section 4.

<sup>8</sup> Except for the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) that makes its own review arrangements.

## 2.1 Previous Reviews

The following reviews have been undertaken of GNSO and GNSO Council, or otherwise have a bearing on the GNSO and its activities:

2004	Patrick Sharry reviewed the GNSO Council.
2004	Concurrent with Patrick Sharry's review, the GNSO Council undertook a self-review.
2006	The London School of Economics (LSE) undertook a review of the GNSO
2007	<p>ICANN's Board Governance Committee formed a Working Group (the BGC WG) to consider the previous reviews and public feedback on them. The recommendations from the reviews included these themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diversity of representation and participation</li> <li>• Allowing more flexibility in the PDP process</li> <li>• Ensuring strong staff support for policy development</li> <li>• Developing better mechanisms for public participation and discussion.</li> </ul> <p>The BGC WG responded by producing recommendations in these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt a WG model</li> <li>• Revise the PDP</li> <li>• Restructure GNSO and Council</li> <li>• Enhance and support stakeholder groups and constituencies</li> <li>• Improve communications and coordination with ICANN structures.</li> </ul>
2008	The Board accepted the BGC WG Report and initiated a GNSO improvements programme. The GNSO underwent a programme of change, some of it structural, as a result.
2012	The Board concluded that "the Program has substantially developed the structures, policies, procedures, and disciplines designed to achieve long-term improvement in all five target areas." <sup>9</sup>
2013	The Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team report (ATRT2) was provided to the Board; it contains recommendations that are germane to the GNSO, particularly in recommending wider community involvement in policy development, and multilingualism.

---

<sup>9</sup> ICANN Board minutes 23 June 2012

## 2.2 Current Review

The current review began in 2014. ICANN published a Request for Proposals on 22 April 2014<sup>10</sup> and following this competitive process Westlake Governance Limited (Westlake) was appointed as the Independent Reviewer to work with a Working Party (WP) appointed by the GNSO.

ICANN staff provided guidance (but not direction) and helped with information gathering, and support in efforts to contact stakeholders and potential interviewees.

## 2.3 Approach

The Westlake Review Team has taken the following approach:

- Reviewed material for previous reviews and initiatives taken by the GNSO and ICANN in response to their recommendations
- Reviewed the timelines and progress of PDPs that have been conducted by the GNSO
- Developed and administered an online survey to gain quantitative and qualitative feedback about the GNSO from ICANN community members – this was extended several times and heavily promoted within the ICANN community; nevertheless it is a self-selected sample
- Developed and administered a second online survey to gather feedback on PDP and non-PDP Working Groups
- Conducted about forty interviews at ICANN51 and subsequently by phone and Skype. The Review Team contacted all Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies; we were able to arrange interviews with many of them.
- Drafted a working text and presented it at ICANN52 and online for WP members to provide any factual corrections
- Incorporated WP feedback on that working text to produce a revised version, and following further feedback from the WP a Draft Report was posted for Public Comment
- After the Public Comment Period, and consideration of comments received, we have prepared this Final Report for publication. We have also provided ICANN staff with a summary of public comments and our rationale for adoption or otherwise.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6b-2014-04-23-en>

## 2.4 Scope of Review

In making its enquiries, and in developing its findings and recommendations, the Westlake Review Team has considered these scope items:

1. The *context of previous reviews* as set out above. Many recommendations have been made about the GNSO since its first review in 2004. The Review Team has assessed, where possible, the extent to which these have been implemented, and the extent to which the recommendations have achieved what their framers intended
2. The *changing operating environment* – the environment in which the GNSO and ICANN operate is changing rapidly, as are the demands and expectations placed on them. Internet usage and technology also continue to evolve, raising worldwide challenges for policy makers. For instance, the expanding gTLD space has increased the number and variety of stakeholders participating in GNSO policy making,<sup>11</sup> which places demands on the GNSO to continue to ensure adequate representation of these stakeholders.

The GNSO structure and purpose are specifically not within the scope of the Review, although it was envisaged that matters relating to the GNSO's structure might arise around aspects of the Review and during the implementation phase.

---

<sup>11</sup> As noted in the ICANN Board resolution online at <https://www.myicann.org/gnso-review?language=es>

## SECTION 3: REVIEW METHODOLOGY

---

### 3.1 Previous Review

The last review of the GNSO began in 2006. The report of the independent reviewer was then considered by the Board Governance Committee, which issued its report on 3 February 2008. It included five target areas for improvement:

1. Adopt a working group model
2. Revise the Policy Development Process (PDP)
3. Restructure of the GNSO Council
4. Enhance constituencies
5. Improve communication and coordination with ICANN structures

The Board endorsed the recommendations of the Board Governance Committee in June 2008, which led to the formation of various GNSO committees to address implementation ... The improvement implementation work continued through 2012.<sup>12</sup>

### 3.2 Scope of the Westlake Review Team work

The RFP described the proposed scope of work for this review as follows:<sup>13</sup>

*... An independent reviewer to conduct an examination of the GNSO's organizational effectiveness in accordance with the ICANN-provided objective and quantifiable criteria ...*

*Note that the assessment of whether or not the GNSO has an ongoing purpose will not be considered as part of the current review.*

*The work methods are expected to include the following:*

- *Examination of documentation, records and reports.*

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-6b-2014-04-23-en>

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.



- *Outcomes from the 360° Assessment, an online mechanism to collect and summarize feedback from members of the GNSO structure, interested members from ICANN community and other structures, members of the Board and staff.*
- *Integration of Assessments of the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team [ATRT2] – see Appendix A of the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team Report and Recommendations*
- *Limited interviews, if needed.*

Our actual methodology expanded well beyond this published scope:

### **1. Examination of documentation, records and reports**

We have conducted an extensive examination of documentation, records and reports, including some material that had been archived and withdrawn from the ICANN website but to which ICANN staff referred us.

One of the challenges the Westlake Review Team encountered is the lack of quantitative data, or measures that allow for the assessment of effectiveness, such as the participation rates from each constituency in a WG, the number of new volunteers, retention rates, diversity and gender of participants. While little centralised data was available in these areas, consistency in survey responses and interviews, and the Westlake Review Team's observations and analysis supported our findings.

### **2. Outcomes from the 360° Assessment and Supplementary Working Group Surveys**

The 360° Assessment was originally envisaged as the primary means for gathering community input and feedback into the Review. The community response to the 360° Assessment was positive with 250 individuals accessing the survey and 152 completing it. Aggregate quantitative responses to the survey are contained in Appendix 2 of this document. Where possible we tested survey responses during our in depth interviews, see *4. Limited interviews, if needed, below.*

Considerable resources were applied in developing the 360° Assessment at the start of our assignment, seeking input and comment from members of the GNSO Review Working Party (Working Party), which met at frequent intervals in the early stages of the review.

It had been intended that the 360° would remain open for about a month. However, this period was extended on several occasions to allow for additional responses. ICANN staff also

sent numerous reminders to stakeholders, encouraging their participation. In the event, we received a broad cross-section of feedback from English speakers. This included a response from at least one member (and in many cases more) of the Executive Committee of every Stakeholder Group and Constituency, except for the Non-Commercial Users Constituency.

The 360° survey was in three parts:

- The first section gathered demographic data, quantitative assessment and general comments about the GNSO from all participants.
- The second part dealt with the GNSO's individual component parts – the GNSO Council, Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

Before allowing respondents to complete the section on the GNSO Council, individual SGs or Cs, the survey required them to answer the following 'filtering' question:

*Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the GNSO Council [or ... Stakeholder Group, or Constituency]?*

For SGs (as distinct from Constituencies), there was a further 'filter':

*Do not answer yes if you are involved in a constituency but not the group; we will ask about the constituencies separately.*

Only if the respondents answered *Yes*, were they presented with the statements associated with the GNSO Council, or that SG or C. If they answered *No*, they were taken automatically to the next section of the survey. Therefore, while it was possible in theory for somebody to answer without being a member or close observer, in practice we consider this improbable.

The relatively low number of respondents to each of these individual sections means that they do not have statistical validity. However, many of the comments and views were useful in guiding the direction and questions for our interviews and desk research.

- The third part sought open comments on opportunities for improvement.

In addition to the 360° Assessment, a Supplementary Working Group Survey was also circulated. This generated some useful qualitative data, but the response level was too low to be quantitatively meaningful.

### **3. *Integration of Assessments of ATRT2***

In addition to commenting on the implementation and effectiveness of the outcomes from the BGC WG's 2008 Review, we have where possible cross-referred to the Assessments of ATRT2 throughout our report.

### **4. *Limited interviews, if needed***

Our original aim in conducting the 'limited interviews' was to speak to a small cross-section of people, largely to validate the responses to the 360<sup>o</sup>s. We selected one or more individuals, typically in leadership positions, across all SGs and Cs, as well as the GNSO Council and other ICANN bodies including the Board. Despite assistance from ICANN staff (who provided recipient contact details), a considerable proportion of those we sent invitations to did not reply in the first instance or were not available during ICANN 51. We persisted in trying to contact some individuals we considered would have important contributions, before, during and after ICANN 51, but again we received no response from several of them.

During our interviews, we also received several recommendations to contact a few further individuals. At ICANN 51 in Los Angeles, we interviewed about 20 people and spoke informally to many others. We conducted further interviews remotely after ICANN 51.

Later, several people whom we had tried unsuccessfully to contact (some of whom had not completed the 360<sup>o</sup> Assessments, despite multiple communications through multiple channels from ICANN staff to the community), made it known that they did wish to be interviewed.

As a result, we have interviewed about 40 people<sup>14</sup> either face-to-face or by telephone or Skype. The interviews extended into January 2015.

The interviews allowed us to go into considerable depth about some matters, while the 360<sup>o</sup>s provided a greater breadth of comment, in most cases without the depth.

---

<sup>14</sup> Refer Appendix 3: Interviewees

In retrospect this approach was less than ideally efficient:

- a. It is almost axiomatic that members of the Working Party are currently active in the GNSO and a significant number of its members have significant experience with ICANN over many years. Not surprisingly, the composition of the Working Party largely reflects ICANN's and the GNSO's demographic make-up – most of them would likely be viewed as GNSO 'insiders'. As a result, issues of concern to 'outsiders' and those with little experience in ICANN did not emerge clearly in the early stages of our review.
- b. After the launch of the 360° Assessment, we were made aware that we needed to examine the role of GNSO Working Groups in more detail than the 360° Assessment had provided. We therefore developed and launched a Supplementary Working Group survey that was posted after the close of the main 360° Assessment. This Supplementary survey gathered some useful information, from a small number of people who completed it, but the number of responses was small (25 responses – including multiple responses from a small number of people who commented on more than one Working Group). The actual number of individuals responding was fewer than 20 so we attempted where possible to cross-check comments against those from people we later interviewed.
- c. The 360° Assessment and the Working Group surveys for this review were initially published in English, and ICANN translated both surveys into the five other United Nations languages, posting invitations in all of these languages on the GNSO website. Social media, including communications in the five other UN languages, were deployed consistently to promote participation in the surveys. Despite these efforts and significant promotion of both surveys, we did not receive a single request to send a copy of the survey in a language other than English. We did receive two sets of responses in French, but these were posted to the English language version of the 360° Assessment. We conclude from this that even those respondents had at least a working knowledge of English, in order to understand the statements they were responding to.

##### **5. Public Comment Period**

As prescribed by ICANN's processes, our Draft Report was posted for Public Comment in May 2015. In addition to comments provided online, the reviewers received substantive

further comment at ICANN53, which they attended, from members of the GNSO Review Working Party, representatives of the GNSO Council, Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other interested parties.

The reviewers found many comments provided during the Public Comment Period of great value, and elements of our Final Report were modified as a result.

### 3.3 Structure of our Report

For ease of cross-checking, we have prepared our report so that it follows largely the sequence indicated in the BGC WG's summary of the main issues. Under each of the BGC WG's main recommendations, we have reported as follows:

- Our assessment of whether the BGC WG's recommendation has been implemented effectively.
- Our observations, analysis and conclusions providing support for our assessment (whether evidence-based, anecdotal, the results of our own observations, or based on our own professional experience).
- Our further recommendations, where we have considered it appropriate.

Besides following the sequence of the BGC WG's recommendations, we have added one further future-focused part, Section 9 – Changing Environment. In addition, as we developed our recommendations, four main themes became evident:

- Participation & Representation
- Continuous Development
- Transparency
- Alignment with ICANN's future

In total, the Westlake Review Team has provided 36 recommendations. To assist understanding of how each recommendation contributes, we have included an Annex to Section 1: Report Summary, where we have listed each recommendation under its theme.

### 3.4 Interaction with ICANN staff and the Working Party

Throughout the review, the Westlake Review Team has kept in close contact with ICANN staff responsible for administering the review. In most cases formal contact has been at least weekly and informal discussions have often occurred on a daily basis. We acknowledge the assistance of ICANN

staff, who have willingly and proactively provided assistance and introductions, and on several occasions have directed us to information that we might not otherwise have been aware of or been able to find.

Similarly, the input from and liaison with the GNSO Review Working Party and its members proved very helpful in identifying many of the key matters, providing well informed insights and 'peer reviewing' and testing the 360° surveys before they were launched. We note our comment above regarding the 'ICANN insider' status of several WP members, but this is in no way a reflection on the individual members, or their willingness (with few exceptions) to engage with us and provide us with outstandingly useful information – some on multiple occasions.

## SECTION 4: ADOPTING A WORKING GROUP MODEL

---

### 4.1 BGC Recommendations

**BGC 1:** *Working Groups (WGs) should become the foundation for consensus policy development work in the GNSO. Such an approach tends to be a more constructive way of establishing where agreement might lie than task forces, where discussion can be seen as futile because the prospect of voting can polarize the group. There is value in enabling parties to become a part of the process from the beginning. This inclusiveness can have benefits in terms of being able to develop and then implement policies addressing complex or controversial issues.*

**BGC 2:** *Council and Staff should work together to develop appropriate operating principles, rules and procedures for the establishment and conduct of GNSO WG as the primary vehicle for policy development. This effort should draw upon the broad and deep expertise within the ICANN community on how lessons learned in other organizations, including but not limited to the IETF, W3C and the RIRs, might benefit ICANN. These rules and procedures should include:*

- *WGs should be open to everyone . . .*
- *Notices about the creation of working groups should be posted clearly and as broadly as possible, both inside and outside of the ICANN community . . .*
- *A strong, experienced and respected chair is essential . . .*
- *At the outset, the working group or the Council should set a minimum threshold for active support established before a decision can be considered to have been reached. . .*
- *Where such agreement is not possible, a group should strive to reach agreement on points where there is significant support and few abstentions. .*
- *Decisions where there is widespread apathy should be avoided. On the other hand, dissenters should not be able to stop a group's work simply by saying that they cannot live with a decision. . .*
- *The author(s) of the working group report will play a crucial role in building consensus, and should be distinct from the Chair. . .*
- *There should be a procedure for appealing a decision of the Chair. . .*
- *Anyone joining a working group after it has begun must review all documents and mailing list postings . . .*
- *Members of working groups must disclose certain information on standardized Statement of Interest and Declaration of Interest forms, which will be available online for public review.*

**BGC 3:** *ICANN Staff must be ready to provide sufficient support to a working group. This should include the option of recruiting and compensating outside experts for assistance on*

*particular areas of work, providing translation of relevant documents, and developing relevant training and development programs. Most important, the budget implications of additional resources for working groups should be factored into the planning cycle to the extent that has not already happened.*

## 4.2 Major accomplishments and milestones

The GNSO Council approved<sup>15</sup> a new set of Working Group Guidelines (March 2011):

- Developed by the Working Group Model Work Team (WG-WT) over the course of two years and approved by the Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC), the new guidelines feature a thorough review of every aspect of the Working Group process from its first meeting through and including the final outputs of the group.
- The new guidelines are incorporated within the GNSO Operating Procedures as Annex 1. At the Council's direction, Staff prepared a Summary of the new guidelines that is available for all current and future Working Group volunteers.

## 4.3 Summary of the Westlake Review Team's assessment of implementation effectiveness

### **BGC Recommendations 1 and 2 (WG model and WG Operating Procedures)**

The Westlake Review Team considers that the BGC Recommendations have been implemented effectively. A WG model has been adopted for consensus-based policy development. In March 2011<sup>16</sup> the Council approved new Working Group guidelines<sup>17</sup> that reflect the requirement of BGC Recommendations for the establishment and conduct of GNSO WGs as the primary vehicle for gTLD policy development. All Working Groups are formed, chartered, operated and closed in accordance with the GNSO's Working Group Guidelines. The GNSO Council is responsible for managing the Policy Development Process and recommending substantive gTLD policies to the ICANN Board for their approval. Working Groups are also used for non-PDP activities (for example, the Policy & Implementation WG).

The Westlake Review Team considers that implementation of the WG model has been effective and that the result is a marked improvement on the previous task force model. The new model meets

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/ongoing-work/archive/2012/improvements/accomplishments-en.htm>

<sup>16</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/annex-1-gnso-wg-guidelines-07apr11-en.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/council/annex-1-gnso-wg-guidelines-26mar14-en.pdf>



the intent of the BGC Recommendation in that it involves wider participation than just the members from existing constituencies. It is much more open, inclusive and transparent than previously. However, as we show later in this section, there are areas where improvements can be made.

### **BGC Recommendation 3 (Staff Support for WGs)**

The Westlake Review Team considers that the BGC Recommendation has been implemented effectively. With very few exceptions, survey respondents and interviewees noted the strong support ICANN staff provide to Working Groups.

#### **4.4 Basis for Westlake's assessment**

In general, survey respondents and interviewees highlighted the positive improvements made in the policy development area, following the changes adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board in 2011. The detailed quantitative results of the 360° and Working Group surveys are shown in Appendix 2.

The key observations (which we discuss in greater detail under subsequent headings) that contribute to our assessment of implementation effectiveness are as follows:

- The WG model is effective
- Staff support for WGs is rated very highly


Despite the overall view that the Working Group concept is effective, many respondents noted material concerns:

- A relatively small group of volunteers does the majority of the work
- Working Groups are dominated by English speakers from NA/EU
- Working Group involvement in policy implementation is limited

#### 4.4.1 The WG model is effective

##### Observations

The following chart shows that a significant majority (77%) of survey respondents hold a positive view regarding the survey statement *The Working Group model is effective in dealing with specific policy issues*:



Typical comments specifically supporting the Policy Development Process and the Working Group model from survey respondents and interviewees included:

- *The WG was very effective despite a lot of different views and interests represented and a highly complex subject.*
- *I believe that the WG was very thorough in evaluating all issues and providing appropriate recommendations.*
- *Very good transparency (all meetings recorded and transcribed and information is provided to the community in a timely manor)*
- *...I found this group worked well and delivered a good output. This was due, in large part, to the effective and capable chairing...*
- *Community feedback is sought and incorporated.*
- *There is room for improvement but overall the working group model has been effective. It is fully open, inclusive and transparent. Minority opinions are reported. It is not always possible*


*to reach consensus but that should be expected in an extremely diverse, global community with lots of controversial issues.*

- *...the Policy Development Process/Working Group model has produced and continues to produce effective and successful gTLD policy within the bottom-up multi-stakeholder system of ICANN.*

The supplementary Working Group survey had a limited response rate (quantitative statement response rate varied from 18 to 24 respondents). All the quantitative statements received strongly positive responses as shown below (further detail is available in Appendix 2 - Survey statistics).

These include:

- This WG welcomes and includes all interested stakeholders (84% positive, N = 25)
- This WG has an appropriate balance of views & affiliations (72% positive, N = 25)




#### 4.4.2 Staff support for WGs is rated very highly

##### Observations

The following chart shows results from the supplementary 360° survey. It reflects very positive views (although from a small sample) about the support for WGs provided by ICANN staff. Supplementary comments suggested a few areas in which respondents considered this could be enhanced further.

### This Working Group has sufficient secretariat staff support



The following comment is typical of those made in the survey regarding staff support for Working Groups:

- *Staff support for GNSO Working Groups has improved dramatically over last 5 years. Staff is presently doing an excellent job organizing calls and documenting outcomes...*

#### 4.4.3 A relatively small group of volunteers does the majority of the work


##### Observations

One of the concerns raised about the effectiveness of the WG implementation related to the concentration of work among a small cadre of volunteers. This concentration is exacerbated, because not only has a very small number of people worked on more than two WGs, but a significant number of volunteers have worked on only one (see graph below). Typical survey and interview responses, included:

- *There are too many WGs, not enough volunteers, have to get the same people all the time. Hard to find people who are prepared to do this*

- *The Working Group model is fantastic, but when you look at who is involved in Working Groups it's too few technical minds and too dominated by lawyers ... The model itself is sound, but we need to do something around outreach because the engagement levels are all out of whack.*
- *The GNSO is beset by a number of issues that hamper its effectiveness: - Overloaded and dispirited volunteer pool - A very small group of people who do the bulk of the work...*

The graph below (from the ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation Study report page 35)<sup>18</sup> confirms that by far the majority of Working Group members are only involved in one Working Group. The dramatic 'fall off' in participants in their second, third and more Working Groups appears to show that only a limited number of people are willing to participate in more than one WG. Consequences of this are that WGs will typically consist of members new to WGs and there will be a continual need to source new talent whenever a WG is formed.



One respondent highlighted two particular issues regarding the difficulties of participating in Working Groups:

- *“It is very difficult for anyone new to the GNSO to get up to speed quickly and be a productive member of the Working Group”* (the required level of knowledge, including technical issues

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gns0-evaluation-21nov13-en.pdf>

and acronyms, were highlighted as issues that took time to understand and could be daunting challenges for newcomers. Likewise language can be a significant barrier for some).

- *“For Working Group volunteer members, there is little economic reward or acknowledgement of their time and effort”* (however this is difficult to address consistently as not all members of WGs are volunteers; some are there as part of their paid employment).

Suggestions to address the situation included strategies to attract a larger pool of volunteers to avoid burn-out and to get “new blood and ideas.” Some respondents also believed that travel support would facilitate increased participation.

### **Analysis**

Any organisation that relies on volunteers must carefully manage volunteer recruitment, retention, performance, training/development and rewards. This is true for the ICANN community – the issues raised by respondents and prior reviews in relation to volunteers include the number of volunteers available, the skills required, their diversity (for example geography, ethnicity and gender) and financial assistance.

The BGC WG commented that *“The effective functioning of the GNSO Council relies significantly on the existence of vibrant and active stakeholders,”* and recommended the development of a global outreach programme aimed at increasing participation in constituencies and the GNSO policy process. As a follow up to this, in 2011 the Operations Steering Committee Constituency & Stakeholder Group (OSC CSG) Work Team made a set of recommendations to broaden participation in the GNSO.<sup>19</sup>

The core of these recommendations was to form a GNSO Global Outreach Task Force (OTF) to coordinate with existing groups and committees in ICANN that are engaged in outreach activities to develop an outreach strategy; including the identification of potential participants and target populations and the development of a plan to reach them; and the identification of programmes and resources to execute the strategy.

An OTF drafting team was formed to develop a charter, which was forwarded to the GNSO Council on 18th October 2011. However the Council was unable to agree on the charter for the group. In

---

<sup>19</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/global-outreach-recommendations-21jan11-en.pdf>

response to a question asked by the Westlake Review Team, staff responded, *It appears the reason it [GNSO Council] did not take further action is that the overall ICANN organization started its own outreach efforts to engage members of the GNSO community. That effort appears to have superseded the GNSO activity, or at least caused the GNSO Council to assume that it no longer needed to take action since several constituencies/SGs were involved in the ICANN outreach efforts.*

Current ICANN outreach efforts include:

- The Community Regional Outreach Pilot Programme (CROPP)<sup>20</sup> - listed under ATRT2 implementation updates.<sup>21</sup>  
CROPP<sup>22</sup> provides a framework in which each of the At-Large, RALOs and GNSO Non-Contracted Constituencies are allocated 5 regional (3-day) outreach trips. This pilot programme aims to resource individual trips to specific events for the purposes of conducting regional outreach. Trips are subject to criteria and operating guidelines. CROPP began in 2013-2014 (fiscal year) and will also run in 2015 to “*continue implementation and rigorous evaluation in order to assist in determining whether such resourced outreach merits support in future fiscal cycles.*” CROPP is overseen by ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement Team (GSE).<sup>23</sup>
- The Global Stakeholder Engagement Team is “a team of people appointed to demonstrate ICANN's commitment to international participation and the efficacy of its multi-stakeholder environment. The GSE network works with the community and organization's staff to achieve the strategic goal of better representing the regions in ICANN and facilitating ICANN's engagement with and responsiveness to the regions.” There are 23 staff in the GSE who are responsible for various regions - Africa, Asia, Australasia/Pacific Islands, Europe, Latin America & Caribbean, Middle East., North America, and Russia, Commonwealth of Independent States & Eastern Europe.

---

<sup>20</sup>

<https://community.icann.org/display/croppfy15/Community+Regional+Outreach+Pilot+Program+%28CROPP%29-FY15+Home>

<sup>21</sup> <https://community.icann.org/display/prgrmatrt2impl/ATRT2+Implementation+Program+Home>

<sup>22</sup>

<https://community.icann.org/display/croppfy15/Community+Regional+Outreach+Pilot+Program+%28CROPP%29-FY15+Home>

<sup>23</sup> <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=35521555>

- Volunteer Engagement Project<sup>24</sup>

Following a meeting between a number of leaders from ICANN constituent bodies (SOs/ACs/SGs/Cs) and ICANN’s Global Stakeholder Engagement team at ICANN 51, a project team was initiated to address the question of “*How can ICANN get more volunteers to be more meaningfully involved?*” The project team consists of:

- Tony Holmes (Internet Services Connectivity Providers Constituency);
- Rudi Vansnick: (Not for Profit Operational Concerns Chair);
- Bill Drake: (Non Commercial Users Constituency Chair);
- Chris Mondini (Vice President for Stakeholder Engagement, North America and Global Business Engagement); and
- Sally Costerton (senior advisor to President, GSE).

- Community Special Budget Request

Staff also advised that “... In recent years, as part of the annual Community Special Budget Request effort, individual communities have pursued specific requests for outreach funding and support.” According to the ICANN website, these funds pertain to a dedicated part of the overall ICANN annual budget that is set aside to take into account specific requests from the community for activities that are not already included in the recurring ICANN budget.

- Fellowship Programme<sup>25</sup>

The ICANN website states: *The Fellowship program seeks to create a broader and more regionally diverse base of knowledgeable constituents by reaching out to the less developed regions of the world to build capacity within the ICANN Multi-stakeholder Model.*

*Participation in the program at an ICANN Meeting is a ‘fast-track’ experience of engagement into that community model, with presentations designed to facilitate understanding of the many pieces and parts of ICANN while providing opportunities to network and promoting interaction with staff and community leaders.*

*The expectation is that recipients will ‘graduate’ from the program to participate in ICANN in a more visible manner, through outreach in their region, as a member of a working group, or as an active participant and potentially leader within an ICANN SO, AC, constituency or*

---

<sup>24</sup> <https://community.icann.org/display/gsenorthamwkspc/Volunteer+Engagement+Project>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/fellowships-2012-02-25-en>



*stakeholder group. Recipients of the program's support are now engaged members of the GAC, ccNSO, ALAC, SSAC, and the gNSO, with representation in its various stakeholder groups, constituencies and councils.*

As at October 2014, over 3,000 people had applied to be an ICANN fellow, and almost 600 had been selected. At ICANN52 there were 50 fellows from 37 countries. The GNSO Council has 4 appointees who have been ICANN fellows and at least some of the SGs and Cs also include members who have been ICANN fellows.

- Increasing the pool of PDP WG volunteers

One of the ongoing GNSO PDP Improvement activities is to increase the pool of PDP WG volunteers. A PDP Improvements Discussion Group,<sup>26</sup> made up of a committee of interested GNSO Councillors, was formed in January 2014 to work with staff on improvement initiatives. An update at ICANN 51 noted the following progress:

- Monthly open house newcomer WG webinars co-hosted with GNSO Council members (RSVPs have increased threefold),
- Implementation of PDP WG Member On-boarding Program, and
- Exploring other tools to facilitate sign-up and induction.

Staff also implemented a change that allows for interested parties to partially join a WG as a 'mailing list observer' with the aim that volunteers can, in the words of one interviewee, *watch a little bit for a while until you feel comfortable to actually join as a full member.* These actions aim to reduce the barriers for newcomers, such as the widespread use of acronyms and the complexity of ICANN (how it works, its structures, and rules and processes).

The various initiatives above highlight that a number of programmes have been designed to increase volunteer participation and engagement. Apart from "*Increasing the pool of PDP WG volunteers,*" the initiatives relate to ICANN in general, rather than specifically addressing the limited PDP volunteer pool and WG workload issue in the GNSO. It is clear from our survey responses and interviewees and the ATRT2 review (see details below) that the availability of appropriate volunteers for the PDP process remains an issue.

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/meetings/projects-list.pdf>

The ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation Study<sup>27</sup> concluded that: *...fully engaged participation in PDPs requires an extraordinary set of demands on participants. In the last five years: The vast majority of people who participate in Working Groups participate only once, and a small number of participants who have economic and other support for their ongoing engagement have dominated Working Group attendance records.”*

*Having such a small pool poses accountability, credibility, and resource risks for the policy development process. It also results in very few participants who have the experience to lead, moderate and bring to completion the difficult work of guiding participants and policy through the PDP.*

*There is clear statistical evidence that three of ICANN’s [five] regions play no meaningful part in the PDP. The research conducted for this report identified two key factors in producing this geographic imbalance:*

- *Language is a genuine barrier to participation in PDPs.*
- *The collaboration and discourse model built into the current PDP has a distinctly Western approach and does not take into account other cultural approaches to developing and building consensus policies.*

*The GNSO [puts at risk its] global legitimacy—a core value of the policy that comes out of the PDPs—when it does not include viewpoints from Africa, Asia/Pacific and the Latin American/Caribbean/South American regions.*

Two ATRT2 recommendations relate to the limited volunteer pool issue:

1. *The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO policy development processes, as well as other GNSO processes. The focus should be on the viability and methodology of having the opportunity for equitable, substantive and robust participation from and representing:*
  - a. *All ICANN communities with an interest in gTLD policy and in particular, those represented within the GNSO,*
  - b. *Under-represented geographical regions,*
  - c. *Non-English speaking linguistic groups,*

---

<sup>27</sup> <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/41898277/Final%20Report%20-%20ATRT2%20GNSO%20PDP%20Review.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1380909881000&api=v2>

- d. *Those with non-Western cultural traditions, and*
  - e. *Those with a vital interest in gTLD policy issues but who lack the financial support of industry players.*
2. *The Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities, of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players.*

The Westlake Review Team received many comments consistent with the above points, especially – as might be expected – from survey respondents and interviewees located outside NA and EU and from people whose first language was not English. A different perspective presented by a number of English speakers was the difficulty they had in understanding participants for whom English was not their first language.

### **Westlake Review Team Recommendations**

- ❖ **Recommendation 1:** That the GNSO 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).
- ❖ **Recommendation 2:** That the GNSO 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 3:** That the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in WGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 4:** That the GNSO Council introduce non-financial rewards and recognition for volunteers.
- ❖ **Recommendation 5:** That, during each WG self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.

#### 4.4.4 Working Groups are dominated by English speakers from NA/EU.

##### **Observations**

Section 3.2 of Annex 1 to the GNSO Operating Procedures<sup>28</sup> (the GNSO Working Group Guidelines) on Representativeness states that

*“Ideally, a Working Group should mirror the diversity and representativeness of the community by having representatives from most, if not all, Chartering Organization (CO), Stakeholder Groups and/or Constituencies. It should be noted that certain issues might be more of interest to one part of the community than others. The Chair, in cooperation with the Secretariat and ICANN Staff, is continually expected to assess whether the WG has sufficiently broad representation, and if not, which groups should be approached to encourage participation. Similarly, if the Chair is of the opinion that there is over-representation to the point of capture, he/she should inform the Chartering Organization.”*

While it is recognised that it is not mandatory to have representatives from most if not all Stakeholder Groups and/or Constituencies in a WG, one of the GNSO PDP improvement proposals is to look at *“requiring a WG representative from each SG/C to participate including as a silent observer.”* To date little progress has been made on this initiative. As the GNSO does not collect WG members’ representation data, it is difficult to assess the size of this problem, however we received many comments and saw significant anecdotal evidence of the lack of progress in this area. At the ICANN 51 meeting, it was reported that staff would review data to identify the make-up of recent WGs<sup>29</sup>.


ICANN’s Core Value 4 refers to *Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.* However, it appears that GNSO Working Group Guidelines cover the need to have SG/C representation but are silent on geographic and cultural diversity as required under ICANN’s Core Value 4. As we discuss in Section 7 - Enhance Constituencies, many respondents commented that diversity and representation are issues for the GNSO and its WGs. The Westlake Review Team believes that reflecting the diversity of the community in GNSO WGs is important in respect of ICANN Core Value 4 - Functional Diversity.

---

<sup>28</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/op-procedures-13nov14-en.pdf>

<sup>29</sup> <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/sat-gns0-working/transcript-pdp-improvements-11oct14-en>

The following two graphs extracted from the ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation Study<sup>30</sup> highlight the issue.




Data for the graph above was extracted from the geographic location specified by Working Group participants in their Statement of Interest. North American participants account for 70% of participation in Working Groups. Europe provides 18.7% of Working Group members in recent PDPs. Together, Africa, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Latin America/Caribbean account for 13.3% of Working Group members.

The following comments from the 360<sup>0</sup> Assessment support these observations:

- *Stop discussing in a language only them understand*
- *Language is a real barrier. The English-only culture is exclusive...*
- *It is hard to participate in ICANN if English is not your first language... Native English speakers do not need to make the effort that non-English speakers do*

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gns0-evaluation-21nov13-en.pdf>



The ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation study identified that

*“Two issues stand out immediately: first, participation in WG is dominated by men; and second, participation by women is increasing. It appears that while women participation may be less, the effort to pursue gender diversity may be working.”*

The Westlake Review Team agrees with the ATRT2 recommendations on representation and diversity as set out in the section relating to increasing the pool of volunteers (noted above in *Section 4.4.3 - A relatively small number of volunteers do the majority of the work*).

Based on survey comments, interviews and the difficulty we had in obtaining current data on participation and diversity, we consider that the GNSO should record this information and make it public. We were asked what number of volunteers would make up an appropriate PDP volunteer pool. This is almost impossible to assess given the varying number of participants in WGs and varying number of WGs running at any one time.

### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 6:** That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on WG participation (including diversity statistics).
- ❖ **Recommendation 7:** That Stakeholder Groups (SGs) and Constituencies (Cs) engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English, as a means to overcoming language barriers.

#### 4.4.5 Working Group involvement in policy implementation is limited.

##### Observations

A number of survey respondents and interviewees commented on the distinction between Policy [Development] and Implementation [of Policy]. Below is a range of typical comments:

- *While the GNSO has been effective at developing initial policies - it has often not been engaged in the ongoing evolution of those policies.*
- *Responsible for [policy development], yes; but [GNSO] also has allowed other portions of ICANN to steer policy -- including ICANN staff in implementation of policy.*
- *While the GNSO process is effective in producing policy recommendations in a bottom-up process, there are a few gaps in following through with more interactive processes through to the implementation and execution phases of policies:*
  - a. *Ability to guard against top-down policies driven by the staff in the name of practice/precedence or interpretation thereof.*
  - b. *Ability to follow through from policy development to policy implementation and operational execution to ensure the integrity of the policy and the interpretation of which remains in the public interest and considered in a multi-stakeholder model*
  - c. *Ability to interactively work with 1&2 above especially when further advice is received after policy recommendations are submitted (e.g. advices from GAC, ALAC, SSAC, etc.)*

ATRT2 believed that while ICANN had undertaken significant work, “A continuing lack of clarity about ‘policy versus implementation’ causes uncertainty at best and distrust at worst about whether

*ICANN Board or staff is acting within its proper scope or whether ICANN is acting in a 'top-down' as opposed to a 'bottom-up' manner."*

The Policy & Implementation Working Group was initiated in August 2013 as a result of increased focus on which topics call for policy and which call for implementation work. In December 2014, this WG provided the GNSO Council with its initial Recommendations Report for public comment, on:

- A set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions.
- A process for developing gTLD input, perhaps in the form of "Policy Guidance", (e.g., policy clarification including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process for developing input other than "Consensus Policy") instead of a GNSO Policy Development Process.
- A framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO Policy Recommendations.
- Criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation, and
- Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams are expected to function and operate.

The Westlake Review Team considers that the recommendations from this working group have the potential to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the Policy Development Process. This could result in fewer discussions within the WG about what is policy and what is implementation, and also improve transparency and role clarity between staff and WG participants.

A further issue raised by survey respondents and interviewees was that WGs were not called upon to respond to or provide input to questions raised when policy developed by the WG was being implemented. For example:

- *...[WGs] be able, and asked to, provide implementation guidance to its policies.*
- *GNSO WGs should not disband after recommendations are made. They need to come back together to address implementation questions.*

The Westlake Review Team notes that the issue of WGs providing implementation guidance is being considered by the Policy and Implementation Working Group. We consider that this Working



Group's output should include specific recommendations regarding the WGs having a role in responding to issues related to policy implementation.

### **Westlake Review Team Recommendations**

- ❖ **Recommendation 8:** That WGs should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> We understand that GNSO Council has now adopted the recommendations of the Working Group under which Implementation Review Teams will become standard practice.

## SECTION 5: REVISE THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDP)

---

### 5.1 BGC Recommendations

- BGC 4:** *While the procedure for developing “consensus policies” will need to continue to be established by the Bylaws as long as required by ICANN’s contracts, Council and Staff should work together to propose new PDP rules for the Board’s consideration and approval. Once approved, the rules would become part of the GNSO Council’s operating procedures. They should be subject to periodic review by the Council, which may come back to the Board to recommend changes. The rules should better align the PDP with the contractual requirements of “consensus policies,” as that term is used in ICANN’s contracts with registries and registrars, and distinguish that procedure more clearly from general policy advice the GNSO may wish to provide the Board. In addition, the Bylaws should clarify that only a GNSO recommendation on a consensus policy can, depending on the breadth of support, be considered binding on the Board, unless it is rejected by a supermajority vote.*
- In preparing the new PDP proposal, the implementation team should emphasize the importance of the work that must be done before launch of a working group . . .*
- BGC 5:** *Periodic assessment of the influence of the GNSO Council, including the PDP, is another important component of successful policy development. Metrics can help measure the success of the policy recommendation. Frequent self-assessment by the Council and its working groups can lead to immediate improvements in the GNSO’s ability to make meaningful policy contributions. The Council should ask each working group to include in its report a self-assessment of any lessons learned, as well as input on metrics that could help measure the success of the policy recommendation.*
- BGC 6:** *The PDP should be better aligned with ICANN’s strategic plan and operations plan. A formal Policy Development Plan should be linked to ICANN’s overall strategic plan, but at the same time should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in priority.*

## 5.2 Major accomplishments and milestones

The ICANN Board adopted<sup>32</sup> revised Annex A and the new GNSO Policy Development Process (8 December 2011) containing 48 improvement recommendations crafted over the course of two years by the Policy Development Process Work Team (PDP-WT). A Policy Development Process Model has also been developed which documents the following major improvements:

- Standardized Request for an Issue Report Template;
- Introduction of a Preliminary Issues Report which shall be published for public comment prior to the creation of a Final Issues Report to be acted upon by the GNSO Council;
- Requirement that each PDP Working Group operate under a Charter;
- Bylaws amended such that upon initiation of a PDP, public comment periods are optional rather than mandatory, at the discretion of the PDP Working Group;
- Public Comment timeframes include:<sup>33</sup> (i) a required open period of no less than 30 days on a PDP Working Group's Initial Report; and (ii) a minimum of 21 days for any non-required Public Comment periods the PDP WG might choose to initiate at its discretion;
- Requirement of PDP WG to produce both an Initial Report and Final Report, but giving the WG discretion to produce additional outputs;
- Provision to allow the termination of a PDP prior to delivery of the Final Report;
- New procedures on the delivery of recommendations to the Board including a requirement that all are reviewed by either the PDP Working Group or the GNSO Council and made publicly available; and
- Optional use of Implementation Review Teams.

---

<sup>32</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/ongoing-work/archive/2012/improvements/accomplishments-en.htm>

<sup>33</sup> The GNSO Operating Procedures have since changed. The current version is v2.9 dated November 2014.

### 5.3 Summary of the Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness

#### **BGC Recommendation 4 (PDP Rules/Operating Procedures)**

The Westlake Review Team considers that Recommendation 4 has been implemented. The ICANN Board adopted revised Annex A and the new GNSO Policy Development Process (8 December 2011), which fulfils the requirements of the BGC Recommendations.

In respect of effectiveness, survey respondents and interviewees considered that the Policy Development Process in general works well. However, they considered that improvements could be made in the following areas:

1. Experienced and skilled WG leadership (including educating and training chairs and co-chairs).
2. Having more face-to-face meetings (including support on travel costs) to make better use of time and improve effectiveness.
3. Alternatives to the full PDP to be available in certain circumstances.

These are discussed below in “5.4 Basis for Westlake’s Assessment.”

#### **BGC Recommendation 5 (Self Assessment)**

The Westlake Review Team is of the view that implementation of BGC Recommendation 5 is incomplete.

A WG self-assessment questionnaire is available.<sup>34</sup> We understand that no WG had completed a questionnaire as at the end of 2014, however we have been advised that the IRTP-D WG completed a self-assessment in early 2015.

The GNSO Operating Procedures (Annex 1: Section 7 – Working Group Self-Assessment) states “A *WG Self-Assessment instrument has been developed as a means for Chartering Organizations to formally request feedback from a WG as part of its closure process. WG members are asked a series of questions about the team’s inputs, processes (e.g., norms, decision-making, logistics), and outputs as well as other relevant dimensions and participant experiences.*”

---

<sup>34</sup> <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-reviewdt/msg00214.html>

We note that under the current GNSO Operating Procedures, the evaluations should occur following a request from the WG's Chartering Organization. The Westlake Review Team was also unable to find any evidence of COs having requested a WG self-evaluation, but understands that the ability for a WG to complete a self-evaluation was only recently included (March 2014) in an update to the GNSO Operating Procedures<sup>35</sup>. We support the BGC WG's recommendation and, further, consider such evaluations should be undertaken as part of the standard WG closure process, regardless of whether the Chartering Organisation requests it. WG self-evaluations can provide valuable information for monitoring process effectiveness and improving the process over time.

### **BGC Recommendation 6 (Link to ICANN's Strategic Plan)**

The Westlake Review Team was unable to locate any evidence of links between ICANN's overall Strategic Plan and the GNSO's policy development work plan. Staff advised that there is no formal linkage. We support the BGC WG's recommendation and conclude that Recommendation 6 has not been implemented.

## **5.4 Basis for Westlake's assessment**

### **5.4.1 BGC Recommendation 4 (PDP Rules/Operating Procedures)**

#### ***Observations***

Many comments from the surveys and interviews suggest that the length of time it takes to complete a PDP is excessive, however a roughly similar number expressed the following counter view:


- *While it may be slower-moving than top-down decisions, it takes into account the entire community and allows them to discuss matters of import to the Internet—arguably the most powerful technology in the world, affecting nearly everyone on the globe.*

---

35

<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoworkgroupres/GNSO+Council+Resolution%3A+WG+Self-Assessments>

The following graph from the 360° Assessment shows that respondents are almost equally divided in relation to the statement “GNSO’s policy recommendations are timely.” 50% of responses Strongly agreed or Agreed, from a total of 137 respondents.



Survey respondents and interviewees made the following typical comments:

- *The multi-stakeholder model is by design a slow and deliberative process, and this is how it should be. A truly bottom-up process requires this. It can sometimes be frustrating that progress is slow, but progress is only ever quick in a top-down model and that isn't how the Internet can or should work.*
- *I think that the current process is very thorough and very complete. There is community involvement at several moments in the life of a PDP, but this has of course an impact on the timeliness.*
- *It takes far too long to develop recommendations.*
- *Although I support the GNSO's policy development process, I have to admit that the process takes more time than desired by the community. I wish there were methods [to] expedite the PDP process.*
- *Recommendations are not timely but it will not be easy to make them timely except on very simple issues. Steps should be taken to make them more timely but not by risking the fundamental principle of bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development.*

- *The GNSO does need to develop processes that allow it to more quickly identify issues, alternative solutions to those issues, and then move forward.*
- *While the GNSO process seems long, it is relatively reasonable compared to equivalent processes.*

## **Analysis**

The ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation Study<sup>36</sup> noted “... *It is very difficult to determine what the right time would be for any issue where a PDP successfully passes each stage of the PDP, through to implementation.*” The variation in the overall duration of PDPs could be caused by the complexity of the policy or the inefficiencies of the process, or both. The survey responses and interviews suggest it is a mixture of both.

Staff provided the Westlake Review Team with a table of PDP timelines<sup>37</sup> – showing the time from the “Request for an Issues Report” to the “Council Vote” stage of the process. The average length of a PDP is between 2 and 3 years, the shortest was 343 days (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) - Part A), and the longest 1,005 days (Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR)).

A number of respondents cautioned against the potential consequences of shortening the Policy Development Process. These included:

- The balance between speed and thoroughness.
- Increasing speed could further reduce participation rates, as volunteers may be unable to meet tighter deadlines/milestones.
- With potentially lower participation rates comes the possibility of reduced stakeholder ‘buy in’ and consequently less effective implementation of developed policy.

Notwithstanding these points of caution, survey respondents and interviewees suggested a number of ways to shorten or improve the effectiveness of the PDP, including:

1. Experienced and skilled WG leadership (including educating and training chairs and co-chairs).

---

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gns0-evaluation-21nov13-en.pdf>

<sup>37</sup> See Appendix 5 – PDP Timelines

2. Having more face-to-face meetings (including support on travel costs) to make better use of time and improve effectiveness.
3. Alternative processes:
  - Fast track process for policy enhancement (as distinct from Policy Development).
  - Chunking – breaking policy development into smaller (discrete) pieces.
  - Including the Proposed Charter as part of the Preliminary Issues Report.
  - Intensity of PDP WG meetings
  - Exploring flexibility in relation to public comment forum duration

These are addressed in more detail below.

### **1. Experienced and skilled Working Group leadership**

#### ***Observations***

The BGC WG recognised that the move to Working Groups as the primary means of policy development would require both skilled chairs and training for the members of the ICANN community who might wish to participate in Working Groups.

Survey respondents and interviewees made consistent comments about the benefit of experienced and skilled leadership of Working Groups. Many respondents suggested paid facilitation as a way to improve leadership while others suggested training and development for WG Chairs (and potential Chairs). For example:

- *Process is good, depends on chair skills. Often a subject matter expert is a poor chair...*
- *If a PDP is run professionally, it works really well...*

A trained and experienced chair is a commonly accepted means of managing a diverse group of participants, in a complex policy development environment, in order to ensure focus and overcome political agendas. Some respondents also suggested the use of experts (who might include staff, where appropriate) for PDP preparatory work.



The use of facilitators was also suggested in the earlier Patrick Sharry report<sup>38</sup>. The BGC WG also suggested *“The Council and Staff might consider using a professional facilitator to help a chair ensure neutrality and promote consensus, or to provide other expertise.”*

This recommendation is supported by the following comment, which was typical of the feedback we received:

- *Provide expert facilitation for working groups to avoid political agendas diverting time and attention away from the real work.*

The Westlake Review Team considers that an experienced independent chair is the preferred option because, as a full member of the WG, they will be seen to be working within the WG and have incentives to complete the process in a timely manner. An independent paid facilitator may have no such incentive – indeed they may benefit personally from prolonging the process.

To achieve skilled leadership, the BGC WG recommended that *The [GNSO] Council should work with Staff to develop a training and development curriculum to promote skills development for the Council, prospective chairs of working groups and, ideally, all members of the ICANN community who might wish to take part in working groups; and ...to put in place...an initial package of training and development programs and other systems to create a group of skilled chairs and a pool of facilitators familiar with ICANN issues... It also suggested that ICANN may want to consider developing a process for accreditation or certification for those who complete certain extensive curriculum ... Once these training and development structures are in place, ICANN should urge those who wish to hold positions, such as chairs of working groups and members of the Council, to undertake the relevant training (or equivalent training) or to do so upon their appointment.*

## **Analysis**

Our analysis shows that progress has been made in respect of skilled leadership and facilitators:

- The development of the ICANN Leadership Training Programme as one module of the ICANN Academy.

This programme was run in 2013 and 2014. It is supplemented by online training tools and is for both new and existing community leaders. It is an intensive on-boarding and facilitation

---

<sup>38</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/reviews/gns0-review-sec1-22dec04.pdf>

skills training programme with key elements such as facilitation, conflict, mediation and communication skills. Community leaders are urged to attend the programme, but this is not compulsory. In addition, while feedback is required from all participants, there does not appear to be any assessment system in place to measure the effectiveness of the programme and/or the skill sets of community leaders.

A well tailored training and development programme could be an incentive for personal development and therefore be attractive for both new and existing volunteers (see more in the volunteer section below).

The Westlake Review Team considers that the implementation of the BGC Recommendation in respect of training and development has not yet achieved the desired results:

- Leadership accreditation/certification as suggested by the BGC WG has not been implemented
- Survey respondents and interviewees identified that leadership skills remain an issue.

The ATRT2 recommended that the Board should develop funded services to provide *“training to enhance work group leaders' and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situations.”*

In addition we note that it is difficult to identify and address training and development needs when there are no objective measures.

- Use of professional facilitator/moderator

Professional facilitation/moderation is one of the suggested GNSO PDP Improvement topics initiated by staff in 2013. Survey respondents and interviewees generally supported the ATRT2 recommendation that *“the Board should develop funded options for professional services to assist GNSO policy development WGs. Such services could include training to enhance work group leaders' and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situations, professional facilitation, mediation, negotiation. The GNSO should develop guidelines for when such options may be invoked.”*

The Westlake Review Team considers that the use of a professional facilitator/moderator, who is well briefed on the subject matter of the WG, is helpful 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).

We note that the first pilot of a facilitated face-to-face WG meeting<sup>39</sup> occurred at ICANN 51 in October 2014. This pilot is specifically focused on assessing the impact of professional facilitation as well as face-to-face time for PDP WGs. We regard this as a positive development.

### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 9:** That a formal Working Group leadership assessment programme be developed as part of the overall training and development programme.
- ❖ **Recommendation 10:** That the GNSO Council develop criteria for WGs to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations.

## 5.4.2 Facilitating Consensus-Based Decision-Making

### Observations

Working Group decision-making uses three primary channels: email lists, audio conferences and face-to-face meetings. All have their disadvantages. Using face-to-face meetings to improve WG meetings was a commonly suggested improvement from survey respondents and interviewees. They also felt that travel support would be required for participants (especially volunteers) to attend face-to-face meetings. We note however that a smaller number of respondents expressed concern that the resulting increase in the travel required could present significant challenges for volunteer participants in particular and would of course impact on ICANN's budget.

The Westlake Review Team believes that in some situations it will be more effective and efficient to conduct discussions face-to-face. Where possible, face-to-face meetings should be held in conjunction with ICANN meetings, before or after the main meeting. We acknowledge that GNSO has utilised the ICANN meetings as an opportunity to conduct some face-to-face meetings, but increased and targeted use of face-to-face meetings would be beneficial and could enhance both decision-making and efficiencies. We support the ATRT2 recommendation that *The Board should provide adequate funding for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, wiki and teleconferences for GNSO policy development processes. Such face-to-face meeting must also accommodate remote participation, and consideration should also be given to using regional ICANN facilities (regional hubs*

---

<sup>39</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-03oct14-en.htm>

*and engagement centers) to support intersessional meetings. Moreover, the possibility of meetings added on to the start or end of ICANN meetings could also be considered.*

Teleconferences as used by the GNSO and its WGs have a number of disadvantages:

- They use a relatively high proportion of their time conducting administrative matters such as roll calls, which makes them an inefficient use of time
- They require familiarity with the English language and can be very difficult to follow if the speaker and/or listener does not have excellent English, which makes it hard for non-Anglophone people to participate
- They do not transmit non-verbal cues, so-called “body language”, that in a face-to-face environment may make a speaker’s intent clearer
- They require everyone to be available simultaneously which has the effect of reducing participation by people outside American and European time zones.

Email is used for off-line communication. It doesn’t suffer the same disadvantages as teleconferences, in that as an off-line medium it can be read and answered when convenient and it can be translated using e.g. Google Translate if necessary. However, it has its own disadvantages:

- It can be much slower to reach consensus than an online meeting
- It is harder to be certain that all parties have agreed
- As many of the ICANN community routinely receive a very large quantity of email they may miss important points being made.

### ***Analysis***

The paucity of tools available to working groups contributes to their relatively slow progress, to their narrow participation and to the frustration levels of their members. There are alternative tools for debating and achieving consensus on the Internet. One that is known to the reviewers (but in which they have no interest) is Loomio<sup>40</sup>. Like email, Loomio is off-line in that people contribute as and when they have are able. Unlike email it provides a structured environment for interaction, allowing

---

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.loomio.org>

participants to set up proposals, to have conversations about those proposals, to vote on them, and to change their votes if they become persuaded of an alternative point of view, until the decision is made. As well as posting their comments as text, users can express a state which is one of *Yes*, *Neutral*, *No* or *Block* and which they can change over time as the discussion continues and a consensus emerges. All interactions are logged and available for later review, to provide accountability and transparency.

Loomio is open source software licensed under the AGPL version 3. It is written in Ruby on Rails and uses the PostgreSQL database. Loomio can be run on Loomio's own servers for modest cost or forked, modified as desired and run on ICANN's servers or e.g. Amazon AWS as desired. We have established that adding machine translation by using, for example, the Google Translate API should be relatively straightforward.

We propose that ICANN and the GNSO evaluate a technology solution (which might include Loomio and/or suitable alternatives), with a view to:

1. Implementing automatic machine translation into relevant languages (UN plus Portuguese as a minimum)
2. Adding participation metrics, so that the volumes of comments and votes from each participant can be measured.

The chosen solution, with modification as needed, could be piloted for a PDP WG and a non-PDP WG, and also by SGs, Cs and the GNSO Council. Participants and staff would evaluate the pilot, with a view to the GNSO adopting the technology.

If such a technology was adopted, several of our Recommendations (for example those relating to Participation and Metrics) would be implemented as a matter of course by the technology.

The ICANN community has long prided itself on being faster at decision-making than older trans-national bodies such as those sponsored by the UN. These bodies have grown up with an ethos of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic cooperation, which partly explains the perceived slowness and bureaucracy of their decision processes, relative to ICANN's model. However, the Anglophone-centricity of the GNSO's policy development processes as described in this report is not sustainable in the face of a globalizing Internet. An alternative to becoming more like the UN would be for ICANN and the GNSO to make better use of the infrastructure it is there to be steward of and embrace modern Internet-based tools to build the bottom-up consensus its mandate requires.

### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 11:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 12:** That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcribing service in audio conferences for WG meetings.
- ❖ **Recommendation 13:** That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in WG consensus-based decision making.

### 3. Alternative policy development processes

#### Observations

Several survey respondents and interviewees suggested ways to streamline the Policy Development Process. These include adopting a fast-track process for policy enhancements (in contrast to development of new policy) and ‘chunking’ or breaking one complex PDP into several smaller discrete PDPs. The ideal time for this to occur would be at the Issues Report Stage of the PDP.

In addition three current initiatives from the GNSO PDP Improvements Project propose reviewing several components of the PDP:

- Inclusion of the Proposed Charter as part of the Preliminary Issues Report,
- The intensity of PDP WG meetings, and
- Flexibility in relation to public comment forum duration.

#### Analysis

- Fast-track Process

A ‘Fast-track’ process was discussed in 2011. The Policy Development Process Working Team (PDP WT), part of the Policy Process Steering Committee, discussed a fast-track procedure extensively and did not reach agreement on whether such a process was needed. It recommended *“that the GNSO re-evaluate the need for a fast-track procedure in due time as part of the review of the new PDP, as it is of the view that the new PDP will offer additional flexibility and would allow for faster PDPs provided that the necessary resources are available without the need for a formal fast-track process.”*

The Policy and Implementation Working Group is currently reviewing recommendations to address various issues relating to policy and implementation. We have been advised that this WG has recently published its Initial Recommendations Report for public comment, including a proposed Expedited Policy Development Process for use in limited circumstances.

- 'Chunking'/Breaking PDP into smaller discrete PDPs

Adopting different process for different PDPs could reduce a WG's workload and hence reduce barriers to volunteer recruitment.

In the case of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) for example, it was broken down into four PDPs and appears to have worked well.

	IRTP Part A	IRTP Part B	IRTP Part C	IRTP Part D
<b>Request for issues report</b>	May 2008	April 2009	June 2011	Oct 2012
<b>Council vote</b>	April 2009	June 2011	Oct 2012	Oct 2014

Three members (including the chair) participated in all four Parts of this PDP. Other members participated in one or more. Based on this information, it appears that breaking down the PDP has allowed increased flexibility for people to participate in the 'chunks' that are of more interest to them, rather than participating in the entire PDP. 'Chunking' could therefore reduce the time demand on some volunteers, which has been highlighted as one of the barriers to volunteer participation in WGs. The disadvantage of such an approach could be the lack of continuity of knowledge of interconnected topics for those who join only parts of the series. However, no evidence of this was noted by survey respondents or interviewees.

The Westlake Review Team considers on the limited evidence to date that there are circumstances in which breaking PDP into discrete 'chunks' may be beneficial.

- Including the Proposed Charter in the Preliminary Issues Report

Staff noted that Charter Development took approximately 150 to 250 days following the initiation of a PDP because it required a specific and additional call for drafting team volunteers and sometimes lengthy discussions. The inclusion of a draft charter (as part of the Preliminary and Final Issues Report) has been suggested as a way to reduce this time. It would allow the draft charter to be considered during the public comment period. The

Council could then approve the charter at the same time as part of the initiation of the PDP. At the time of writing the GNSO Council has conducted a pilot process for the Curative Rights Preliminary Issues Report.

- Intensity of PDP WG meetings

Staff have suggested that they may be able to shorten the PDP process by extending the current one hour long weekly meetings, spread over a year and a half. Some of these longer meetings could occur face-to-face (see above).

We have commented earlier that our review of WG meeting transcripts revealed that a significant proportion of the allocated hour's meeting was taken up with the roll call and other procedural matters and this was, naturally, more noticeable in those WGs that had a larger membership.

Given these observations, we consider that increasing the length of individual WG meetings, and reducing the number, may increase efficiency and shorten the overall process. In turn this would probably require an increased period between WG meetings, because we have been advised that many people would be unable to increase what is already seen as a significant time requirement to serve on a WG.

If a WG decided to follow this approach – longer but fewer meetings – a necessary trade-off is likely to be some loss of continuity. We would therefore recommend that each WG consider what meeting schedule best balances its needs and the constraints of its members.

- Explore flexibility in relation to public comment forum duration

A small number of survey respondents and interviewees noted that little substantive policy change ever resulted from the public comment period. The following points were noted:

- *It seems public comments have NEVER affected change to a policy outside of a minor tweak in wording.*
- *Public comment system doesn't work well.*
- *...Multiple public consultations, rationale is comment then people may want to comment on comments. Should change.*



However the issue did not appear to be a concern for the majority of respondents.

ATRT2 made the following recommendations in relation to the public comment phases of the PDP:

- *The Board should explore mechanisms to improve Public Comment through adjusted time allotments, forward planning regarding the number of consultations given anticipated growth in participation, and new tools that facilitate participation.*
- *The Board should establish a process under the Public Comment Process where those who commented or replied during the Public Comment and/or Reply Comment period(s) can request changes to the synthesis reports in cases where they believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comment(s)<sup>41</sup>.*

The Westlake Review Team notes that the PDP manual requires WGs to review and analyse comments and demonstrate how these were considered. A number of improvements have been made already to the public comment process and specifically that the public comment period has been changed to require a minimum of 40 days<sup>42</sup>. We note further that the Policy and Implementation WG sought Public Comment by means of an on-line survey. We recommend that the WG and the GNSO Council assess the effectiveness of this approach. Further improvements are under consideration and development.<sup>43</sup>

### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 14:** That the GNSO further explores PDP ‘chunking’ and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.
- ❖ **Recommendation 15:** That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.

---

<sup>41</sup> The Westlake Review Team note that this recommendation is being implemented in February 2015

<sup>42</sup> <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-01-16-en>

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.icann.org/news/blog/sharing-a-plan-for-public-comment-improvements>.

### 5.4.3 BGC Recommendation 5 (Self Assessment)

#### **Observations**

A number of survey respondents and interviewees commented on measures and metrics in relation to policy development. For example:

- *More transparent measurement and evaluation would assist both the work of the GNSO, and as assessment of its impact on policy outcomes...and on implementation.*
- *Need more dialogue with regard to what is measured w/r to impact of outputs, and how that can be understood by the wider constituency communities.*
- *Very little measurement of public needs, or the public consequences of its policies.*
- *More needs to be done to measure the impact of its [GNSO] output. This is a huge challenge but it has become better with an active action item and project list. Still a lot could be done but volunteer burn out is important.*

The Westlake Review Team notes that the Data & Metrics for Policy Making WG (non PDP) has been initiated to review data and metrics in relation to policy development<sup>44</sup>. This WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on:

- A set of principles that may complement any GNSO policy efforts related to metric/data requirements to better inform the policy development process.
- A process for requesting metrics and reports both internal to ICANN or external, including GNSO contracted parties.
- A framework for distributing metrics and reports to Working Groups, the GNSO Council and the GNSO as a whole.
- Changes, if any, to existing Working Group Guidelines and work product templates.

In relation to the final point above, the Westlake Review Team considers that the WG should consider measures of effectiveness at two levels:

- The effectiveness of the policy development process, and

---

<sup>44</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/dmpm>

- The effectiveness of the policy once it has been implemented.

#### Policy Development Effectiveness

The GNSO Operating Procedures (Annex 1: Section 7 – Working Group Self Assessment) states “A WG Self-Assessment instrument has been developed as a means for Chartering Organizations to formally request feedback from a WG as part of its closure process. WG members are asked a series of questions about the team’s inputs, processes (e.g., norms, decision-making, logistics), and outputs as well as other relevant dimensions and participant experiences.”

#### Policy Effectiveness

The BGC WG noted<sup>45</sup> *“Subsequent review by Council should discuss the extent to which policy adopted has been implemented successfully and proven effective,”* and *“The GNSO Council Chair to present an annual report to the ICANN community on the effectiveness of new GNSO policies using the metrics developed at the end of each PDP”*.

We note also that the GNSO Operating Procedures (Annex 2: Policy Development Process Manual, item 17 - Periodic Assessments of Approved Policies), state *“Periodic assessment of PDP recommendations and policies is an important tool to guard against unexpected results or inefficient processes arising from GNSO policies. PDP Teams are encouraged to include proposed timing, assessment tools, and metrics for review as part of their Final Report. In addition, the GNSO Council may at any time initiate reviews of past policy recommendations.”*

The diagram below - A Generic Policy Development Process<sup>46</sup> - identifies the four commonly accepted stages of a generic process for developing policies:


- Agenda setting, identifies the issues and defines policy objectives that define the expected outcomes;
- Policy formulation/development, defines and analyses the range of policy instruments that could be applied to achieve the objectives.
- Policy implementation, takes these methods and allocates resources to applying them;

---

<sup>45</sup> <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

<sup>46</sup> Adapted from <http://www.creatingfutures.org.nz/assets/CF-Uploads/Publications/Creating-Futures/Regional-Policy-Development-Processes-Opportunities-for-use-of-Creating-Futures-tools.pdf>

- Policy evaluation, the final process in the cycle monitors the results of implementing the methods and evaluates the results against anticipated results of the policy.



The Westlake Review Team considers the PDP as currently practised encompasses the first three stages (beginning with the stage at the top of the diagram, coloured green above). However, the PDP has been deficient in evaluating the effectiveness of the policy against the original PDP charter (as distinct from the self assessment of the WG itself), as the final stage. Such evaluations should provide valuable information for monitoring the effectiveness of policy, and over time, improving the effectiveness of GNSO gTLD policy.

In addition, the Westlake Review Team considers that any proposed policy that is likely to affect large numbers of people on the Internet should include an assessment of its likely impact. The impact assessment should be undertaken as a part of the Issues Report and updated as the policy is developed.


### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 16:** That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process.
- ❖ **Recommendation 17:** That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation be incorporated into the policy development process; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.
- ❖ **Recommendation 18:** 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.

#### 5.4.4 BGC Recommendation 6 ([Link to ICANN's Strategic Plan](#))

##### Observations

Responses to the 360° survey statement “Council’s planned objectives align with the planned objectives of ICANN as a whole”, are shown below:



Specific comments include:

- *If the GNSO Council (a) plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its activities, (b) aligns its objectives with the planned objectives of ICANN as a whole; or (c) applies metrics to its outputs, it doesn't communicate those efforts - at all.*
- *Dedicate more time to strategic planning and consideration of higher-level issues.*
- *GNSO Council is planning but improvements could be made to integration with overall ICANN objectives. This needs to be handled carefully since GNSO Council is community driven and, if anything, the movement needs to be as much on the part of "ICANN as a whole" as it does of the GNSO Council.*
- *...work is often is often event or situation driven and is not in line with planned objectives but is aligned with Bylaw mandate for ICANN.*
- *...GNSO objectives do not align with those of ICANN as a whole...*

### **Analysis**

The Westlake Review Team was unable to find evidence of a GNSO Strategic or Annual Plan. The GNSO does not appear to have a process to align Policy Development with ICANN's overall Strategic Plan. However, the GNSO does have a Project List<sup>47</sup> and a Policy Activities<sup>48</sup> section on its website.

Based on this and comments by survey respondents and interviewees, the Westlake Review Team concluded that BGC Recommendation 6 has not been implemented.

We do however note that the GNSO Council has run "Induction and Development Sessions" in 2013 and 2014. These sessions developed planning objectives for the coming year and reviewed prior year outcomes.

The Westlake Review Team considers that planning and measurement are vital management tools. In addition, as the GNSO is a component part of ICANN, it is important that GNSO strategies and activities are linked to and align with ICANN's Strategic Plan<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>47</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/project>

<sup>48</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/policy>

<sup>49</sup> See Recommendation 20 in Section 6

## SECTION 6: RESTRUCTURE THE GNSO COUNCIL

---

### 6.1 BGC Recommendations

**BGC 7:** *The Council should transition from being a legislative body to a strategic manager overseeing policy development. Among the Council's most important functions should be guiding the establishment of working groups and monitoring their progress. The Council should be responsible for launching a working group by deciding upon the appropriate mandate and timeline, and ensuring that it has an experienced and impartial Chair, who performs adequate outreach and has sufficient expertise. The Council should be available to provide guidance on any issues when they arise.*

*A working group should present its report and conclusions, including any minority views, to the Council for review...*

*In forwarding the working group's report to the Board, the Council should indicate whether it agrees that the working group has fulfilled its mandate...*

**BGC 8:** *A second important role for the Council is to develop ways to (i) assess and benchmark gTLD policy implementation; and (ii) analyze trends and changes in the gTLD arena...*

**BGC 9:** *A third important role for the Council is to work with ICANN Staff to (i) align the GNSO Council's work with ICANN's strategic plan, (ii) increase the use of project- management methodologies; and (iii) improve the GNSO's website, document management capacity and ability to solicit meaningful public comments on its work.*

**BGC 10:** *To reach its full potential, the Council should be as inclusive and representative of the broad interests represented in the GNSO as possible, while limiting its size to promote efficiency and effectiveness. We recommend a 19-person Council consisting of 16 elected members, four from each of four stakeholder groups, with two of these groups representing those parties "under contract" with ICANN, namely registries (four seats) and registrars (four seats). These we refer to as "ICANN contracted parties". The other two stakeholder groups will represent those who are "affected by the contracts" ("ICANN non-contracted parties"), including commercial registrants (four seats) and non-commercial registrants (four seats). In addition, three Councilors would be appointed by the Nominating Committee (pending the outcome of the BGC's "NomCom Improvement Process"). Under this restructuring plan, there is no longer a justification for weighted voting...*

**BGC 11:** *Another way to enhance inclusiveness and enable more people to feel involved in Council activities is to establish term limits for Councilors, thus giving more people an opportunity to serve in these important positions.*

*BGC 12: Council members should provide real-time, updated Statements of Interest similar to what is required for members of the Board in a standardized format that is publicly accessible. ICANN Staff should develop a basic template of information that GNSO Councilors, constituency leaders and others participating in policy development activities must first complete. These Statements should be supplemented by Declarations of Interest that pertain to specific matters under discussion.*

*BGC 13: The Council should work with Staff to develop a training and development curriculum to promote skills development for the Council, prospective chairs of working groups and, ideally, all members of the ICANN community who might wish to take part in working groups.*

## 6.2 Major accomplishments and milestones

(As noted on the GNSO website<sup>50</sup>):

- Board approved revised Article X (GNSO) Bylaws (September 2009)
- Stakeholder Groups/Constituencies (SG/C)
  - Board approved four new Stakeholder Groups (28 August 2009)
  - Board approved permanent Charters for Registries and Registrars Stakeholder Groups (30 July 2009)
  - Board approved permanent Charters for Non-Commercial and Commercial Stakeholder Groups (24 June 2011)
  - Board recognized the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns (NPOC) Constituency in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (June 2011).
  - Board approved a new Process for Recognition of New GNSO Constituencies (24 June 2011)
- GNSO/Council
  - Bicameral Council established with two voting Houses (Seoul, Q4 2009)
  - Substantially enhanced GNSO Operating Procedures (currently v2.4) including new voting remedies (proxy/abstentions), statements of interest, SG/Constituency operating

---

<sup>50</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/ongoing-work/archive/2012/improvements/accomplishments-en.htm>



principles and participation guidelines, Working Group guidelines (Annex 1), and a Policy Development Process manual (Annex 2).

- Approved the Charter for a new Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation (SCI) to review and assess the ongoing functioning of recommendations accepted by the two Steering Committees and the Council (7 April 2011).

### 6.3 Summary of the Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness

#### **BGC Recommendation 7 (Council as strategic manager of policy development)**

The Westlake Review Team considers that BGC Recommendation 7 has been implemented. However, the role of the GNSO Council in gTLD Policy Development should be clarified to confine the Council to ensuring that due process is followed and that all stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute. The Council should not be re-litigating policy that has been reported by a Working Group.

#### **BGC Recommendation 8 (Assess policy implementation and analyze trends in the gTLD arena)**

The Westlake Review Team has commented above (Section 5.4.2) on assessment of policy implementation.

#### **BGC Recommendation 9 (Align Council’s work with ICANN’s strategic plan, increase project management methodologies and improve GNSO’s website and document management).**

The Westlake Review Team has commented above (Section 5.4.3) on links to ICANN’s Strategic Plan, noting that the GNSO does not have plans that link to ICANN’s Strategic Plan.

Project information showing stages of activity for each current project is shown on the GNSO website (Projects List<sup>51</sup>). However we were unable to locate the type of information that would normally be expected with a ‘project management’ approach to operating WGs, for example resource planning and management.

---

<sup>51</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/meetings/projects-list.pdf>

We received no comments or suggestions regarding improvements to the GNSO website, but several people commented that so much information is available that it can be difficult to find what one is looking for. However the Westlake Review Team notes that staff have recently launched a one-stop web-page to assist<sup>52</sup>.

The Westlake Review Team considers that Recommendation 9 has been partially implemented.

### **BGC Recommendation 10, 11, 12 (Restructure Council membership, councillor term limits and Council member statements of interest)**

The Westlake Review Team considers that BGC Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 have been implemented effectively and has commented elsewhere on Council Member Statements of Interest (Section 7 – Enhance Constituencies). However, the Westlake Review Team considers that there are some areas where improvements could be made and we note these below.

### **BGC Recommendation 13 (Council training and development)**

The GNSO ran the first Council Induction and Development Session at ICANN 48 in Buenos Aires and again at ICANN 51 in Los Angeles. In 2013 the ICANN Leadership Training Programme was introduced as one module of the ICANN Academy, as a cross-community effort in which GNSO members participated. While BGC Recommendation 13 has been implemented, the Westlake Review Team believes that actions could be taken to further improve the effectiveness of this recommendation.

## **6.4 Basis for Westlake’s assessment**

### **6.4.1 BGC Recommendation 7 (Council as strategic manager of policy development)**

#### ***Observations/Analysis***

In its 2008 review, the BGC recommended<sup>53</sup> that *The Council should transition from being a legislative body to a strategic manager overseeing policy development. Among the Council’s most important functions should be guiding the establishment of Working Groups and monitoring their progress.*

Most survey respondents and interviewees consider that this recommendation has been implemented effectively – see comments in section 4.4.1 - The WG model is effective.

---

<sup>52</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/sites/gns0.icann.org/files/gns0/presentations/policy-efforts.htm>

<sup>53</sup> <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/gns0-improvements/gns0-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

The Westlake Review Team considers that one of the principles of good policy is that it be developed in an open and transparent way, by a Working Group drawn from a diverse range of informed and committed stakeholders. This is the intention of the PDP that has been developed in recent years.

The key steps for the GNSO Council in the PDP process are;

- The Council should decide whether and when to charter a working group, based on the Issue Report.
- The Council should be responsible for launching a working group by deciding upon the appropriate mandate and timeline.
- The Council should ensure that the working group has an experienced and neutral Chair, appropriate representation and has sufficient technical expertise and knowledge of ICANN.
- The Council should monitor the progress of each working group. In doing so, the Council should offer guidance and support to assist the working group in reaching a satisfactory conclusion, with the participation of all relevant stakeholders.

In practice, there is potential for this process to be compromised by inputs from other parties or groups, and several survey respondents and interviewees referred to three of these in various ways as unhelpful to the development of timely and well-crafted policy:

1. The GAC.

Several respondents noted that the GAC had sometimes provided input to Policy Development Processes at a very late stage in the process. While these respondents did not question the right of the GAC to offer input, there was concern that it came so late in the process, and that in some cases the GAC had not participated at an earlier stage. The response we have heard from some members of the GAC is that they cannot generally participate earlier because that would require their nominee to act on behalf of all GAC members, and no GAC member is authorized to state a position that would bind all members (GAC members represent sovereign governments and therefore cannot be bound by others).

We understand that GNSO has recently appointed a Liaison to work with the GAC to facilitate information sharing and early engagement of the GAC in GNSO policy development. The GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is working on additional mechanisms for early engagement of the GAC in policy development. We believe these are constructive steps; as noted above, we recommend further that the GAC consider appointing a liaison to

every PDP Working Group that involves identified public interest concerns. This would provide a channel of communication and offer guidance which, although not binding on the GAC, might help to identify issues of potential concern to the GAC and reduce delays later in the process.

## 2. The GNSO Council

Several survey respondents and interviewees commented that there appears to be some confusion around the role of the Council in relation to policy development. Under certain circumstances, the GNSO Council is currently able to draft an amendment to a policy recommended by a WG. Although we are not aware of any instances of this occurring, in our view, this power is inappropriate: it compromises the WG led multi-stakeholder, consensus-driven process that has been carefully developed. The process also underpins the credible functioning of the GNSO in developing policy that is legally binding on many of its members. In our view, and as the BGC noted, the Council should not be a ‘legislative body,’ but a strategic manager of the policy setting process.

The role of the Council is to satisfy itself that the Working Group has followed the correct process and reached the required level of consensus in producing its recommendations. The GNSO Council should then (as the BGC WG recommended) ensure that:

- The scoping of the issue remains valid
- All relevant stakeholders are aware of, and involved, in the process
- No Stakeholder Group is dominating the process
- Any necessary expert opinion has been provided
- Data has been provided and used where appropriate
- The proposed policy can be implemented

The Westlake Review Team considers that, if these conditions have been satisfied, the Council should forward the policy to the Board for final approval. Any concerns should be limited to matters of the process, not the substance of the policy.

If the Council cannot reach agreement, it should articulate the reasons why the policy could not be recommended in its existing format and refer the matter back to the WG for possible amendment.

### 3. The Board

Several survey respondents and interviewees noted that the Board had overruled policy developed through a PDP and recommended by the GNSO Council. There was a view that in at least one recent case the Board had yielded to a late submission from the GAC and on that basis had referred the proposed policy back to the GNSO Council. As one respondent noted:

- *...a recent example is that the Board, instead of acting on the recommendation of the GNSO, allowed the GAC to derail a recommendation regarding rights protection mechanisms for IGOs and NGO's. The Board sent the issue back to the GNSO for consideration. One comment I heard was, 'at least they sent it back, normally they would ignore us all together'.*

We acknowledge that the Board is the peak governing body of ICANN, so it would be inappropriate to limit its authority. However, we consider that this power should be used only in cases where the Board:<sup>54</sup>

- Identified a significant risk raised by the recommended policy, or
- Considered that the recommended policy would compromise or conflict with ICANN's strategy, values or existing legal obligations, or with other existing ICANN policy or policies, or
- Believed that the recommended policy went beyond ICANN's limited technical mandate.

As noted above in relation to the GNSO Council, we consider that the role of the Board should not be to re-litigate or amend policy itself, but to articulate its reasons for rejection and refer the policy back to the GNSO PDP WG for re-consideration and re-submission.

Besides ensuring that a balance of stakeholders will be involved throughout, the amendment we recommend should mitigate the risk of compromising the PDP through the lobbying of the GNSO Council or Board members in favour of a particular policy line.

---

<sup>54</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en> - refer Annex A - GNSO Policy Development Process

It would also reduce the ability of other arms of ICANN to determine policy without regard (whether actual or perceived) for the full Policy Development Process.

### **Westlake Review Team Recommendation**

❖ **Recommendation 19:** 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.

### **BGC Recommendation 8. (Assess policy implementation and analyze trends in the gTLD arena)**

We have discussed the issue of policy implementation assessment in section 5.4.2 BGC Recommendation 5 (Self Assessment)

### **BGC Recommendation 9. (Align Council's work with ICANN's strategic plan, increase project management methodologies and improve GNSO's website and document management).**

We have discussed the issue of aligning the GNSO Council's work with the ICANN Strategic Plan in section 5.4.3 BGC Recommendation 6 (Link to ICANN's Strategic Plan).

### ***Prioritization of GNSO Projects***

As noted elsewhere in this review, volunteer time is a limited resource. Prioritization is one management tool that assists in making the most effective use of limited resources. The Communications and Coordination Work Team<sup>55</sup> recommended "*work prioritisation so as not to overwhelm the community and unintentionally hinder active participation*".

---

<sup>55</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/ongoing-work/archive/2012/improvements/osc-en.htm>

## **Observations**

A number of survey respondents and interviewees commented that except in urgent cases, the number of PDPs running concurrently should be limited, allowing for resources (particularly volunteer time) to be prioritized. For example:

- *There are too many WGs, not enough volunteers, have to get the same people all the time. Hard to find people who are prepared to do this.*
- *Limit the number of working groups that can be in existence at any one time.*
- *Planning and prioritizing efforts. Volunteers are being spread too thin and having too many issues bubbling along at any one point in time is going to lead to poor outcomes.*
- *Focus on less issues at one time*

Survey respondents and interviewees also noted that PDPs should be focused on generic names policy development (as required under Article X of the ICANN Bylaws) rather than other topics such as governance, administration and budget. For example:

- *[GNSO should] stick to its remit of producing policy related to gTLDs - nothing more*
- *There should be a distinction between policies related to ICANN governance, administration, budget, etc and generic names policy. Also broader Internet Governance policy issues should be relegated to committees. These are three distinct buckets of work that should be treated separately. They do not all directly impinge on generic names policy development.*
- *Stop creating too many WGs that aren't sure if they will end in PDP*
- *Stop performing PDPs on subjects that may be duplicative of, or mooted by, other ongoing work within ICANN (e.g. the PPSAI PDP WG vis-a-vis the EWG RDS system) before the outcomes of the other work are finalized.*
- **CONCENTRATE ON GNSO (gTLD) POLICY AND ALLOW REPRESENTATION ON BROADER ISSUES TO BE DRIVEN BY CONSTITUENCIES e.g. participation in Cross Community WGs should be at the Constituency level. [Emphasis in the original]**

## **Analysis**

The prioritization issues raised by survey respondents and interviewees relate to both policy development and other GNSO projects. As with a number of issues identified throughout this review,

prioritization of resources is not new. During 2010, the GNSO Council convened the Work Prioritization Model Drafting Team (WPM-DT) to develop procedures to categorise and rank/prioritize each project (PDPs and others)<sup>56</sup>. The goals of the WPM-DT were:

- Education and Transparency: to establish organisational awareness and understanding of the [GNSO] Council's priorities.
- Resource Allocation: to assist the [GNSO] Council in managing limited resources among the organisation's prioritised projects.
- Strategic Management: to inform [GNSO] Councillors so that the GNSO's prioritization is considered when discussing issues and voting on related motions.

A list of eligible projects was adopted by the Council effective 20 May 2010 and Value Ratings approved 23 June 2010 in Brussels<sup>57</sup>.

We have been advised that no consensus on how projects should be prioritised could be reached and the Project did not proceed. The Westlake Review Team has been unable to locate GNSO Council resolutions related to abandoning this project, but a poll was conducted which resulted in further discussions taking place via email, with no specific actions resulting<sup>58</sup>.

### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 20:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 21:** That the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the policy-making process.

---

<sup>56</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/wpmg-section-6-and-annex-09apr10-en.pdf>

<sup>57</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/draft-work-prioritization-project-list-value-ratings-23jun10-en.pdf>

<sup>58</sup> <http://sel.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg09519.html>



## **BGC Recommendations 10 and 11. (Restructure Council membership and councillor term limits)**

### ***Observations***

The Council was restructured following the BGC recommendations. Term limits were introduced at the same time.

The Council appears functional. It is constructed to balance the various interests.

### ***Analysis***

The current structure has been implemented relatively recently. It is not broken, and we do not recommend any change at this time.

## **BGC Recommendation 12. (Council member statements of interest)**

Statements of Interest are discussed in section 7.4.2 BGC Recommendation 15 (Constituency operating rules and participation)

## **BGC Recommendation 13 (Council training and development)**

### ***Observations***

Various comments were made in the 360° survey and interviews relating to this Council training and development. Comments include: variable performance of Council members; member selection process not being aimed at delivering people with the appropriate skills (e.g. planning); a lack of technical training; and a lack of measures. For example:

- *The GNSO would benefit from actively encouraging technical/operational expertise on the part of councillors.*
- *Provide technical training to counsellors without technical background*
- *...the GNSO Council; Not much PM experience. Little use of the word 'governance.'...*

### ***Analysis***

As discussed above, Section 5 – Revise the PDP, staff introduced the ICANN Leadership Training Programme in 2013. This programme is for both new and existing community leaders and is an intensive on-boarding and facilitation skills training programme with key elements such as facilitation, conflict, mediation and communication skills.

In addition to the ICANN Leadership Training Programme, GNSO Council Induction and Development Sessions were run in 2013 and 2014.<sup>59</sup> The objectives of these sessions are to allow for the Council members to get to know each other better, provide information on the functioning and operations of the GNSO Council and to allow for planning for upcoming projects and activities, in order to further enhance the co-operation within and effectiveness of the GNSO Council. The Westlake Review Team considers that these sessions are an important part of the on-going development programme for Council members.

However we consider the effectiveness of BGC Recommendation 13 could be improved:

- A. The BGC WG proposed action under this recommendation anticipated “A proposed curriculum (including suggested courses, delivery mechanisms and links between positions and training) should be developed.” This meant that training should be relevant to the positions. The Westlake Review Team was unable to locate any training and development specifically linked to the skills and competencies required for GNSO Council members. The ICANN Leadership Training Programme is a positive step to provide training for incoming and existing leaders in general, but Council members have other needs such as governance and technical skills (for example, project management).
- B. As discussed in Section 6 - Revise the PDP, there is no formal skills assessment system in place. The training programme is optional and generic, and does not address identified individual needs. There is no means to measure the level of competence and skills of incumbents, or the effectiveness of the training undertaken.

ATRT<sup>60</sup> Recommendations 1, 2, 3 provided recommendations in the area of Board performance and work practices as follows:

- ATRT Recommendation 1: *The Board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN Board members and the success of Board improvement efforts, and analyse those findings over time.*
- ATRT2 Recommendation 2: *The Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board’s functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.*

---

<sup>59</sup> <https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/council-development-notes-17oct14-en.pdf>

<sup>60</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/about/aoc-review/atrt/final-recommendations-31dec13-en.pdf>

- ATRT2 Recommendation 3: *The Board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time...*

While the above recommendations relate to the ICANN Board, we consider the principles underlying these recommendations are equally applicable to the GNSO Council and should be considered in its training and development programme.

The Westlake Review Team considers that a robust training and development programme is a critical element in maintaining the effectiveness of the GNSO Council.

### **Westlake Review Team Recommendations**

- Recommendation 22: That the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework, which its members should utilise to identify development needs and opportunities.

## SECTION 7: ENHANCE CONSTITUENCIES

---

### 7.1 BGC Recommendations

*BGC 14: ICANN should take steps to clarify and promote the option to self-form a new constituency. It should engage in greater outreach to ensure that all parts of the community, particularly in those areas where English is not widely spoken, are aware of the option to form new constituencies. Together, ICANN Staff and the GNSO constituencies should develop specific recommendations for achieving these goals.*

*BGC 15: The GNSO constituencies, along with the Council and staff, should develop operating principles that will form the basis for consistent participation rules and operating procedures for all constituencies, ensuring that ICANN constituencies function in a representative, open, transparent and democratic manner. The criteria for participation in any ICANN constituency should be objective, standardized and clearly stated.*

*General information about each participant application and the decision should be publicly available.*

*Mailing and discussion lists should be open and publicly archived...*

*There should be term limits for constituency officers, just as for Councilors...*

*There should be an emphasis on reaching consensus...*

*There should be a centralized registry of the participants of all constituencies and others involved in GNSO policy development work, which is up-to-date and publicly accessible...*

*BGC 16: ICANN should provide dedicated Staff support for constituencies to assist with standardization, outreach and administrative work, which can lower constituency costs and fees. ICANN should offer each constituency a “toolkit” of in-kind assistance (as opposed to financial aid). The toolkit should include, for example, assistance with tracking PDP deadlines and summarizing policy debates, supporting websites and mailing lists, scheduling calls and other administrative duties.*

## 7.2 Major accomplishments and milestones

(As noted on the GNSO website<sup>61</sup>):

- GNSO Council approved “Stakeholder Group/Constituency Operating Principles and Participation Guidelines” which were developed over two years and incorporated into the GNSO Operating Procedures as Chapter 7 (5 August 2010).
- Global Outreach: Significant progress has been made in developing recommendations concerning outreach:
  - Developed a set of Recommendations to develop a Global Outreach Program to Broaden Participation in the GNSO (21 January 2011) containing a recommendation that the Council “manage the development of the OTF (Outreach Task Force) through the creation of a Drafting Team to develop the OTF’s Charter.”
  - The OTF-DT was formed and it provided to the GNSO Council a Draft Charter on 18 October 2011.
- “Toolkit” of GNSO Services:
  - Utilizing the results of a GNSO Constituency Survey conducted by Staff in October 2008, the Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team (CSG-WT) analyzed the results, conducted a follow-up survey, and recommended a prioritized list of eleven (11) services in its final report (25 October 2009).
  - The Operations Steering Committee (OSC) forwarded the recommendations to the GNSO Council (4 December 2009), which approved them by Resolution (17 December 2009) directing Staff to develop costs, funding, specifications, requirements, and procedures as well as notify the GNSO Communities of the “Toolkit” and the process for requesting services:
    - Seven (7) of the eleven (11) services are currently being provided to the GNSO community.
    - One service, #7-Provide Grants/Funding Directly to Constituencies, has been deferred.

---

<sup>61</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/ongoing-work/archive/2012/improvements/accomplishments-en.htm>

- Three (3) services are in varying states of analysis, development, and implementation

### 7.3 Summary of Westlake Review Team's assessment of implementation effectiveness

#### **BGC Recommendation 14 (New Constituencies)**

This recommendation has been implemented, but the Westlake Review Team is of the view that it has not been effective. Since 2011, when the rules for new Constituencies were approved, only one new Constituency has been added to the GNSO.

#### **BGC Recommendation 15 (Constituency operating rules and participation)**

This recommendation has been implemented, but the Westlake Review Team is of the view that it has not been fully effective in respect of membership transparency, statements of interest and encouraging broad community participation, especially from new members.

#### **BGC Recommendation 16 (Constituency administration support)**

This recommendation has been implemented, but the Westlake Review Team is of the view that it should be applied consistently across all SGs and Cs, in order to be fully effective.

### 7.4 Basis for Westlake's assessment

#### **BGC Recommendation 14 (New Constituencies)**

##### ***Background***

Following the BGC WG review, but before the new and final Constituency process was implemented (2011), staff developed a two-step process (Notice of Intent to form a New Constituency, New Constituency petition and Charter applications) for new constituency applications<sup>62</sup>.

In 2009, there were four petitions to create new GNSO Constituencies:

- Consumer Constituency
- Cyber Safety Constituency

---

<sup>62</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/city-2009-06-05-en>

- City TLD Constituency
- IDNgTLD Constituency

These four petitions were the first formal requests following the BGC WG review.

The ICANN Board declined three of these petitions (Cyber Safety Constituency, City TLD Constituency, and IDNgTLD Constituency) and took no action on the Consumer Constituency as it was still being worked on<sup>63</sup>. The ALAC supported the Consumer Constituency Petition but others were strongly opposed<sup>64</sup>. Subsequent discussions<sup>65</sup> have ensued, but no further action on this application has been taken.

In June 2010, the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns (NPOC) Constituency submitted its application and the ICANN Board approved it the following year. To date the NPOC has been the only new constituency approved.

Extracts from the Board resolution:

*Whereas, the Board has specifically directed that efforts be made to provide leadership and guidance within the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group to encourage the creation of broad, diverse and representative new GNSO Constituencies advancing global non-commercial interests...*

*Resolved (2011.06.24.05), the Board approves the proposed charter of the new Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency and formally recognizes the organization as an official Constituency within the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)...*

*Rationale for Resolutions 2011.06.24.05 – 2011.06.24.06*

*The promotion of new GNSO Constituencies was one of the fundamental recommendations of the GNSO Review effort and an important intentional strategy to expand participation in GNSO policy development efforts...*

---

<sup>63</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2009-12-09-en>

<sup>64</sup> <http://forum.icann.org/lists/consumers-constituency-petition/msg00017.html>

<sup>65</sup> <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ianatransition/2014/000196.html>

In addition, some 360° survey respondents and interviewees noted the point that the BGC WG had envisaged new constituencies being admitted to the GNSO:<sup>66</sup>

*...The option of forming a new constituency should not be viewed as an impossible task. ICANN should engage in greater outreach to ensure that all parts of the community, particularly where English is not widely spoken, are aware of the option to form new constituencies.*

#### New Constituency approval process

The Board approved a new process for Constituency applications on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2011<sup>67</sup>.

The first application under this process came from the Public Internet Access/Cybercafe Ecosystem Constituency (PIA/CC) in Oct 2012<sup>68</sup>.

In January 2013, NCSG concluded that the application did not meet the required criteria<sup>69</sup> and recommended that the Board reject it, which the Board agreed, based on the advice from the NCSG.

The NCSG made several observations about this application. We note, however, that the second of the NCSG's three recommendation to the Board for the application to be denied appears to run counter to both the BGC WG's recommendations, reiterated in the Board's 2011 resolution (immediately above) regarding the expansion of Constituencies:

*The working group finds that applicants for new constituencies should become involved in the GNSO first, develop an understanding of how it works, and then seek to form a new constituency in the event that its needs are not met or their viewpoints not represented adequately by current constituencies or SGs.*

Our understanding of the very reason for wanting to establish a new constituency is that *[the new group's] needs are not met or their viewpoints not represented adequately by current constituencies or SGs.*

---

<sup>66</sup> <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

<sup>67</sup> <https://community.icann.org/display/tap/2011-06-24+-Approval+of+New+GNSO+Constituency+Recognition+Process>

<sup>68</sup> [https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/afc-ccaoi-piacc-2012-10-10-en?routing\\_type=path](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/afc-ccaoi-piacc-2012-10-10-en?routing_type=path)

<sup>69</sup> <https://gnso.icann.org/en/about/stakeholders-constituencies/comments-ncsg-afc-ccaoi-piacc-31jan13-en.pdf>



We do not argue with the validity of the two other recommendations of the NCSG Working Group for denial of the application. However, we consider that this particular ground for rejection was incorrect and went against both the Board's resolution and the BGC WG's intent in encouraging the establishment of new Constituencies.

At the NCUC session at ICANN53, a former chair and current NCUC executive committee member explained that NCUC had never accepted that multiple Constituencies in the NCSG were necessary or desirable, and that the NCUC and NCSG should be combined to remove overhead<sup>70</sup>.

This view that there should be only one avenue for non-commercial representation is clearly at odds with previous review recommendations that the ICANN Board has accepted and with the Board's unambiguous 2011 directive (quoted at greater length above):

*... The Board has specifically directed that efforts be made ... within the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group to encourage the creation of broad, diverse and representative new GNSO Constituencies ...*

Nevertheless, in practice NCUC's view has largely won out.

*The record of unsuccessful applicants to date and the obstacles they have reported reinforce our observations that the intent of the Board's published resolution is far from universally accepted. A view such as that expressed by the NCUC former chair serves to exacerbate the existing structural hurdles to creating a new Constituency: not only is any application likely to face a biased reception within the (currently NCUC-dominated) NCSG, but, even if successful, the attitude is unlikely to encourage a sense of inclusiveness and collaboration that could assist a new Constituency in gaining momentum within the GNSO's labyrinthine structures and processes.*

### **Observations**

The GNSO's structure is designed to be adaptable and future-proofed by allowing for the creation of new Constituencies as needs arise, within the four Stakeholder Groups.

The emergence of new Constituencies and possible winding up and disappearance of others, as the BGC WG foresaw<sup>71</sup>, has not occurred: since the new structure was introduced, establishing a new

---

<sup>70</sup> <https://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/tue-ncuc/transcript-ncuc-23jun15-en.pdf>, p51 et passim

Constituency has proved to be extremely difficult and only one Constituency has formed and become a member of the GNSO structure.

In theory the current GNSO structure provides for a wider range of views to be represented in three of the four SGs: within the CSG and the NCSG, by means of new Constituencies; and, in the RySG, by means of Interest Groups. The RySG has several current and active Interest Groups<sup>72</sup>. We note that the charter of the RrSG does not provide for either Constituencies or Interest Groups.

According to the Board Governance Committee, *Making it easier to form a new constituency can also address any obstacles people perceive in joining existing constituencies. Overall, this approach can encourage the participation of more people in the GNSO.*<sup>73</sup> We concur with this intent.

Much of the comment we received about structure concerned the perceived barriers to entry for a new Constituency: we received views from several parties that the GNSO (and ICANN as an institution) have developed, or allowed to develop, significant informal barriers that include, among others, the following:

- The process for admitting new Constituencies has in the experience of applicants been less than transparent and is understood to have been subject to direct lobbying by current GNSO parties (Constituencies and individuals) to Council and Board members, aimed at delaying/denying the new Constituency's application. We spoke to several people who had been involved in applying for a new Constituency to be admitted. All of them expressed extreme frustration. Their main theme concerned the lack of clear process or interpretation of the requirements for setting up a new Constituency. In most cases we were told about, the application process had become a prolonged 'battle of attrition' in which new objections or questions were raised at every step in the process, until, in two cases, the applicants (volunteers) gave up because the personal and professional cost had become excessive and they could see no end.
- The other key concern, also discussed elsewhere, is the strongly defensive position adopted by some incumbents that has the effect, deliberate or otherwise, of deterring all but the most determined newcomer from becoming involved in the GNSO. The reasons appear varied, and include:

---

<sup>71</sup> <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

<sup>72</sup> [http://icannwiki.com/RySG#Interest\\_Groups](http://icannwiki.com/RySG#Interest_Groups)

<sup>73</sup> <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

- Concerns among existing participants about a newcomer’s ability to contribute or understand the GNSO; and
  - Less ‘pure’ or altruistic motives, such as protecting one’s own position, status in the GNSO/ICANN community or travel funding.
- Some newer participants referred to personal experiences of verbal abuse and active discouragement from a few entrenched individuals who appeared determined to ‘protect their patch’ in ICANN/GNSO. We believe strongly that such experiences and behaviour are inconsistent with ICANN’s core values.

We consider that the barriers to entry for new Constituencies (evidenced by the creation of only one new Constituency, from six applications, since the structure was adopted) must be lowered if the GNSO structure is to remain relevant and adaptable to new developments and evolving interests (as we have discussed further in Section 9).

We anticipate that not all applications to form new Constituencies will meet the conditions for entry. However, even in cases where an application is declined, a change in attitude whereby applicants are made to feel welcome will assist considerably in overcoming the perceived existing barriers to entry. Where appropriate, new applicants should also be provided with assistance in helping them to satisfy the conditions for entry.

#### Constituency Council Seats

Public Comment received on the Draft of our report highlighted a lack of equity in the distribution of GNSO Council seats in the NCSG.

We note a significant contrast in the way the two SGs in the Non-Contracted Parties House allocate / elect their nominees for the GNSO Council, for which each of the two SGs is entitled to six positions.

#### 1. CSG

Section 2.3.2 of the CSG Charter<sup>74</sup> states that *Recognized Constituencies will work together to select six (6) designated representatives to the GNSO Council, on the basis of two (2) Council representatives per Recognized Constituency*

#### 2. NCSG

---

<sup>74</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/improvements/csg-charter-01nov10-en.pdf>

In contrast, Section 3.1 of the NCSG Charter<sup>75</sup> does not distribute its Council seats between Constituencies, instead, *NCSG GNSO Council representatives will be directly voted on by the full membership of the NCSG using weighted voting as defined in Section 4.*<sup>76</sup>

In direct contrast to the equal distribution of seats between Constituencies in the CSG, all six of the NCSG's current representatives at the GNSO Council are members of the NCUC, while none is an NPOC member. We understand that only one NPOC member has ever held a position on the GNSO Council (2013-2014) and we observe that all three candidates for NCSG's Council positions in the current round of elections (September 2015), and their nominators, are also NCUC members.

If a Constituency is not represented at the GNSO Council, its input can be marginalized, and its members effectively disenfranchised. If a Constituency's members have no assurance of Copuncil representation, a potential new member would probably see little benefit in joining it. The likely result of this is that any Constituency without GNSO Council representation will face a significant barrier to achieving critical mass in its membership.

A Constituency with a large number of Individual members is always likely to be able to outvote, a Constituency representing a much smaller number of large organizations (that may themselves have very large membership), even allowing for the Weighted Voting system mandated by the NCSG Charter. The NCUC's dominance of the NCSG's Council seats is entrenched by the majoritarian direct voting requirement in the NCSG's charter. To overcome this, we consider that the governing documents of both Stakeholder Groups in the NCPH should require that they assign their Council seats equitably among their Constituencies, as is the current practice in the CSG.

There are two main ways in which an SG's Council seats could be allocated equitably:

1. Equal distribution of seats among its Constituencies. Under this method, each of the two current Constituencies in the NCSG would have three positions.

This approach would remove the ability of members from any single Constituency to dominate that SG's agenda at the GNSO Council. For a new Constituency, it removes the barrier resulting from the lack of representation, and, for potential new members, equal

---

<sup>75</sup> <http://gnso.icann.org/en/improvements/ncsg-charter-05may11-en.pdf>

<sup>76</sup> 'Weighted voting' under this section allocates 1 vote each to members classified as 'Individuals'; 2 votes each to 'Small Organizations'; and 3 votes each to 'Large Organizations'

distribution of seats should also remove the incentive to join one Constituency over another because of its stronger representation at Council.

As discussed earlier in our report, many people have noted the difficult relationship that exists currently between the NCUC and the NPOC. A consequential benefit of the equal allocation of Council positions is that it would create an incentive for Constituencies in an SG to work collaboratively, as is evident among the disparate interests in the CSG.

2. Allocation of at least one Council position per Constituency. Under this option, all Constituencies would have at least one position and the remaining positions could be elected by the full membership of the SG.

The main benefit of this second option is its simplicity and that it remains mathematically practicable for any number up to six Constituencies per SG. However, it fails to address what in our view is one of the main problems with grossly unequal allocation, the perception of one Constituency having a dominant voice over the other at the GNSO Council.

To be consistent with the principle of broad representation across ICANN, we consider that as an absolute minimum each Constituency must have at least one seat at the GNSO Council.

Either of these allocation methods remains straightforward as long as an SG has one, two, three or six Constituencies. However, if either of the SGs in the NCPH admits sufficient new Constituencies to result in its having a total of four (or five) Constituencies (one or two more for the CSG, two or three more for the NCSG) – as we would envisage, refer our Recommendation 24 – we recommend that, each Constituency would then receive one Council seat as of right, and the remaining seat(s) would be elected by the full SG membership.

Under this model, no Constituency's nominees could hold a majority of that SG's Council positions, even if they won all the remaining elected positions. The model begins to break down only at the point where the SG has seven or more Constituencies. Based on experience to date – even allowing for implementation of Recommendation 24 – this is likely to create a barrier only in theory rather than practice for the foreseeable future. At that stage, a number of possible solutions would be available – which might include an election based on voting by Constituencies as a whole, rather than by the size of each Constituency's membership, or an alternative such as increasing the total number of seats at the GNSO Council. Since we consider this outcome is unlikely in the foreseeable future, we have not commented further or recommended a preferred option.

We have been advised that, when the current structure was developed, there were concerns that to allow an automatic allocation of Council seats to Constituencies might lead to a rush of Constituency applicants. Clearly, this has not occurred.

We acknowledge the concern that a new Constituency may not have sufficiently qualified or experienced nominees for Council membership (and that this may reflect the current situation). However, our Recommendations regarding Leadership Training and the Competency Framework will substantially address this concern. Some of our other Recommendations, particularly those relating to the Operating Procedures, will assist in lowering existing barriers to the entry of a new Constituency. On their own, however, they will not be sufficient.

Therefore we make the following recommendations:

#### **Westlake Review Team Recommendations**

- ❖ **Recommendation 23:** In order to support ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, all Cs should have seats on the GNSO Council, allocated equally (as far as numerically practicable) by their SGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 24:** 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 the published process, subject to which the default outcome is that a new Constituency is admitted. That all applications for new Constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making.
- ❖ **Recommendation 25:** That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency.

### **BGC Recommendation 15 (Constituency operating rules and participation)**

#### ***Context***

ICANN's Core Value 4 reads: Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making. It is often described as being a multi-stakeholder bottom-up consensus-driven organisation.

## **Observations**

The observations in this section on Constituency operating rules and participation relate to both Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. Observations on participation in Working Groups have been provided in Section 4 – Adopt a Working Group Model.

### Operating Rules

Respondents to the 360° Survey and interviewees raised concerns mainly around Statements of Interest (SOIs) and Membership Lists.

The Westlake Review Team considers that an open, transparent, bottom-up and multi-stakeholder organization requires the ability to identify who is making policy. If this is not clear, it is difficult to determine whether the policy has been developed through a genuinely multi-stakeholder process and certainly it is hard to argue that the process has achieved the goal of transparency.

The GNSO's Operating Procedures<sup>77</sup> set out in some detail the requirements for completing Statements of Interest for publication on the ICANN website. Under the Procedures, an interest is defined as a matter that *“may affect the Relevant Party's judgment, on any matters to be considered by the GNSO Group.”* Some respondents have noted that observance of this provision is unsatisfactory, because while someone may declare that they are connected with 'XYZ Corporation', this may not give sufficient information for an independent objective observer to determine whether *“an interest”* or a conflict of interests exists.

In addition to the SOI issue, the Westlake Review Team notes that no centralised list of Stakeholder Groups', Constituencies' and Working Groups' membership exists. This information is accessible in most instances in various places, but is not available on a consistent basis, and, where an SOI is required, individuals' affiliations and interests are not consistently disclosed. We recommend that this situation be remedied. One way of doing this is to make the guidelines already provided in the Operating Procedures enforceable.

Membership lists are publicly available in most cases, except for the ISPCP, which does not publish its membership.

---

<sup>77</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/op-procedures-13nov14-en.pdf>

We note that there is provision in the Operating Procedures for contact details to be withheld for privacy reasons, but we consider that publication of a full list of members is fundamental to ICANN's principles of openness and transparency.

In our view, full compliance with section 5.3.3, especially subsection 6, of the Operating Procedures would ensure adequate transparency:

- 5.3.3.(6).i ... describe the material interest in ICANN GNSO policy development processes and outcomes.
- 5.3.3.(6).ii ... describe the arrangements/agreements and the name of the group, constituency or person(s).

The Bylaws state that *ICANN and its constituents shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner...* We consider that the GNSO's Participation Rules and Operating Procedures fall short of this requirement in the Bylaws, because they may be interpreted as being guidelines, rather than mandated procedures.

For ICANN to uphold its commitment to openness and transparency, the GNSO must require all participants to be clear about their affiliations, and if they are acting for others, the identity of their principals. If potential participants are unwilling to do this, for reasons of legal privilege or otherwise, they must at least identify the position(s) they are representing. Failing such disclosure (as a minimum level of compliance with ICANN requirements), they should not be able to participate.

We also consider that this observation is consistent with and reiterates the BGC WG's earlier recommendation *that Groups shall ... abide by a set of participation rules and operating procedures.*<sup>78</sup>

### Participation

We discuss in this section participation in SG and C activities.

The GNSO's structure is intended to produce a situation where no one set of interests can outvote the others, and all points of view can be heard. Seats on the GNSO Council are allocated to different groups in an attempt to achieve this balance.

---

<sup>78</sup> GNSO Operating Procedures, v2.9, Section 6.1



The 360° survey invited respondents to state the extent to which they agreed with the assertion that various groups were adequately represented in the GNSO.

The results are presented below.

The following group is adequately represented in GNSO:	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total positive	N
Commercial	28%	41%	15%	14%	70%	137
Non-Commercial	16%	42%	22%	18%	59%	130
Registrars	38%	52%	6%	2%	91%	135
Registries	37%	51%	7%	3%	88%	135
ALAC (through liaison)	17%	62%	13%	5%	80%	124
ccNSO (through liaison)	17%	56%	20%	5%	73%	115

(The final column labelled 'N' is the total number of respondents to the statement)

The results show that the majority of respondents consider that most of these groups in the GNSO are adequately represented, with the exception of Non-Commercial Stakeholders, where just over half of respondents agreed. These findings are consistent with our observations from interviews.

As discussed in Section 3: Methodology, before allowing respondents to complete the section on individual SGs or Cs, the survey required them to answer 'filtering' questions. So, while it was possible in theory for somebody to answer without being a member or close observer of the SG or C, in practice we consider this improbable.

The table below shows the extent to which respondents (filtered as described earlier) considered that:

- The executive committee of the group was balanced and appropriately representative
- The group was effective in encouraging new participants to become involved in the group to avoid volunteer burnout
- The group encouraged participation from all geographic regions
- The group managed workload issues effectively
- The group applied appropriate metrics to determine the impact of its outputs
- The group used community feedback to improve its effectiveness

	Exec C'ttee balanced	Encourages new people	Geographic diversity	Manages workload	Applies metrics	Accepts feedback	N
<b>RySG</b>	57%	74%	52%	70%	39%	65%	23
<b>RRSG</b>	75%	67%	75%	67%	50%	67%	12
<b>NCSG</b>	48%	40%	62%	31%	26%	57%	42
<b>NCUC</b>	52%	41%	59%	37%	33%	44%	27
<b>NPOC</b>	47%	35%	59%	35%	35%	53%	17
<b>CSG</b>	44%	35%	56%	42%	21%	42%	43
<b>CBUC</b>	50%	50%	54%	46%	46%	50%	28
<b>IPC</b>	66%	38%	63%	50%	31%	66%	32
<b>ISPCP</b>	53%	47%	53%	53%	53%	53%	17

We highlight below some specific observations about representation, segmented by Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

#### Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups

The contracted parties (registries and registrars) have well-represented groups, as might be expected because they are contractually bound to adhere to consensus policies, so GNSO policy-making can directly affect their businesses. About half the RySG respondents considered that the Registries' Stakeholder Group encouraged participation from all geographic regions. This may be a function of the present dominance of large US-based registries and currently a very low number of registries in Africa and LAC.

In relation to the Registrar Stakeholder Group, some comments were made to the effect that larger registrars were more likely to be represented than smaller ones. The numbers of responses about the Registrars' Stakeholder Group were insufficient to draw quantitative conclusions.

A case was put to us that the existing division of Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies does not meet the needs of "brands" that are, increasingly, acquiring their own TLDs, in which they can be registries, registrars and business users. The business objectives and policies of "brands" as registries may differ significantly from those of the registries which have traditionally comprised the membership of the RySG.

We note also that the charter of the RySG does not envisage the formation of Constituencies, but does allow for "Interest Groups" under the RySG umbrella. Interest Groups as defined in the RySG

Charter are less formal structures than the Constituencies of the Non-Contracted Parties House SGs, but share several characteristics with them.

#### Non-Commercial Stakeholders

While the quantitative responses to the 360° Survey showed results consistent with other SGs and Cs, some of the free-text comments (and some of our interviewees) demonstrated strong and diverse views on several issues. Several survey respondents and interviewees noted that leadership positions remain in the hands of only a few people. For example:

- *It [the NCSG] seems to actively discourage new leadership for fear of existing leaders losing their place on the totem pole.*
- *Very little diversity in the leadership, resistance to new blood, leads to bad morale.*

In contrast, the NCSG's overall membership was perceived as being the most diverse within the GNSO:

- *The NCSG publishes its membership and runs an open mailing list. It has the most diverse membership in the GNSO, and brings in new and fresh GNSO Councilors each election...*
- *The NCSG does the best job of geographic diversity of any Stakeholder Group, generally by a fairly big margin.*

A number of respondents to the 360° survey raised issues such as leadership self-perpetuation, new members (including transparency of process and obstructing membership applications for the NPOC) and domination of the NCSG by NCUC members. The NPOC's acknowledged difficulties in starting up and growing its membership may also have fed the perception that the NCUC sees it as a competitor.

We noted these points in our initial text provided to the GNSO Review Working Party. We have subsequently received extensive feedback from NCUC members of the Working Party, which provided a degree of balance to the opinions expressed by interviewees and respondents to the 360° survey.

The range of views expressed to us through the 360° survey, interview comments and subsequent NCUC WP member feedback on our initial text indicate that there remains widespread discord and misunderstanding between the Constituencies in the NCSG. This is perhaps best captured in the following response from the 360° survey:

- *The NCUC and NPOC construct is confusing and artificial and has resulted in embarrassing discord among the groups. The issues faced by the GNSO are too important to allow this meaningless dispute to continue.*

### Commercial Stakeholders

The Commercial Stakeholders Group is a mix of Constituencies that have diverse and often divergent interests. A number of interviewees expressed concerns that Constituencies were established to allow decision-making at the appropriate level, yet the ICANN board required their disparate views and interests to be amalgamated artificially into a 'common' Stakeholder Group position.

The issues that this creates were highlighted in the discussion at ICANN 51 between the CSG Constituency Chairs and the ICANN Board<sup>79</sup>, where they expressed concerns that the Board's requirement to have a single set of views expressed through the single Stakeholder Group was often at odds with their Constituency views. The concept of a CSG view became meaningless and frustrating for those involved.

The Commercial Business Users' Constituency is intended to offer a representative function for businesses that use the Internet as registrants or end users. Quantitative survey results show that the CBUC's executive committee is thought to be less representative than average and that its geographic diversity is perceived to be less than average across the GNSO. Comments indicate a degree of self-perpetuation of the leadership of this group.

Relatively few Internet Service Providers (ISPs) are active in the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP). This may be because ISPs do not generally think domain name policy is sufficiently important to their businesses to justify the time input required. Some respondents noted also that the ISPCP's membership was shrinking and, as noted above, that desired outcomes were only achieved when views between Constituencies were not combined at the CSG level.

---

<sup>79</sup> <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/tue-board-csg/transcript-board-csg-14oct14-en.pdf>

In relation to the CSG generally, but most notably the Intellectual Property Constituency, some interviewees and respondents to the 360° Survey argued that, while legal privilege might prevent disclosure of a client or sponsor's name, ICANN's values of openness and transparency should require participants to disclose at least their underlying interests in a matter.

### Volunteer Participation

Volunteers from the community have various incentives to participate in GNSO activities, including:

1. To manage the impact on a contracted party's business
2. To represent a paying client or generate clients for themselves
3. Out of a sense of service
4. As a means of participating in ICANN processes and meetings

Many participants will have a mix of these. Those whose businesses or clients pay them to attend may, in the view of some respondents, have less of an incentive to conclude processes quickly than those who are contributing their time, and sometimes their travel costs. This leads to two often-described issues:

- *Volunteer burnout* – in common with many voluntary group activities, there is a tendency for a few individuals to undertake most of the work, leading to stress and burnout. This is despite groups apparently being well-resourced; one working group was said to have more than 50 members.
- *"Consensus by exhaustion"* – this phrase was used by one respondent, and others expressed similar sentiments, to describe how they saw decisions being reached. It reflects the differing incentives on volunteers discussed above – non-commercial representatives generally have limits to the time they can spend on what, to them, is a public-good issue, so they can effectively be "waited out" by people who are paid to attend.

A further point raised in respect of volunteers was a tendency to 'recycle leaders' (as discussed above). There is an often-expressed view that the same people remain in charge but swap positions periodically to overcome term limits. This accords with our own observations over several years.

We were also advised by some interviewees and 360° Survey respondents of active hostility to new leadership from a few participants of long standing. The following survey comments were typical:

- *Develop succession planning for outreach and leadership roles.*

- *Strict term limits for all leadership positions and a cap on the number of times any individual can hold leadership positions.*
- *Stop recirculating the leadership spots among the same basic group of insiders.*
- *Stop rotating leaders from one position to the next to provide fresh thinking.*
- *Recycling leadership is a problem. Intimidating. Experience talks, trumps new people...*

These comments show that the perception of incumbency exists and this reduces the incentive for new participants to become involved. It is seen as fundamentally inconsistent with the multi-stakeholder model and widespread incumbency in leadership roles exacerbates the perception of the GNSO's lack of diversity.

We consider that a culture change, driven by the 'tone at the top', is essential for the GNSO to admit and welcome new participants. Many people already demonstrate this, but this is far from universal. We also note many efforts by ICANN generally over the years to be more inclusive, such as extensive translation services, but the real change required is in the attitude of some incumbent participants – some of them of long-standing.

This culture change is essential not only for welcoming newcomers, but also for the GNSO to remain relevant, by evolving over time to meet emerging needs – many of which have probably not been identified yet (as we discuss further in Section 9).

### **Conclusions**

The current structure of two Houses, four Stakeholder Groups, and multiple Constituencies, is very complex but allows for functional diversity while maintaining the balance of voting power between the Contracted and Non-Contracted Parties' Houses.

#### **Westlake Review Team Recommendations**

- ❖ **Recommendation 26:** That GNSO Council members, Executive Committee members of SGs and Cs and members of WGs complete and maintain a current, comprehensive SOI on the GNSO website. 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 27:** 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).

- ❖ **Recommendation 28:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 29:** That SOIs of GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all SGs and Cs include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN.

## **BGC Recommendation 16 (Constituency administration support)**

### ***Observations***

ICANN Staff provide support for most but not all Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. The table below shows quantitative feedback to the survey statement: *"The Group has sufficient human resources support from ICANN staff"*.

These survey responses are variable, although this may reflect quantity rather than quality of support provided, as feedback from interviewees and others spoken to was overwhelmingly positive:

- *High skill smart staff.*
- *Staff who support the GNSO are incredible.*
- *Secretariat support is excellent.*

Several people noted that, while ICANN staff support is excellent where it is provided, not all SGs and Cs receive consistent levels of support. For example:

- *Staff support (one staffer) for each stakeholder group to coordinate and collect comments and papers would be a welcome addition.*
- *More support from ICANN staff*
- *Insist that all SGs and Constituencies have adequate secretariat support.*
- *Receive increased support from ICANN to assist volunteers in each constituency vis-a-vis dedicated secretariat and parliamentary positions.*
- *More staff resources to help the NCPH accomplish and enhance its work.*

**Westlake Review Team Recommendations**

- ❖ **Recommendation 30:** 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.



## SECTION 8: IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION WITH ICANN STRUCTURES

---

### 8.1 BGC Recommendations

*BGC 17: The Council should propose specific ways in which it can improve communications between it and Board Members elected from the GNSO.*

*BGC 18: There should be more frequent contact and communication among the Chairs of the GNSO, GNSO constituencies, other Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs), especially in advance of each ICANN Meeting. The Council should also consider other ways in which it can further enhance coordination with other ICANN structures, and report to the Board within six months on such steps.*

### 8.2 Major accomplishments and milestones

(As noted on the GNSO website<sup>80</sup>):

- The Communications and Coordination Work Team (CCT) submitted its Final Consolidated Report to the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) and was approved by the GNSO Council (23 June 2010, Brussels), after a Public Comment period (23 April 2010 – 16 May 2010). The Council directed Staff to begin implementation focusing on the CCT’s three major recommendations:
  - Developing new GNSO website requirements including document management and collaboration tools;
  - Improving the GNSO’s ability to solicit meaningful feedback; and
  - Improving the GNSO’s coordination with other ICANN structures.
- Website Design and Development:
  - During September-October 2009, utilizing the CCT’s foundational work, members of the ICANN Policy Staff and the CCT sub-team developed a framework/layout for a new GNSO website and conducted several presentations during the Seoul ICANN meeting to show various GNSO groups the “wireframes” and obtain feedback.

---

<sup>80</sup> <http://gns0.icann.org/en/ongoing-work/archive/2012/improvements/accomplishments-en.htm>

- Two Requests for Proposals were published (February, April 2010) culminating in a contract award and delivery of a re-themed site in September 2010.
- Extensive content development ensued in the intervening period and the new GNSO site became operational effective 24 May 2012: Major improvements include: complete site reorganization and content presentation; implementation of taxonomy and extensive document tagging; conversion to database for improved efficiencies; new browse (library) and search capability; modern theming/navigation; and a focus on new user education (podcasts, webinars).

### **8.3 Summary of Westlake Review Team’s assessment of implementation effectiveness**

#### **BGC Recommendation 17 (Improved communication with ICANN Board members appointed by GNSO)**

This has been successfully implemented.

#### **BGC Recommendation 18 (Improved communication and coordination with other ICANN structures)**

Problems with coordination remain but are being addressed by initiatives of the GNSO Council.

### **8.4 Basis for Westlake’s assessment**


#### **BGC Recommendation 17 (Improved communication with ICANN Board)**

We received no comment of any kind on the issue of communication between the GNSO Council and Board members elected from the GNSO. Based on this, it would appear that it is no longer a significant issue. Therefore, we conclude that the BGC recommendation has been implemented successfully.

## BGC Recommendation 18 (Improved communication and coordination with other ICANN structures)

### Observations

A number of survey respondents and interviewees commented on the need to improve the interaction between the GNSO and other SOs and ACs. The following graph shows positive responses (57%) only slightly outweigh the negative (43%) in relation to the survey proposition *The GNSO is effective in coordinating its work with other SOs and ACs*.



Below is a range of comments from survey respondents and interviewees:

- *Focus on co-operation, collaboration and productive work with others in the ICANN SO & AC structures.*
- *Siloization, needs better mechanisms for interacting with SOs/ACs outside the GNSO silo.*
- *While there has been substantial improvement over the past few years, more and better liaison work needs to be done to communicate GNSO work with other SOs and ACs*
- *GNSO should always make a formal decision to ask SSAC (or not) at some stage in a PDP.*<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> We note this is a mandated requirement of the GNSO Operating Procedures

- *There is a longstanding problem with GAC - no one member can represent GAC. Hence no liaison from GAC to SO's. Process in GNSO is so onerous that GAC members (who have day jobs) can't stay in touch with PDPs. Has been tried, (e.g. by US GAC rep). GAC waits until they see the policy proposition, looks to GNSO that they are blocking, not entirely fair view.*
- *GAC prefers to only comment once policy becomes clear toward the end of the policy development process*
- *A closer coordination between the GNSO and the GAC will improve efficiencies, reduce differences of opinion, and add much value to the entire organization and community.*
- *[the GNSO should] see the GAC and all other SOs and ACs as family members with whom we must work out our differences, preferably BEFORE policy recommendations get to the ICANN Board.*
- *The GNSO is heavily involved in coordination efforts with other SOs and ACs as well as the GAC and the board. The weekend sessions of the council provide an informative means of communications for all ongoing work.*

### **Analysis**

Improved co-ordination with SOs/ACs was one of the recommendations of BGC WG. The following recommendations arose from the two work teams of the Policy Steering Committee.

1. *The PDP Process Work Team recommended that input from other SOs and ACs must be sought . . .*
2. *The Communications and Coordination Work Team (CCT) recommended the following regarding cross SO/AC communications in section 5.3 of their report. “. . .that more formal processes be developed for seeking input from other ICANN organizations on proposed GNSO policies when working groups are underway. The GNSO Council has been very well served by the non-voting ALAC liaison who participates actively on Council calls and in various policy working groups. The CCT also recommends that the active engagement of liaison be encouraged along these lines, recognising that it may be more difficult for some ACs, such as GAC, to participate in such a manner.*

*Seeking Input from other SOs and ACs* is included in Section 9 of the Policy Development Process Manual (Annex 2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures):

- *The PDP Team is also encouraged to formally seek the opinion of other ICANN Advisory*

- *Committees and Supporting Organizations, as appropriate that may have expertise, experience, or an interest in the PDP issue. Solicitation of opinions should be done during the early stages of the PDP. In addition, the PDP Team should seek input from other SOs and ACs. Such input should be treated with the same due diligence as other comments and input processes. In addition, comments from ACs and SOs should receive a response from the PDP Team. This may include, for example, direct reference in the applicable Report or embedded in other responsive documentation or a direct response. The PDP Team is expected to detail in its report how input was sought from other SOs and ACs.*

PDP WGs formally seek input from SOs and ACs using a standard template “Community Input Statement Request Template”. In reviewing a number of PDPs, the Westlake Review Team found few comments provided by SOs and ACs other than the ALAC. This was also the finding of the ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation Study<sup>82</sup>. We are also advised that significant co-operation among SOs and ACs has been evident during the current IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability projects.

The Westlake Review Team understands that there is a current GNSO Council action item to establish an SSAC liaison to GNSO or vice versa.

The ATRT2 GNSO PDP Evaluation Study<sup>83</sup> commented that *GAC rarely participates in any PDP. The consequences of the GAC not participating in GNSO PDPs is that the GAC may only raise concerns after lengthy processes have been completed, and negotiations and agreements reached. This report also shows that while there are several windows of opportunities for GAC to provide advice during PDPs, those opportunities are not taken.* Concerns were also raised that the provision of GAC advice can provide an opportunity for the GAC to be used by other players in the community as an alternative vehicle for policy changes.

The ATRT2 report was completed in late 2013, so it is not surprising that feedback from survey respondents and interviewees mirrored the comments in that report.

In response to ATRT1 & ATRT2 Reviews and the work of the GAC-Board Joint Working Group (JWG), the GAC and GNSO have established a consultation group (GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early

---

<sup>82</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gns0-evaluation-21nov13-en.pdf>

<sup>83</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gns0-evaluation-21nov13-en.pdf>

Engagement)<sup>84</sup> to *explore ways for the GAC to engage early in the GNSO Policy Development Process and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies.*

We note that the ccNSO and GNSO come together during each ICANN meeting, to co-ordinate joint CWGs and exchange views on topics of common interest. The GAC and GNSO also have a joint session during ICANN meetings, while the ALAC and the ccNSO have a liaison to the GNSO Council.

To date progress includes, among other developments, the appointment of a GNSO Liaison to the GAC as a pilot project for 2015 and a survey of GAC members to evaluate communication mechanisms for awareness, usefulness and possible improvements.

### **Westlake Review Team Recommendation**

❖ **Recommendation 31:** 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.

---

<sup>84</sup> <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsogcgoeeeipdp/3.+Charter>

## SECTION 9: CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

---

### 9.1 Purpose of this Section

*He aha te mea nui o te ao? He tangata! He tangata! He tangata!*

*(What is the most important thing in the world? It is people! It is people! It is people! – New Zealand Māori proverb)*

Much of this report has focussed on the GNSO's response to previous reviews and the BGC WG's recommendations from those reviews. The GNSO also needs to focus on the future, in a significantly changed and changing operating environment. This section considers some of those changes and assesses the extent to which the GNSO is ready to meet the challenges they pose.

### 9.2 Introduction

Until relatively recently, the GNSO had operated in a rapidly-growing but comparatively stable environment. Some of the biggest changes in the use of the domain name system are likely to arise from the shift in the "centre of gravity" of the user base of the Internet, from developed, mostly Anglophone, economies, when ICANN was established, to an Internet that is now numerically dominated by people from Asian and other largely non-Anglophone regions. In addition to other languages, different scripts and cultures become increasingly material.

Both the introduction of Internationalised Domain Names (IDNs) and the massive expansion in the number of gTLDs available are significant changes to the way in which the DNS is used. They create a range of issues that are likely to need addressing through the development of new policy.

Another major environmental change for ICANN is its evolution from being seen as US-centric, to accountability to the global Internet community, as evidenced by the introduction of the Affirmation of Commitments and the IANA Stewardship Transition. As well as influencing the demand for policies, these moves underline the importance of ensuring that a truly representative group is involved in making policy.

### 9.3 Demographic structure of the Internet

The following table is taken from [www.internetworldstats.com](http://www.internetworldstats.com).

World Regions	Population 2014 (m)	Internet Users End 2000 (m)	Internet Users Mid 2014 (m)	Growth 2000-2014	Penetration Mid 2014
North America	354	108	310	187 %	87.7 %
Oceania / Australia	37	8	27	252 %	72.9 %
Europe	826	105	582	454 %	70.5 %
Latin America / Caribbean	612	18	320	1 673 %	52.3 %
Middle East	232	3	112	3 304 %	48.3 %
Asia	3 996	114	1 386	1 113 %	34.7 %
Africa	1 126	5	298	6 499 %	26.5 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7 182</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>3 036</b>	<b>741 %</b>	<b>42.3 %</b>

At ICANN's inception Internet users were split roughly evenly between North America, Europe and Asia. Now, almost half the world's Internet users are in Asia. More significantly, the two regions that still show the lowest levels of penetration, Asia and Africa, are also the two with the largest total populations (and also some of the world's fastest growing populations), with a total of 71% of the world's total population at 2014. Internet penetration in these regions is still only about one-quarter (Africa) or one-third (Asia), compared with about three-quarters in the richer economies: the steep growth in Asia and Africa is likely to continue for some time, exacerbating further the current gap between the demographics of the "average" Internet user of 2015 (and later) and the background of those responsible for developing policy.

These changes may lead beyond the requirement to develop or amend GNSO policy. They may stimulate the initiation of new, and/or the amalgamation of existing, GNSO constituencies.

Several respondents to the 360° and some interviewees commented on some or all of these demographic issues, but with the general point – that the GNSO remains dominated by participants from largely Anglophone, developed nations. As a result the issues they considered tended to be those of interest to developed wealthy economies. The Westlake Review Team considered that several related issues also posed potential barriers:

- English-speaking people are already a minority on the Internet and will almost inevitably become a smaller minority.



- Richer economies are better able to support a volunteer structure: experienced participants are overwhelmingly North American, Western European or Australian/New Zealanders.
- Complexity deters newcomers.
- Because of the imbalance in the GNSO's composition, it was seen by some to be poorly equipped to identify and develop policies or consider issues relating to gTLDs that are of significance to less developed economies.

Among suggestions of means to encourage more diverse participation were the concept of enforced term limits for incumbents, formal induction and training for newcomers (including new chairs of WGs), and staff providing support and ready advice on process.

## 9.4 Diversity

In its Core Value 4, ICANN is committed to cultural diversity, although it does not define this term. In the UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity, culture is defined as:

*The set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and that it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs.*

To meet its core value, we consider that ICANN should therefore be taking steps to maximise the variety of cultures represented in the ICANN community, and the GNSO should seek to maximise the diversity of cultures whose members contribute to the policy-making process.

The definition of cultural diversity given above is not easily measurable. However, a partial proxy would be birth language. Other easily measurable aspects would be gender and year/decade of birth. If the GNSO (and ICANN more widely) were to collect this information from participants and report on it, the level of diversity would become more obvious.

Achieving real diversity means involving the widest practicable community of stakeholders – specifically:

- *Geographic diversity* refers to seeking stakeholder input from around the globe. ICANN has a definition of regions that is partly helpful in assessing diversity.
- *Functional diversity* includes representation from people and organisations with a range of relationships with gTLDs. Achieving functional diversity requires that stakeholders with differing interests and skills can participate in the GNSO, i.e. they can find and be admitted to an appropriate existing constituency, or as the BGC WG recommended, that it should not

be impossible to form a new Constituency (or, in the case of Registry SG members, a new Interest Group).

- *Cultural diversity* is not (as mentioned above) defined in the Bylaws or in other ICANN material that we have reviewed. However, it is something that can be obvious by its absence and includes factors such as ethnicity, age, language, and socio-economic factors. In a broader context, gender diversity is a visible measure of demographic diversity. Gender diversity relating to participants in GNSO PDP Working Groups has been measured and commented on in previous reviews<sup>85</sup>. We have also discussed aspects of gender diversity above, in our discussion of PDP Working Group processes.

#### 9.4.1 Geographic Diversity


It is not possible to be definitive about the geographic diversity of the membership of the GNSO, firstly because ICANN does not collect comprehensive statistics on geographic (or gender and cultural) diversity of its community. It does collect geographic diversity information, but we consider the criterion to be flawed, since people can state their place of residence regardless of their ethnicity or actual affinity (for example, an Australian national living in Nigeria could choose to be recorded as a member from Africa). Secondly, Constituency and SG membership consists in many cases of organisations and/or individuals. Organisations may themselves be based in one region but consist of individuals from many. We believe, as explained further below, that ICANN's geographic regions are a poor measure of cultural or ethnic diversity.

Details of geographic diversity on the GNSO Council itself are easier to obtain because its membership is a matter of public record.

---

<sup>85</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gns0-evaluation-21nov13-en.pdf>

The chart below shows that North America is the most represented region at 44%, Asia Pacific is second at 26% with Europe third at 17%. The Latin America and Caribbean, and African, regions make up less than 15%. It was also noted that these figures can be distorted through individuals holding multiple citizenships.



To address geographic diversity, attempts are made to balance leadership structures by appointing candidates from different geographic regions. It is not clear that any consideration of cultural diversity is made in addition to geographic diversity.


Our observation of ICANN meetings (ICANN51 and earlier) suggests that North Americans and Europeans comprised the vast majority of those present and active. At ICANN50 (London) and 51 (Los Angeles), this may have been due partly to the location of the meetings. However, this predominance has been evident at other recent ICANN meetings Westlake representatives have attended in Singapore, Beijing and elsewhere. Leadership positions in GNSO structures also show a heavy weighting of EU and NA nationals and/or residents.

#### 9.4.2 Cultural Diversity

The chart of Council's geographic diversity presented under *Geographic Diversity* above shows that nearly half of all Council positions are held by people from North America, and a quarter by people from Asia Pacific. Under ICANN's current definition, Asia Pacific includes Australia and New Zealand

which are in general culturally more similar to North America and parts of Europe than to most Asian cultures.

If the chart is re-cast to show Australia and New Zealand as part of a group including North America and Europe, it shows that only 17% of Council membership falls outside this group.



As at July 2013, people from Asia (not including Australia or New Zealand) made up 48% of total Internet users.<sup>86</sup> The chart above shows that people from Anglophone and European cultures are heavily over-represented on Council, and in our observation, in the GNSO as a whole.

Several survey respondents and interviewees noted a number of factors as presenting barriers to culturally broader participation in the GNSO:

1. GNSO's working language is English. Despite extensive translation services provided by ICANN there is limited opportunity to participate effectively without a reasonable level of English language fluency.
2. In North America and to a lesser degree much of Europe, a robust confrontational style of debate is often regarded as acceptable in a business context. Such a style is less acceptable and often seen as distasteful in some other cultures. Several respondents referred negatively to the tone of some debates within the GNSO. In contrast, other respondents

---

<sup>86</sup> Internet Live Statistics, <http://internetlivestats.com>, viewed 15 December 2014

commented that under the current leadership of the GNSO Council it had become more inclusive and less confrontational than previously.

3. Some interviewees said that voting on every item before a committee is very much a US-style approach and difficult for people from other cultures to deal with; they would attempt to reach a consensus and only surface open disagreement if absolutely necessary.

We note that the ICANN Board's Nominating Committee (NomCom) appoints three members to the GNSO Council. ICANN's Bylaws refer specifically to the NomCom's responsibility *to ensure that the persons selected to fill vacancies ... shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be applied ... make selections guided by Core Value 4.*

The make-up of the current GNSO Council does not demonstrate a focus by SGs or Cs on achieving geographic, gender or cultural diversity. In addition, all three NomCom appointees to the Council are male, two are from North and Latin America and the other is from Europe.

An observation made to us more than once during the course of our interviews was that the GNSO and/or ICANN often refers to the principles of diversity as set out in Core Value 4, but there is little evidence of substantial change to the demographic and gender mix of participants and office holders over the last few years.

Several respondents also commented on the issue of 'leadership recycling'. While there are term limits in some parts of ICANN including the GNSO, we received many comments to the effect that the same people remain in leadership positions by trading places. One specific feature identified was that some people had served in various roles on the ALAC and had subsequently moved into leadership roles in the GNSO. This accords with our own observations, during our involvement with ICANN over many years. We were also given several anecdotal but credible instances of active resistance to new members becoming involved in leadership.

As we have noted above in Section 3 – Review Methodology, the 360° survey and the Working Group surveys for this review were initially published in English, and ICANN translated both surveys into the five other United Nations languages, posting invitations in all of these languages on the GNSO website. Despite these efforts and significant promotion of both surveys, we did not receive a single request to send a copy of the survey in any language other than English. We did receive two sets of responses in French, but these were posted to the English language version of the 360° survey. We might conclude from this that even those respondents had at least a working knowledge of English, in order to understand the statements they were responding to.

We conclude that, by any measure, there is a significant absence of geographic diversity in the make-up of most GNSO structures, and of the Council. Part of this may be explained by the longevity of many of the participants and office holders: when they first became involved with the GNSO (or ICANN), often ten or more years ago, developed western economies dominated the use of the Internet. This has changed significantly in the last decade: for example, China and India together now have more than three times the number of Internet users as does the United States, and this ratio will only increase as penetration continues to grow in China and India. The make-up of the GNSO Council and office holders has not kept pace with these changes.

Recent studies of obstacles to achieving diversity in companies, particularly gender diversity, have highlighted what are referred to as “unconscious biases”<sup>87</sup> that inhibit changes – behaviours and attitudes that tend to perpetuate existing structures (for example after-hours social sessions that are traditionally male-orientated and often not convenient for female managers) – without people being generally aware that they are having this impact.

One example of such unconscious bias mentioned in our interviews was the timing of PDP WG telephone meetings: in the view of our interviewee, the timing of these calls almost invariably favoured North American/Western European WG members, and therefore disadvantaged members on the other side of the world, who often had to call in the middle of their night. In our view it is unlikely that this timing is deliberately biased, and is more likely to be set to suit the majority of (current) WG members, but it makes it harder for people in Asia, especially, to participate and therefore tends to perpetuate the dominance of existing WG membership.

(We have been advised in a previous review that the ICANN board addressed this matter by scheduling each monthly meeting to start eight hours earlier than the previous month’s meeting. In this way, inconvenience was shared around the globe, and on average each board member would attend one board meeting in every three at a time when they would normally be asleep, but no geographic region was favoured or disadvantaged over another.)

The ICANN Geographic Regions Working Group<sup>88</sup> recommended, amongst other things, that “the general principle of geographic diversity is valuable and should be preserved,” and “application of the geographic diversity principles must be more rigorous, clear and consistent.”

---

<sup>87</sup> <http://www.genderworx.com.au/our-book/>

<sup>88</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/geo-regions-final-report-22jun13-en.pdf>

To reinforce our recommendations, we cite Vint Cerf, former Chairman of the ICANN Board of Directors:

*The Internet is for everyone.*<sup>89</sup>

## 9.5 Internationalised domain names

ICANN has long acknowledged that IDNs represent a difficult challenge both technically and for policy making. Nevertheless, real progress has been made and IDNs have been launched within existing TLDs and as TLDs in their own right.

In order to support many non-English languages, including the UN languages Arabic, Chinese and Russian, IDNs are required. Policy about IDNs needs to be informed by people with cultural and linguistic understanding that is relevant to the languages that each script is designed to support.

## 9.6 New gTLDs

gTLD expansion has caused a range of policy demands. It has also changed the landscape of industry players through the creation of dotBrands. A brand that has its own TLD would be a registry, it might also be a registrar, and it may have intellectual property interests and business or not-for-profit interests in the use of the TLD. These roles cut across the GNSO's existing Constituency and Stakeholder Group model.

Some respondents expressed the view that the introduction of a large number of new gTLDs will upset the existing balance in the GNSO, in particular the CPH. As a side observation, the Westlake Review Team was surprised that few people even raised the topic of new gTLDs, or the potential impact on the GNSO of introducing hundreds of new TLDs, after several years of relative stability when the number of gTLDs remained in the low 20s. However, a small number of survey respondents and interviewees did comment on these issues, some at considerable length. It was difficult to assess whether this was because they considered that no particular issues arose as a result of new gTLDs, or whether this was a further example of the perils of incumbency and holding to traditional assumptions.

One interviewee expressed the view the CPH has been quite successful in accommodating the large number of new gTLDs within existing structures – especially noting the substantial growth in Registry Stakeholder Group membership – from the low 20s to more than 100. We have commented

---

<sup>89</sup> <https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3271.txt>

elsewhere on the constitutions of CPH SGs, which do not provide for the establishment of separate Constituencies, but the charter of the RySG does allow for the formation of Interest Groups. In our view, this structure could allow groups of users to coalesce in ways that they may not now be doing, within the broader RySG.

## 9.7 GNSO Structure

We received more than 120 unsolicited comments on the GNSO's structure in the 360° Survey and in our interviews.

Of those respondents who commented on structure, the majority expressed the view that it was overly complex, and the most common solution offered was to abolish the two-House structure. Against this, several respondents considered either that the GNSO's two-House structure was largely immaterial to its effectiveness, and a smaller number noted that the GNSO structure had been designed and built carefully over several years and that it was now able to focus more effectively than before on its core purpose – to develop and recommend to the Board substantive policies relating to gTLDs.<sup>90</sup>

The GNSO's structure is complex – two Houses, four Stakeholder Groups and numerous Constituencies and we have observed that GNSO meetings can be lengthy and by many measures are inefficient. It is notable however that much of the complexity relates to achieving a balance in voting between different groups: Contracted/Non-Contracted Parties, Registries/Registrars and Commercial/Non-Commercial Stakeholders. In practice some of the constructs, notably the two Houses, appear to be little more than vehicles for voting and generally do not have a separate 'life' of their own.

Views on the structure of the GNSO that we received through the 360° Survey and our interviews, ranged across a full spectrum:

- *[The GNSO is] a dysfunctional structure created by the last review, which creates procedural, numeric and behavioral barriers to cooperation.*
- *...unwieldy, unbalanced and doesn't work.*
- *While it may be slower-moving than top-down decisions, it takes into account the entire community and allows them to discuss matters of import to the Internet.*

---

<sup>90</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/bylaws-2012-02-25-en> - X



- *It is a carefully crafted construct, which permits a sensible balance of power between those with a (contractual) interest in the outcomes and those who seek to influence outcomes for other reasons.*
- *Make absolutely NO changes to the structure of the GNSO right now. GNSO is completely overloaded with other issues that are of far greater importance.*

Some considered that the Contracted Parties had conceded too much voting power in the transition to the two House structure to parties who were not contractually bound by policy. As far as we were able to identify, people holding this view were, not surprisingly, affiliated largely to the CPH.

In contrast, other respondents argued that the Contracted Parties retained too much power (some identified the CPH's 'double vote' that in aggregate gives it a voice equal to that of the NCPH), while some argued further that members of the CPH had a conflict of interests in their dual roles of participating in the development of policy and being contractually bound by such policies. A few of these respondents considered that the Contracted Parties should not participate directly in the decisions of PDP Working Groups, but should have only an advisory, non-voting role.

A small number of respondents argued that membership of the GNSO should be restricted to Contracted Parties only. Other stakeholders should be able to express their views through another arm of ICANN; one suggestion, from a few people, was to merge the whole NCPH into the ALAC.

While survey participants were not asked directly about structural improvements, we received a range of suggested "solutions" to perceived structural weaknesses:

- Do nothing.
- Abolish the two-House structure.
- Extend the structure to three Houses (under this option, a formal voice for Registrants and Users would be created).
- Remove all or part of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group from the GNSO and merge the NCSG into the ALAC.
- Abolish the GNSO completely and restructure the whole of ICANN (we considered that this went beyond our current Terms of Reference).

However, noting that respondents were not asked for 'solutions,' none of them offered detailed alternatives or addressed the consequences of suggested changes, or indeed the potential risks and costs/opportunity cost.

### 9.7.1 Structural Complexity

One of the bigger concerns, expressed by a number of survey respondents and interviewees, related to the perceived complexity of the GNSO's structure and processes. This was considered to be one of several significant barriers for a newcomer wishing to be involved and participate effectively. As a result, some roles in the GNSO were perceived by many to be protected as "an insider's game," with high barriers to entry.

### 9.7.2 Respondent comments on the current structure

Views varied about the effectiveness of the current structure of the GNSO. These included the following as some of the key themes:

- Two Houses are needed in order to give a voice to Contracted Parties.
- A general view that the CPH is reasonably effective: participants in the CPH are often professionals whose participation in GNSO business is a part of their job.
- There is a perception that the IPC is better resourced than other NCPH constituencies, although this is not necessarily accurate. There is also a perception that IPC is not transparent about its membership, possibly because, while IPC membership is indeed published<sup>91</sup> it is not on the GNSO / ICANN website.
- Concerns were raised over the lack of transparency in some Constituencies: membership, email lists, for whom/in whose interests some members were acting, and who was paying.
- It was widely commented by survey respondents and interviewees that the NCSG has issues that inhibit its effectiveness. In the view of some, the NCUC, dominated by small or single person groups, is always likely to have greater numbers to out-vote the NPOC, which represents often larger but fewer NPOs. Most of those who commented on the difficulties perceived to exist in the NCSG hoped that it would solve these itself, rather than having a "solution" imposed.

### 9.7.3 Silo-focused structure

One unique aspect of the GNSO, compared with all other ICANN SOs and ACs is that the GNSO is in practice largely an abstract construct. At an ICANN meeting it is possible to attend a meeting of the

---

<sup>91</sup> <http://www.ipconstituency.org/current-membership/>

ALAC or the ccNSO, while the GAC and the RSSAC also meet in various forms. The GNSO as a single SO does not usually meet in the way that other SOs and ACs do. At other times, the GNSO Council meets; Constituencies and some SGs meet; and Working Groups convene. As a result, the proceedings of the various parts of the GNSO naturally take place in disparate ‘silos’.

Several people highlighted this ‘silo’ nature of the GNSO. In addition, and possibly related, several people – mainly from other than North America – commented on the GNSO’s apparent ‘obsession with voting.’ Together these two factors contributed to what several survey respondents and interviewees described as a ‘confrontational approach to decision-making’, where the key requirement was to assemble sufficient voting support, rather than striving for a genuine consensus of views.

#### 9.7.4 Stakeholder Groups x 4

The current structure provides for a balance of voting between the CPH and the NCPH, while allowing considerable flexibility within each SG, with or without individual Constituencies. It allows new Constituencies to form (at least in policy and theory) without changing the voting balance between the four SGs/two Houses. The intention in setting up the four SGs is that any stakeholder community should fit into one of the four SGs. In addition, some organisations may naturally join more than one SG – for example a complex commercial organization that also operated a gTLD Registry might validly be a member of both the RySG (an SG in the CPH), and the CBUC within the CSG (an SG in the NCPH). However, no party holding concurrent memberships may vote in more than one SG or Constituency.

#### 9.7.5 Linkages with ccNSO

We received a small number of suggestions to align (or re-merge – as in ICANN’s pre-2003 structure) the ccNSO and GNSO: although their roles are similar in that both SOs develop policy relating to TLDs, they are fundamentally different in that most ccNSO members are not contractually bound to ICANN. They also generally operate within the framework of their own sovereign state’s legal and regulatory environment. With the expansion in the number and scope of gTLDs, we observe that some ccTLD operators have become operators of one or more new gTLDs and others are likely to follow. As an example, Nominet has been the ccTLD manager for .uk for many years. In 2014, it launched two new gTLDs, .wales and .cymru (the Welsh language name for Wales) to operate as quasi country-codes for Wales, which has no two-character country code distinct from .uk. As a result, Nominet may now play a valid role in both the ccNSO and the GNSO.

### 9.7.6 Implications for Structure

The scope of this review is constrained by ICANN not to recommend structural solutions. Moreover, in conducting our review, we were told many times that the last round of structural changes had been divisive and distracting, and had diverted attention from the process of developing substantive gTLD policy.

Through the course of the review, we heard many suggestions for structural change, largely involving abolition of the Two-House structure, or reversion to the voting system that prevailed before the 2011 changes. Notwithstanding the constraint on our scope, we were not convinced that these proposals offered sufficient benefit (if any) to warrant another round of material changes to the structure of the GNSO at this stage. We have however identified a deficiency in the carefully-constructed balance of voting powers in the GNSO and we have recommended a remedy.

The current structure of the GNSO has been in place for only about three years. From the Review Team's professional experience of structural change in many organisations of differing types, this represents only a relatively short time for it to become firmly established and for people to be fully familiar with it. This is especially true in an organisation such as ICANN, where a large proportion of the community is involved only part time. We were advised that the structure had been developed with considerable care to provide a balance of voting across a broad range of interests and to give adequate but not excessive voice to those parties that are legally bound by GNSO policy. While complex and the object of much comment and criticism, we consider that the framework of GNSO Council / two Houses / four Stakeholder Groups and multiple Constituencies should continue.

As we discuss above, the emergence of new constituencies and possible winding up and disappearance of others, as the BGC foresaw<sup>92</sup>, has not occurred.

Our view is that structure should not lead but result from strategy ('form follows function'). In addition, we are aware from past experience, and from several comments during this review specifically, of the time and energy consumed and the distraction from core activities that structural changes require.

Changes to structure may be among the most visible of changes to an organization, but amending the structure should not be confused with addressing core issues. Our view has been that the GNSO faces many challenges and we have addressed those we have identified in other sections of our

---

<sup>92</sup> <http://archive.icann.org/en/topics/gns0-improvements/gns0-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

report – matters relating to Policy Development Processes, and to Accountability, Representation and Transparency. We consider that the higher priority should be to consider and, if thought appropriate, implement our Recommendations in these areas, rather than focusing again on the GNSO's structure.

We do not consider that the GNSO's structure is perfect, or that it cannot be improved, but we do not consider that the structure is either the main cause of or currently offers the solution to its most pressing challenges. We acknowledge above that the complexity of the structure presents a barrier to newcomers and we have recommended elsewhere (Section 7 – Enhance Constituencies) some measures to address this. If our Recommendations are adopted, one or more new Constituencies are likely to emerge in the near term.

We also note that the current structure has only been completed in the relatively recent past and our wider experience indicates that certainty and increasing familiarity with the structure are likely to contribute more to improving the GNSO's effectiveness in the near future than marginal benefits that might be gained from further changes. In most organizations, new structures and processes typically require several years to become fully understood and accepted, and for the real benefits and any major issues to emerge.

We consider that the GNSO Council should address the issues that we have identified and implement our recommendations ahead of any further structural review. When a full review of the GNSO's structure does take place, we consider that it should be broader than a review of a single Supporting Organisation and should be underpinned by a more extensive strategic review of the effectiveness of ICANN as a whole, which the structure should be refined to support.

As a specific example, one valid question such a reviewer might ask would relate to determining who could most appropriately represent the views of the broad global base of those who use the Internet for non-commercial purposes in gTLD policy making. At present, this is the role of the NCSG. However, the current active membership in the NCSG reveals a relatively narrow representation compared with the potential universe of global non-commercial users of the Internet. For example, few substantial international NGOs, such as consumer groups and human rights bodies, appear to be active members. We note that many such organizations are enrolled in the ALAC as ALSs, but that as an Advisory Committee the ALAC is intended to play a lesser role in policy making than the GNSO's own structures.

This current intent should not present a barrier to a future reviewer, with a broad brief, asking whether this is the best role for the ALAC, or whether some more radical option might give the ALAC

a more direct role in the GNSO's processes, and indeed bring greater efficiencies through replacing the substantial duplication of resources created by a separate NCSG.

We note that this matter has been raised previously. In September 2012, the ALAC published its White Paper on Future Challenges – “Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected”.<sup>93</sup> Among its recommendations are that ICANN:

*Transform the roles of the GAC and the ALAC from purely advisory to involvement in policy. This measure shall not be implemented separately from, nor before, a coordinated reform of structures affecting all Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees.*

## 9.8 Conclusion

We have discussed above several known changes to the GNSO's operating environment. In addition to these, changes to the environment that are not yet anticipated are highly likely to arise. We consider that the GNSO would be well served if it took active steps to increase the range and diversity of the membership of its various bodies, so that it reflected more the diversity of the user base of the Internet.

Matters of concern and relevance to users in richer economies may be very different from those of significance in developing countries. We do not consider ourselves qualified to identify the issues that might be of relevance to the GNSO and of concern to Internet users in countries and regions where electricity networks are not universally accessible, where the only access is through mobile devices, and in which multiple (non-English) languages and scripts are dominant. However, we also consider that the current members of the GNSO's various bodies, largely from richer economies, would face similar challenges in identifying the relevant issues.

ICANN is committed to maintaining and improving robust mechanisms for public input, accountability and transparency. This is shown by, inter alia, the Board's adoption of the ICANN Accountability & Transparency Frameworks and Principles<sup>94</sup> in 2008, and the subsequent commissioning of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT) reports 1<sup>95</sup> and 2<sup>96</sup> and the Board's commitment to implementing the resulting recommendations.

---

<sup>93</sup> <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/future-challenges-white-paper-17sep12-en.pdf>

<sup>94</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/acct-trans-frameworks-principles-10jan08-en.pdf>

<sup>95</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-recommendations-31dec10-en.pdf>

<sup>96</sup> <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/atrt2-recommendations-2014-01-09-en>

In the context of GNSO activities, ICANN's commitment to accountability, transparency and multi-stakeholderism requires:

- Involvement of the widest practicable community of stakeholders.
- Decision-making and policy development processes that are open and transparent to the community.
- Openness regarding who is contributing to decision-making and gTLD policy development, and who or what interests they represent.
- Participants in GNSO's processes to adhere to ICANN's Expected Standards of Behaviour<sup>97</sup>.

The biggest risk for the GNSO, if it fails to adapt to its changing environment, is that newcomers perceive it to be less relevant to their needs and develop new mechanisms, outside the GNSO and potentially outside ICANN, for addressing these.

We began this section with one quote. We conclude with another:

*If the rate of change on the outside exceeds the rate of change on the inside, the end is near.*

(Jack Welch, author and former CEO).

---

<sup>97</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/acct-trans-frameworks-principles-10jan08-en.pdf>

### Westlake Review Team Recommendations

- ❖ **Recommendation 32:** That ICANN define “cultural diversity” (possibly by using birth language); and regularly publish this along with geographic, gender and age group metrics, at least for the GNSO Council, SGs, Cs and WGs.
- ❖ **Recommendation 33:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 34:** 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.
- ❖ **Recommendation 35:** That the GNSO Council establish a WG, whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole, to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non- English speakers and those with limited command of English.
- ❖ **Recommendation 36:** 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.



## **SECTION 10: Appendices**

---

**Appendix 1: Acknowledgments**

**Appendix 2: Survey Statistics**

**Appendix 3: Interviewees**

**Appendix 4: Recommendations From Prior Reviews**

**Appendix 5: PDP Timelines**

**Appendix 6: GNSO Operating Procedures – proposed revision of section 6**

## Appendix 1: Acknowledgements

In the course of this review, the Westlake Review Team has received submissions, advice and assistance from a wide variety of people. We have interviewed about forty people in person, by telephone or by Skype (see Appendix 3 for a full list, with Affiliations). In addition we have had numerous informal discussions at ICANN Meetings 50, 51 and 52.

Through the various stages of the review, which has extended considerably from what was originally envisaged, we have received much feedback and helpful guidance from members of the GNSO Review Working Party, chaired by Jen Wolfe.

ICANN staff supporting the review have gone beyond reasonable expectations in their commitment, support and responsiveness – and positive attitudes throughout.

In particular we should like to acknowledge the help we have received from ICANN staff members, especially:

- Larisa Gurnick
- Charla Shambley
- Denise Michel
- Matt Ashtiani (during 2014)

Besides these, we have received helpful guidance and valuable information from others, Marika Konings and Mary Wong in particular. All these have given freely of their time and views, and we thank them for this.

While all of these people have been willing to offer guidance and support, the observations, conclusions and recommendations in this report – and any errors – are ours.

## Appendix 2: Survey quantitative summary results

1. GNSO Review 360° Assessment (pages 126-148)
2. GNSO Review Supplementary Working Group 360° Assessment (pages 149-151)

### GNSO REVIEW 360 ASSESSMENT

**1. Westlake will maintain your confidentiality. We will not identify you in material we quote or share with the GNSO and staff unless you grant us specific permission by ticking the box below.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I consent to being identified by name as the author of my feedback	100.0%	146
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>146</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>104</b>

### 2. Your name and contact address:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Name:	100.0%	204
Email Address:	100.0%	204
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>204</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>46</b>

### 3. How many ICANN meetings have you attended?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
None	12.7%	26
1	7.8%	16
2-5	17.2%	35
6-10	15.2%	31
11-20	22.1%	45
more than 20	25.0%	51
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>204</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>46</b>

**4. If you are responding on behalf of a group such as a part of ICANN or a company, please give its name below.**

Answer Options	Response Count
	64
	<b>answered question</b>
	<b>64</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>
	<b>186</b>

**5. Please select the option below that best indicates which group or part of ICANN you participate in (or, if you are no longer active, have participated in) the most:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
ALAC	7.8%	16
ASO	1.0%	2
Board	4.4%	9
ccNSO	2.9%	6
Fellowship	3.4%	7
GAC	3.4%	7
GNSO	50.5%	103
RSSAC	0.0%	0
SSAC	2.5%	5
Staff	9.8%	20
None	14.2%	29
<b>answered question</b>		<b>204</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>46</b>

**6. Have you participated personally in the work of the GNSO?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	60.3%	123
No	39.7%	81
<b>answered question</b>		<b>204</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>46</b>

**7. The GNSO has been effective in achieving its purpose, as defined in Article X of ICANN's Bylaws: There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	13.1%	22
Agree	63.1%	106
Disagree	11.3%	19
Strongly Disagree	4.8%	8
No opinion	6.5%	11
Not applicable	1.2%	2
<b>answered question</b>		<b>168</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>82</b>

**8. The Working Group model is effective in dealing with specific policy issues.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	15.5%	26
Agree	53.6%	90
Disagree	15.5%	26
Strongly Disagree	3.6%	6
No opinion	10.7%	18
Not applicable	1.2%	2
<i>answered question</i>		
		<b>168</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		
		<b>82</b>

**9. GNSO's outputs:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
GNSO's outputs have produced desired outcomes	12	88	38	5	20	5	168
GNSO's outputs are complete and thorough	19	84	33	7	22	3	168
GNSO's policy recommendations are timely	8	61	51	17	27	4	168
<i>answered question</i>							<b>168</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>82</b>

**10. GNSO communications and community responsiveness**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
GNSO provides me with sufficient and appropriate	30	95	22	5	13	3	168
GNSO communicates in plain language	11	77	53	14	12	1	168
GNSO seeks and incorporates community feedback on proposals	34	85	23	8	16	2	168
GNSO is effective in coordinating its work with other SOs and	16	59	47	7	35	4	168
<i>answered question</i>							<b>168</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>82</b>

**11. The following stakeholder communities are adequately represented in GNSO:**

Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
Commercial	39	57	21	20	14	1	152
Non-Commercial	22	55	29	24	17	5	152
Registrars	52	71	9	3	15	2	152
Registries	50	70	10	5	15	2	152
At-Large (through At-Large Advisory Committee Liaison)	22	78	17	7	18	10	152
Country codes (through Country Code Name Supporting	20	65	24	6	27	10	152
<i>answered question</i>							<b>152</b>

skipped question 98

**12. NomCom Appointees:** The NomCom appointees to Council are required under the Bylaws to be guided by ICANN Core Value 4: Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The role of the NomCom appointees is widely understood	6	48	54	20	21	3	152
The NomCom appointees to the GNSO Council are effective in	14	55	24	11	43	5	152
The NomCom appointees represent the best interests of the	11	42	35	14	46	4	152
	answered question						152
	skipped question						98

**13. The two-house structure divides the GNSO Council between the parties with ICANN contracts and those without contracts. It is in addition to GNSO's structure of constituencies and working groups.**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The two-house structure is effective	15	42	29	39	24	3	152
The balance of votes between the Houses is correct	16	37	29	33	34	3	152
	answered question						152
	skipped question						98

**14. Are you involved with the GNSO Council? [Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, I am a member or close observer of the GNSO Council	52.7%	79
No, I'm not involved with this group	47.3%	71
	answered question 150	
	skipped question 100	

**15. GNSO Council participation:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
Participants are engaged in the work of the GNSO Council	16	49	7	2	1	1	76
GNSO Council contains sufficient technical expertise	11	49	11	1	3	1	76
GNSO Council is effective in encouraging new participants to	6	14	36	13	6	1	76
GNSO Council encourages participation from all geographic	11	32	18	6	6	3	76
	answered question						76
	skipped question						174

<b>16. GNSO Council resources:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
GNSO Council has sufficient human resources from ICANN staff	15	44	6	2	8	1	76
GNSO Council has sufficient travel support	10	42	10	2	11	1	76
<i>answered question skipped question</i>							<b>76</b>
							<b>174</b>

<b>17. GNSO Council meetings:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
GNSO Council is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda	13	46	12	2	2	1	76
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	12	42	9	0	12	1	76
GNSO Council uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and	11	49	6	1	8	1	76
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	20	42	6	1	6	1	76
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	11	40	8	1	15	1	76
<i>answered question skipped question</i>							<b>76</b>
							<b>174</b>

<b>18. GNSO Council planning:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
GNSO Council plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its	6	33	20	2	14	1	76
GNSO Council's planned objectives align with the planned	8	32	15	1	18	2	76
GNSO Council applies appropriate metrics to determine the	5	19	36	5	9	2	76
GNSO Council manages workload issues effectively	6	29	21	4	14	2	76
<i>answered question skipped question</i>							<b>76</b>
							<b>174</b>

**19. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Commercial Stakeholder Group?**

[Answering No skips the detailed questions about it] Do not answer yes if you are involved in a constituency but not the group; we will ask about the constituencies separately.

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	30.6%	44
No	69.4%	100
<i>answered question skipped question</i>		
<b>144</b>		
<b>106</b>		

<b>20. Commercial Stakeholder Group's outputs:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group's outputs have produced desired outcomes	4	16	8	5	5	5	43
The Group's outputs are complete and thorough	5	18	8	2	5	5	43
The Group's policy recommendations are timely	5	19	9	2	3	5	43
						<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>43</b>
							<b>207</b>

<b>21. The Executive Committee of the Commercial Stakeholder Group is balanced and appropriately representative:</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Strongly agree	16.3%	7	
Agree	27.9%	12	
Disagree	14.0%	6	
Strongly disagree	11.6%	5	
No opinion	23.3%	10	
Not applicable	7.0%	3	
			<i>answered question skipped question</i>
			<b>43</b>
			<b>207</b>

<b>22. Commercial Stakeholder Group participation:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Participants are engaged in the work of the Group	5	23	5	1	5	4	43
The Group contains sufficient technical expertise	6	15	11	1	6	4	43
The Group is effective in encouraging new participants to become	5	10	15	3	6	4	43
The Group encourages participation from all geographic regions	4	20	8	3	4	4	43
						<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>43</b>
							<b>207</b>

<b>23. Commercial Stakeholder Group resources:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group has sufficient human resources support from ICANN	4	7	14	7	9	2	43
The Group has sufficient travel support	5	7	12	5	11	3	43
						<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>43</b>
							<b>207</b>



<b>24. Commercial Stakeholder Group communications:</b>							<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group communicates in plain language	4	20	8	0	8	3	43
The Group uses community feedback to improve its effectiveness	2	16	9	1	12	3	43
The Group is effective in coordinating its work with other parts of	4	19	7	2	8	3	43
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>43</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>207</b>

<b>25. Commercial Stakeholder Group meetings:</b>							<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda items	4	18	7	0	11	3	43
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	5	10	9	1	14	4	43
The Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and wikis)	5	12	12	0	11	3	43
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	4	9	8	1	16	5	43
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	4	15	9	0	12	3	43
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>43</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>207</b>

<b>26. Commercial Stakeholder Group planning:</b>							<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its	3	15	9	0	12	4	43
The Group's planned objectives align with the planned objectives	4	15	5	1	12	6	43
The Group applies appropriate metrics to determine the impact of	2	7	10	2	17	5	43
The Group manages workload issues effectively	2	16	10	0	11	4	43
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>43</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>207</b>

<b>27. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Commercial Business Users Constituency?[Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	19.1%	27
No	80.9%	114
		<b>answered question</b>
		<b>141</b>
		<b>skipped question</b>
		<b>109</b>

**28. Commercial Business Users Constituency's outputs:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency's outputs have produced desired outcomes	10	9	4	1	3	1	28
The Constituency's outputs are complete and thorough	11	9	3	1	3	1	28
The Constituency's policy recommendations are timely	9	10	3	1	4	1	28
	<i>answered question</i>						28
	<i>skipped question</i>						222

**29. The Executive Committee of the Commercial Business Users Constituency is balanced and appropriately representative:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	17.9%	5
Agree	32.1%	9
Disagree	25.0%	7
Strongly disagree	10.7%	3
No opinion	10.7%	3
Not applicable	3.6%	1
	<i>answered question</i>	28
	<i>skipped question</i>	222

**30. Commercial Business Users Constituency participation:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
Participants are engaged in the work of the Constituency	9	11	2	0	5	1	28
The Constituency contains sufficient technical expertise	7	9	4	1	5	2	28
The Constituency is effective in encouraging new participants to	7	7	7	2	4	1	28
The Constituency encourages participation from all geographic	7	8	3	6	3	1	28
	<i>answered question</i>						28
	<i>skipped question</i>						222

**31. Commercial Business Users Constituency resources:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency has sufficient human resources support from	4	5	10	2	6	1	28
The Constituency has sufficient travel support	6	7	5	1	8	1	28
	<i>answered question</i>						28
	<i>skipped question</i>						222

32. Commercial Business Users Constituency communications:							Response Count
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency communicates in plain language	5	12	4	2	4	1	28
The Constituency uses community feedback to improve its work	5	9	5	2	6	1	28
The Constituency is effective in coordinating its work with other constituencies	6	12	3	2	4	1	28
					<i>answered question skipped question</i>		<b>28</b> <b>222</b>

33. Commercial Business Users Constituency meetings:							Response Count
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda	7	10	5	0	5	1	28
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and frequency	8	7	6	0	6	1	28
The Constituency uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and social media)	8	9	3	2	5	1	28
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	6	10	1	2	6	3	28
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	6	11	3	0	6	2	28
					<i>answered question skipped question</i>		<b>28</b> <b>222</b>

34. Commercial Business Users Constituency planning:							Response Count
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its work	7	8	6	1	5	1	28
The Constituency's planned objectives align with the planned work	8	10	2	1	6	1	28
The Constituency applies appropriate metrics to determine the effectiveness of its work	6	7	7	2	5	1	28
The Constituency manages workload issues effectively	7	6	7	0	7	1	28
					<i>answered question skipped question</i>		<b>28</b> <b>222</b>

35. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Intellectual Property Constituency? [Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	22.7%	32
No	77.3%	109
	<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>141</b> <b>109</b>

**36. Intellectual Property Constituency's outputs:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency's outputs have produced desired outcomes	6	8	11	1	4	2	32
The Constituency's outputs are complete and thorough	11	11	2	4	3	1	32
The Constituency's policy recommendations are timely	8	14	4	2	3	1	32
						<i>answered question</i>	<b>32</b>
						<i>skipped question</i>	<b>218</b>

**37. The Executive Committee of the Intellectual Property Constituency is balanced and appropriately representative:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	21.9%	7
Agree	43.8%	14
Disagree	6.3%	2
Strongly disagree	15.6%	5
No opinion	9.4%	3
Not applicable	3.1%	1
		<i>answered question</i>
		<b>32</b>
		<i>skipped question</i>
		<b>218</b>

**38. Intellectual Property Constituency participation:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
Participants are engaged in the work of the Constituency	12	13	3	0	3	1	32
The Constituency contains sufficient technical expertise	7	11	7	2	3	2	32
The Constituency is effective in encouraging new participants to	4	8	14	3	2	1	32
The Constituency encourages participation from all geographic	6	14	3	4	4	1	32
						<i>answered question</i>	<b>32</b>
						<i>skipped question</i>	<b>218</b>

**39. Intellectual Property Constituency resources:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency has sufficient human resources support from	4	7	8	7	4	2	32
The Constituency has sufficient travel support	4	7	6	8	6	1	32
						<i>answered question</i>	<b>32</b>
						<i>skipped question</i>	<b>218</b>

40. Intellectual Property Constituency communications:							Response Count
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency communicates in plain language	10	11	4	2	4	1	32
The Constituency uses community feedback to improve its	7	14	2	3	4	2	32
The Constituency is effective in coordinating its work with other	11	13	2	2	3	1	32
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>32</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>218</b>

41. Intellectual Property Constituency meetings:							Response Count
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda	11	10	3	1	6	1	32
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	13	8	4	1	5	1	32
The Constituency uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and	11	10	3	1	6	1	32
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	4	14	5	3	4	2	32
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	7	14	3	2	5	1	32
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>32</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>218</b>

42. Intellectual Property Constituency planning:							Response Count
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency plans for the future and uses objectives to guide	9	10	4	1	6	2	32
The Constituency's planned objectives align with the planned	7	9	7	2	5	2	32
The Constituency applies appropriate metrics to determine the	4	6	7	2	9	4	32
The Constituency manages workload issues effectively	6	10	8	1	5	2	32
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>32</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>218</b>

43. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Internet Service Providers Constituency? [Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	12.1%	17
No	87.9%	123
		<b>answered question</b>
		<b>140</b>
		<b>skipped question</b>
		<b>110</b>

**44. Internet Service Providers Constituency's outputs:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency's outputs have produced desired outcomes	5	4	5	1	2	0	17
The Constituency's outputs are complete and thorough	6	3	5	1	2	0	17
The Constituency's policy recommendations are timely	6	4	4	1	2	0	17
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

**45. The Executive Committee of the Internet Service Providers Constituency is balanced and appropriately representative:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly agree	29.4%	5
Agree	23.5%	4
Disagree	17.6%	3
Strongly disagree	11.8%	2
No opinion	11.8%	2
Not applicable	5.9%	1
		<b>answered question</b>
		<b>17</b>
		<b>skipped question</b>
		<b>233</b>

**46. Internet Service Providers Constituency participation:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Participants are engaged in the work of the Constituency	5	6	2	1	2	1	17
The Constituency contains sufficient technical expertise	7	2	3	2	2	1	17
The Constituency is effective in encouraging new participants to	5	3	2	4	2	1	17
The Constituency encourages participation from all geographic	6	3	3	2	2	1	17
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

**47. Internet Service Providers Constituency resources:**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency has sufficient human resources support from	3	2	7	0	5	0	17
The Constituency has sufficient travel support	3	6	3	0	5	0	17
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

**48. Internet Service Providers Constituency communications:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency communicates in plain language	5	7	2	1	2	0	17
The Constituency uses community feedback to improve its	5	4	5	1	2	0	17
The Constituency is effective in coordinating its work with other	4	6	3	1	3	0	17
						<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>17</b> <b>233</b>

**49. Internet Service Providers Constituency meetings:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda	5	6	0	2	4	0	17
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	5	5	1	2	4	0	17
The Constituency uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and	5	4	2	2	4	0	17
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	5	4	2	2	4	0	17
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	5	5	1	1	5	0	17
						<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>17</b> <b>233</b>

**50. Internet Service Providers Constituency planning:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Constituency plans for the future and uses objectives to guide	4	6	3	1	3	0	17
The Constituency's planned objectives align with the planned	4	7	1	1	4	0	17
The Constituency applies appropriate metrics to determine the	4	5	1	2	3	2	17
The Constituency manages workload issues effectively	4	5	2	1	4	1	17
						<i>answered question skipped question</i>	<b>17</b> <b>233</b>

**51. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group?[Answering No skips the detailed questions about it] Do not answer Yes if you are involved in a constituency but not the group; we will ask about the constituencies separately.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	30.0%	42
No	70.0%	98
		<i>answered question skipped question</i>
		<b>140</b> <b>110</b>

**52. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group's outputs:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group's outputs have produced desired outcomes	5	18	10	5	4	0	42
The Group's outputs are complete and thorough	4	19	8	4	7	0	42
The Group's policy recommendations are timely	4	21	7	3	7	0	42
	<i>answered question</i>						42
	<i>skipped question</i>						208

**53. The Executive Committee of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is balanced and appropriately representative:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	19.0%	8
Agree	28.6%	12
Disagree	26.2%	11
Strongly disagree	14.3%	6
No opinion	11.9%	5
Not applicable	0.0%	0
	<i>answered question</i>	
	42	
	<i>skipped question</i>	
	208	

**54. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group participation:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
Participants are engaged in the work of the Group	9	19	9	2	3	0	42
The Group contains sufficient technical expertise	6	19	9	4	4	0	42
The Group is effective in encouraging new participants to become	7	10	12	8	5	0	42
The Group encourages participation from all geographic regions	14	12	10	4	2	0	42
	<i>answered question</i>						42
	<i>skipped question</i>						208

**55. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group resources:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group has sufficient human resources support from ICANN	4	7	14	7	9	1	42
The Group has sufficient travel support	4	6	17	4	11	0	42
	<i>answered question</i>						42
	<i>skipped question</i>						208



<b>56. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group communications:</b>							<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group communicates in plain language	7	17	9	4	5	0	42
The Group uses community feedback to improve its effectiveness	8	16	10	4	4	0	42
The Group is effective in coordinating its work with other parts of	4	13	12	4	9	0	42
	<b>answered question</b>						<b>42</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>						<b>208</b>

<b>57. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group meetings:</b>							<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda items	6	17	9	2	8	0	42
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	6	20	3	2	11	0	42
The Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and wikis)	5	18	8	2	9	0	42
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	9	14	4	1	14	0	42
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	4	15	6	2	15	0	42
	<b>answered question</b>						<b>42</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>						<b>208</b>

<b>58. Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group planning:</b>							<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its	5	17	7	5	8	0	42
The Group's planned objectives align with the planned objectives	5	16	10	5	6	0	42
The Group applies appropriate metrics to determine the impact of	3	8	9	8	12	2	42
The Group manages workload issues effectively	3	10	12	3	14	0	42
	<b>answered question</b>						<b>42</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>						<b>208</b>

<b>59. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Non-Commercial Users Constituency?[Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	20.9%	29
No	79.1%	110
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>139</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>111</b>

<b>60. Non-Commercial Users Constituency's outputs:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency's outputs have produced desired outcomes	4	6	6	6	5	0	27
The Constituency's outputs are complete and thorough	4	10	2	5	6	0	27
The Constituency's policy recommendations are timely	6	7	5	4	5	0	27
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>27</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>223</b>

<b>61. The Executive Committee of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency is balanced and appropriately representative:</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Strongly agree	25.9%	7	
Agree	25.9%	7	
Disagree	7.4%	2	
Strongly disagree	22.2%	6	
No opinion	14.8%	4	
Not applicable	3.7%	1	
			<b>answered question</b>
			<b>27</b>
			<b>skipped question</b>
			<b>223</b>

<b>62. Non-Commercial Users Constituency participation:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Participants are engaged in the work of the Constituency	5	12	3	5	2	0	27
The Constituency contains sufficient technical expertise	3	13	5	4	2	0	27
The Constituency is effective in encouraging new participants to	5	6	5	7	4	0	27
The Constituency encourages participation from all geographic	11	5	4	4	3	0	27
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>27</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>223</b>

<b>63. Non-Commercial Users Constituency resources:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency has sufficient human resources support from	2	3	11	3	8	0	27
The Constituency has sufficient travel support	2	6	6	3	10	0	27
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>27</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>223</b>

<b>64. Non-Commercial Users Constituency communications:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency communicates in plain language	3	14	3	3	4	0	27
The Constituency uses community feedback to improve its	5	7	5	4	6	0	27
The Constituency is effective in coordinating its work with other	2	6	10	3	6	0	27
<i>answered question</i>							<b>27</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>223</b>

<b>65. Non-Commercial Users Constituency meetings:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda	4	11	4	2	6	0	27
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	5	14	0	2	5	1	27
The Constituency uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and	4	11	5	2	5	0	27
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	4	12	2	2	7	0	27
Action Items and follow up work are well-managed	2	9	4	3	8	1	27
<i>answered question</i>							<b>27</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>223</b>

<b>66. Non-Commercial Users Constituency planning:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency plans for the future and uses objectives to guide	4	8	5	4	6	0	27
The Constituency's planned objectives align with the planned	2	9	3	5	8	0	27
The Constituency applies appropriate metrics to determine the	1	8	3	5	10	0	27
The Constituency manages workload issues effectively	1	9	3	4	10	0	27
<i>answered question</i>							<b>27</b>
<i>skipped question</i>							<b>223</b>

<b>67. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency? [Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	12.4%	17
No	87.6%	120
<i>answered question</i>		<b>137</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>113</b>

<b>68. Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency's outputs:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency's outputs have produced desired outcomes	3	4	3	2	5	0	17
The Constituency's outputs are complete and thorough	2	3	4	3	5	0	17
The Constituency's policy recommendations are timely	4	3	3	2	5	0	17
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

<b>69. The Executive Committee of the Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency is balanced and appropriately representative:</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly agree	5.9%	1	1
Agree	41.2%	7	7
Disagree	11.8%	2	2
Strongly disagree	5.9%	1	1
No opinion	29.4%	5	5
Not applicable	5.9%	1	1
		<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
		<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

<b>70. Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency participation:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Participants are engaged in the work of the Constituency	2	6	4	2	2	1	17
The Constituency contains sufficient technical expertise	3	6	1	2	4	1	17
The Constituency is effective in encouraging new participants to	1	5	5	2	3	1	17
The Constituency encourages participation from all geographic	2	8	3	1	2	1	17
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

<b>71. Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency resources:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency has sufficient human resources support from	3	4	4	2	4	0	17
The Constituency has sufficient travel support	3	2	6	1	5	0	17
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>17</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>233</b>

<b>72. Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency communications:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency communicates in plain language	2	10	1	1	3	0	17
The Constituency uses community feedback to improve its	2	7	2	2	4	0	17
The Constituency is effective in coordinating its work with other	2	7	4	0	4	0	17
<b>answered question</b>							<b>17</b>
<b>skipped question</b>							<b>233</b>

<b>73. Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Constituency meetings:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda	1	9	1	1	5	0	17
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	1	8	3	0	5	0	17
The Constituency uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and	2	9	0	2	4	0	17
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	1	10	1	1	4	0	17
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	1	8	3	1	4	0	17
<b>answered question</b>							<b>17</b>
<b>skipped question</b>							<b>233</b>

<b>74. Not-for-profit Operational Concerns Users Constituency planning:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Constituency plans for the future and uses objectives to guide	3	8	0	1	5	0	17
The Constituency's planned objectives align with the planned	2	9	1	1	4	0	17
The Constituency applies appropriate metrics to determine the	2	4	2	1	7	1	17
The Constituency manages workload issues effectively	2	4	4	1	6	0	17
<b>answered question</b>							<b>17</b>
<b>skipped question</b>							<b>233</b>

<b>75. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Registrars Stakeholder Group? [Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	8.8%	12	137
No	91.2%	125	113
<b>answered question</b>			<b>137</b>
<b>skipped question</b>			<b>113</b>

<b>76. Registrars Stakeholder Group's outputs:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group's outputs have produced desired outcomes	4	5	2	0	1	0	12
The Group's outputs are complete and thorough	3	7	1	0	1	0	12
The Group's policy recommendations are timely	3	7	1	0	1	0	12
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>12</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>238</b>

<b>77. The Executive Committee of the Registrars Stakeholder Group is balanced and appropriately representative:</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Strongly agree	33.3%	4	12
Agree	41.7%	5	238
Disagree	8.3%	1	
Strongly disagree	8.3%	1	
No opinion	8.3%	1	
Not applicable	0.0%	0	
			<b>answered question</b>
			<b>skipped question</b>

<b>78. Registrars Stakeholder Group participation:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Participants are engaged in the work of the Group	2	8	1	0	1	0	12
The Group contains sufficient technical expertise	4	8	0	0	0	0	12
The Group is effective in encouraging new participants to become	2	6	1	1	2	0	12
The Group encourages participation from all geographic regions	4	5	1	1	1	0	12
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>12</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>238</b>

<b>79. Registrars Stakeholder Group resources:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group has sufficient human resources support from ICANN	2	3	1	0	6	0	12
The Group has sufficient travel support	2	5	0	0	5	0	12
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>12</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>238</b>

80. Registrars Stakeholder Group communications:							
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group communicates in plain language	4	8	0	0	0	0	12
The Group uses community feedback to improve its effectiveness	3	5	3	0	1	0	12
The Group is effective in coordinating its work with other parts of	1	8	1	0	2	0	12
<i>answered question</i>							12
<i>skipped question</i>							238

81. Registrars Stakeholder Group meetings:							
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda items	4	3	1	0	4	0	12
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	4	3	1	0	4	0	12
The Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and wikis)	5	4	0	0	3	0	12
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	5	3	1	0	3	0	12
Action items and follow up work are well-managed	4	4	0	0	4	0	12
<i>answered question</i>							12
<i>skipped question</i>							238

82. Registrars Stakeholder Group planning:							
Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its	2	7	1	0	2	0	12
The Group's planned objectives align with the planned objectives	4	4	3	0	1	0	12
The Group applies appropriate metrics to determine the impact of	3	3	3	0	3	0	12
The Group manages workload issues effectively	1	7	0	0	4	0	12
<i>answered question</i>							12
<i>skipped question</i>							238

83. Are you involved with, or a close observer of, the Registries Stakeholder Group?[Answering No skips the detailed questions about it]			
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count	Response
Yes	16.8%	23	137
No	83.2%	114	113
<i>answered question</i>			137
<i>skipped question</i>			113

**84. Registries Stakeholder Group's outputs:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group's outputs have produced desired outcomes	8	9	3	1	2	0	23
The Group's outputs are complete and thorough	7	11	2	0	3	0	23
The Group's policy recommendations are timely	6	13	1	0	3	0	23
	<i>answered question</i>						<b>23</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>						<b>227</b>

**85. The Executive Committee of the Registries Stakeholder Group is balanced and appropriately representative:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	13.0%	3
Agree	43.5%	10
Disagree	21.7%	5
Strongly disagree	8.7%	2
No opinion	8.7%	2
Not applicable	4.3%	1
	<i>answered question</i>	
	<b>23</b>	
	<i>skipped question</i>	
	<b>227</b>	

**86. Registries Stakeholder Group participation:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
Participants are engaged in the work of the Group	9	10	2	0	2	0	23
The Group contains sufficient technical expertise	8	12	1	0	2	0	23
The Group is effective in encouraging new participants to become	4	13	2	2	2	0	23
The Group encourages participation from all geographic regions	3	9	5	2	3	1	23
	<i>answered question</i>						<b>23</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>						<b>227</b>

**87. Registries Stakeholder Group resources:**

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Not applicable	Response Count
The Group has sufficient human resources support from ICANN	3	8	7	1	4	0	23
The Group has sufficient travel support	2	9	5	0	7	0	23
	<i>answered question</i>						<b>23</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>						<b>227</b>



<b>88. Registries Stakeholder Group communications:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group communicates in plain language	3	16	2	0	2	0	23
The Group uses community feedback to improve its effectiveness	5	10	2	1	4	1	23
The Group is effective in coordinating its work with other parts of	5	12	2	1	3	0	23
					<b>answered question skipped question</b>		<b>23</b>
							<b>227</b>

<b>89. Registries Stakeholder Group meetings:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group is effective in planning and prioritizing its agenda items	8	9	2	1	3	0	23
Meetings and conference calls are the appropriate length and	5	11	2	2	3	0	23
The Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and wikis)	4	11	3	1	4	0	23
Minutes or transcripts are published in a timely manner	6	14	0	0	3	0	23
Action Items and follow up work are well-managed	3	15	2	0	3	0	23
					<b>answered question skipped question</b>		<b>23</b>
							<b>227</b>

<b>90. Registries Stakeholder Group planning:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
The Group plans for the future and uses objectives to guide its	6	10	4	0	2	1	23
The Group's planned objectives align with the planned objectives	5	7	6	0	4	1	23
The Group applies appropriate metrics to determine the impact of	3	6	7	0	6	1	23
The Group manages workload issues effectively	4	12	4	0	3	0	23
					<b>answered question skipped question</b>		<b>23</b>
							<b>227</b>

### GNSO Review Working Group Supplementary 360 Assessment

**1. Westlake will maintain your confidentiality. We will not identify you in material we quote or share with the GNSO and staff unless you grant us specific permission by ticking the box below.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I consent to being identified by name as the author of my feedback	100.0%	40
<b>answered question</b>		<b>40</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>10</b>

**2. Your name and contact address:**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Name:	100.0%	30
Email Address:	100.0%	30
<b>answered question</b>		<b>30</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>20</b>

**3. Please give your affiliation (i.e. a company or non-profit group that you are member of that is relevant to your interest in the Working Group), if any:**

Answer Options	Response Count
	30
<b>answered question</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>skipped question</b>	<b>20</b>

**4. Which GNSO Working Group are you commenting on in this survey? NOTE: If you wish to provide feedback on more than one Working Group, please complete this brief survey once for each Working Group you are providing feedback on.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Completed (2012-2014) Non-PDP Joint DNS Security and Stability	6.7%	2
Completed (2011-2013) Non-PDP Fake Renewal Notices Drafting	0.0%	0
Completed (2011-2013) Non-PDP Study Group on Use of Names	0.0%	0
Completed (2011-2013) Non-PDP WHOIS Survey Requirements	0.0%	0
Completed (2008-2013) PDP Post Expiration Domain Name	0.0%	0
Completed (2012-2012) Non-PDP: Uniformity of Contracts to	0.0%	0
Completed (2011-2012) Non-PDP: Protection of Red Cross/IOC	6.7%	2
Completed (2011-2012) Non PDP: Consumer Trust	3.3%	1
Completed (2008-2012) Non-PDP: GNSO Improvements	3.3%	1
Completed (2009-2012) Non-PDP: SSAC GNSO IRD	0.0%	0
Completed (2010-2011) Non-PDP: Joint SO/AC on New gTLD	3.3%	1
Completed (2010-2011) Non-PDP: Recommendation 6	0.0%	0
Completed (2009-2011) Non-PDP: Registration Abuse Policies	3.3%	1
Completed (2008-2011) PDP: Fast Flux	3.3%	1
Completed (2009-2010) Non-PDP: Affirmation of Commitments	0.0%	0
Completed (2009-2010) Non-PDP: Special Trademark Issues	0.0%	0
Completed (2009-2010) PDP: Vertical Integration	6.7%	2
Completed (2008-2009) PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy	6.7%	2
Completed (2009-2009) Non-PDP: Trademark Protections –	3.3%	1
Active PDP: IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection	0.0%	0
Active PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy-B	3.3%	1
Active PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy-C	3.3%	1
Active PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy-D	3.3%	1
Active PDP: gTLD Registration Data Services	0.0%	0
Active PDP: Locking of a Domain Name	3.3%	1
Active PDP: Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs	6.7%	2
Active PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues	10.0%	3
Active PDP: 'Thick' Whois	0.0%	0
Active PDP: Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information	6.7%	2
Other (please specify)	16.7%	5
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>5. Working Group participation:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
This Working Group welcomes and includes all interested	10	11	1	3	0	1	26
This Working Group has an appropriate balance of views and	7	11	4	3	0	1	26
This Working Group has informed and constructive discussions	9	11	1	3	1	1	26
This Working Group achieves consensus	8	11	2	3	1	1	26
The volunteer workload for this Working Group is reasonable and	6	10	4	3	2	1	26
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>26</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>24</b>

<b>6. Working Group support:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
This Working Group has sufficient secretariat staff support	11	9	2	1	2	1	26
This Working Group has sufficient technical staff support	9	6	2	2	6	1	26
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>26</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>24</b>

<b>7. Working Group meetings:</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
This Working Group is well chaired	13	7	2	1	1	2	26
This Working Group is effective in planning and prioritising its	7	13	3	1	1	1	26
This Working Group's meetings and conference calls are of	8	11	4	0	2	1	26
This Working Group uses technology effectively (e.g. email lists and	7	12	3	0	3	1	26
This Working Group's documentation, transcripts, and recordings	9	11	3	0	2	1	26
This Working Group's Action Items and follow up work are well-	6	11	4	2	2	1	26
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>26</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>24</b>

<b>8. Policy Development Process (PDP): (If the Working Group has no PDP or has not completed its PDP, please mark "Not Applicable" as your response to the relevant statements)</b>							
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
This Working Group's Charter provides adequate guidance for the	5	10	4	1	2	4	26
This Working Group's reports are thorough in addressing the	9	7	2	0	3	5	26
This Working Group incorporates community feedback well	9	5	3	2	1	6	26
This Working Group's outputs are delivered in a timely manner	2	11	4	1	3	5	26
This Working Group's final report addresses and reflects	8	4	1	1	3	9	26
						<b>answered question</b>	<b>26</b>
						<b>skipped question</b>	<b>24</b>

### Appendix 3: Interviewees

	Name	Affiliation
1.	Alan Greenberg	ALAC
2.	Avri Doria	NCSG
3.	Bill Drake	NCUC
4.	Bill Graham	GNSO Board nominee
5.	Chris LaHatte (twice)	ICANN Ombudsman
6.	Chuck Gomes	RySG
7.	Danny McPherson	RySG
8.	David Cake	GNSO Council
9.	Debra Hughes	Former GNSO Council
10.	Denise Michel	ICANN staff
11.	Elisa Cooper/Steve DelBianco	CBUC
12.	Evan Liebovitch	ALAC
13.	Jen Wolfe	GNSO Council
14.	Jonathan Robinson	GNSO Council Chair
15.	Klaus Stoll	NPOC
16.	Kristina Rosette	IPC
17.	Larisa Gurnick	ICANN staff
18.	Marika Konings	ICANN staff
19.	Marilyn Cade	CBUC
20.	Mary Wong	ICANN staff
21.	Matt Ashtiani	ICANN staff
22.	Naresh Ajwani	ASO
23.	Nick Ashton-Hart	Former ICANN staff
24.	Oswaldo Novoa	ISPC
25.	Pam Little	Former ICANN staff
26.	Patrick Myles	GNSO Council (ccNSO liaison)
27.	Patrik Fältström	SSAC
28.	Philip Sheppard/Martin Sutton	BRG
29.	Rafik Dammak	NCSG Chair
30.	Ray Plzak	Board / ASO
31.	Roberto Gaetano	Former ICANN Board, ALAC

32.	Ron Andruff	CBUC
33.	Rudi Vansnick	NPOC
34.	Sébastien Bachollet	Formerly ICANN Board, former CBUC
35.	Thomas Rickert	GNSO Council
36.	Wendy Seltzer	Formerly GNSO Council, ALAC
37-40.	(Anonymous x 4)	Four individuals asked specifically not to be identified

## **Appendix 4: Recommendations from prior reviews**

Attachment 1 - Patrick Sharry Review Recommendations (pages 155-157)

Attachment 2 - Council Self-Review Recommendations (pages 158-159)

Attachment 3 - LSE Recommendations (pages 160-161)

Attachment 4 - Summary of ATRT2 Review 2013 (pages 162-173)

## Attachment 1 - Patrick Sharry Review Recommendations

- Sharry Rec 1. The Council has made a significant contribution to other ICANN core values such as outreach, bottom-up consensus based policy development, geographical diversity and transparency. It has endeavoured to make good use of the ICANN meetings to conduct outreach activities with other ICANN organizations and with the broader internet community. The Council should plan to expand and enhance these activities
- Sharry Rec 2. The appointment of liaisons is a good step in building links with other parts of the ICANN structure. Again consideration needs to be given to the best way that these liaisons can be used to raise awareness of Council issues. The crafting of a “role description” or “partnership agreement” may assist with setting clear expectations and maximizing outcomes.
- Sharry Rec 3. While it is healthy that the Council has representation from four of the ICANN regions, the Council should develop a plan for increasing representation so that all regions are covered.
- Sharry Rec 4. Furthermore, consideration needs to be given to ways in which people from non-English speaking backgrounds can participate more actively in Council. This may involve making greater use of face-to-face time at ICANN meetings (where communication is easier) in addition to telephone conferences. The availability of translations of key documents would also assist, but this would need careful consideration as it could easily become a very expensive exercise.
- Sharry Rec 5. The Council should seek approval from the Board for a revised policy Development Process. The alternative process should have the following elements:
- Scoping phase (history of the issue, key questions, contractual issues, terms of reference, timelines, milestones including deliverables and check points for legal opinion) which should be done as quickly as feasible, probably within the timeframe of the current issues report
  - Policy work (including research, consultation with constituencies, periods for public comment) with timelines set in the scoping phase according to the complexity of the task
  - Regular reporting to Council on milestones as established in the scoping phase
  - A final report and public comment period as in the current PDP



- A Council vote as in the current PDP

Sharry Rec 6. The Council should develop a formal process for seeking input from other ICANN organizations for each of the policies it is developing.

Sharry Rec 7. In addition to these changes, the Council should consider other measures to speed up the consensus process, including the greater use of time at ICANN meetings to discuss issues face to face, and possibly the use of facilitators to move more quickly to understanding of issues and building of consensus.

Sharry Rec 8. ICANN should move to put in place a high calibre staff policy support person at the earliest possible opportunity.

Sharry Rec 9. The Chair of the GNSO Council and VP Supporting Organizations should oversee an effective handover from the current staff support person to ensure that lessons learnt over the past year are not lost

Sharry Rec 10. The Chair of the GNSO Council and the VP Supporting Organizations should establish a service level agreement between the GNSO Council and ICANN management that specifies the amount and type of support that is to be provided. Where possible, this should include measures (eg turnaround times for legal opinion, delivery of reports by agreed dates, minutes posted within a certain number of days) The Chair should consult the Council to ensure the targets meet the needs of the Council and its taskforces. The VP Supporting Organizations and Chair of GNSO Council should meet quarterly to review performance measures and report these to the President.

Sharry Rec 11. The Council should work with the ICANN General Counsel to establish clear communication channels for the request for and provision of legal opinion. At a minimum this should include detailed legal input at the scoping phase of each PDP. Wherever possible, “check points” for further legal input should be established as part of the scoping study.

Sharry Rec 12. The Council needs to ensure the viability of implementation of each of the policy recommendations that it makes to the Board

Sharry Rec 13. ICANN needs to put in place a compliance function to monitor compliance with policies.

Sharry Rec 14. The Council needs to work with ICANN operational staff to develop a compliance policy with graded penalties

- Sharry Rec 15. Council needs to have a built in review of the effectiveness of policies in the policy recommendations that it makes to the Board
- Sharry Rec 16. The GNSO Council should utilize the Ombudsman and any reports produced by the Ombudsman as source of systematic analysis of complaints and therefore of issues that may need to be addressed through the PDP.
- Sharry Rec 17. The Council should continue to explore ways in which the Nominating Committee members can add value to the Council process.
- Sharry Rec 18. The Council should draft “role descriptions” for the Nominating Committee which describe the skills, expertise (especially technical expertise) and attributes that are needed for the Nominating Committee members to be optimally effective members of the Council.
- Sharry Rec 19. The Council is working well with three representatives from each constituency. No one who is involved with the Council perceives that having three representatives hinders the workings of the Council. The Board should change the bylaws to put in place three representatives from each constituency
- Sharry Rec 20. The GNSO Council should overhaul the website so that it better meets the needs of all who are interested in the work of the GNSO.

## Attachment 2 - Council Self-Review Recommendations

### Required changes to ICANN bylaws

#### Recommendations:

1. Maintain the present 3 representatives per constituency
2. Adjust the bylaws to specify that the timelines in the policy development process are guidelines, and allow the GNSO Council to set and revise timelines according to the level of consensus on a particular issue and the amount of volunteer and staff resources available for the specific issue.

### Additional ICANN staff resources required

#### Recommendations:

1. Prior to the commencement of policy development on a particular issue, ensure that ICANN staff provide an analysis and Issues Paper that provides sufficient background and information to support the development of the Terms of Reference and statement of work for a Task Force. The issue report should indicate how the issue is currently handled within the existing contractual and policy framework. In some instances, it may be necessary for Council to agree to commission an independent expert to analyse an issue (which may include interviewing affected parties within the GNSO) and propose options for policy recommendations that may address the issue.
2. During the public comment process on a proposed policy recommendation, an independent expert may need to be commissioned to produce a report on the views of the GNSO community in relation to a proposed policy recommendation.
3. Provide staff support to the task forces and GNSO Council sub-committees that are skilled in creating reports that reflect the input provided by members of Council, and clearly identify where the areas of disagreement exist.
4. Provide staff support to the Task Forces and to the GNSO Council subcommittees that familiarize themselves with the bylaws and the policy development processes, as well as the relevant previous work of the Council.
5. Ensure that legal counsel is available for all GNSO Council calls, and ensure that legal counsel is available to task forces and subcommittees as required. With respect to policy development activity, ensure that the legal counsel is fully briefed on the existing contractual arrangements with registries and registrars that relate to the particular issue under discussion.
6. Prior to the development of a final policy recommendation for the GNSO Council, ICANN staff should ensure that the recommendation has been reviewed by legal counsel to

ensure that the recommendation can be implemented and enforced via the relevant contracts.

7. Establish a project management process within ICANN that defines a plan and expected dates for implementation of a policy once it is approved by the ICANN Board
8. Ensure that the mechanisms are established for monitoring and enforcing compliance with the new policy. This is particularly important in the first 6 months of a new policy, when registry and registrars systems are being modified to support a new policy.
9. ICANN staff develop a complaints handling process that is capable of logging complaints regarding gTLD domain name registration practices, and capable of producing data on a trend basis. This data reporting would be useful on a monthly basis

#### Actions required by the GNSO Council

##### Recommendations

1. During the early public comment process, encourage members of the ICANN community to submit proposals for solutions to a particular issue.
2. Given that legal contracts between ICANN and registries and registrars may be open to different interpretation by the contracted parties. Ensure that legal advice from ICANN legal counsel (or external counsel to ICANN) is in writing, and allow affected parties (such as registrars and registries) to submit their own written legal advice for consideration by the GNSO community.
3. Ensure that the policy is ready for implementation after approval by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board.
4. As part of the Council report at the end of the policy development process, establish key metrics for measuring the success of the policy, and ensure that appropriate measurement and reporting systems are put in place.
5. To the extent that the lack of intermediate sanctions for non-compliance with contractual obligations presents a significant impediment to compliance activities, the GNSO should, without prejudice to efforts to enforce existing contractual obligations, develop recommendations for a system of graduated or intermediate sanctions for incorporation in revised contracts. As an initial step, ICANN legal counsel should brief GNSO Council (or a relevant subgroup/task force) on ICANN's current plans to correct ongoing harm and provide greater flexibility and legitimacy for the compliance function.

### Attachment 3 - LSE Recommendations

- LSE Rec 1. Establish a centralized register of all GNSO stakeholders, including all members of constituencies and task forces
- LSE Rec 2. Indicate how many members participate in development of each constituency's policy positions.
- LSE Rec 3. Increase staff support to improve coherence and standardization across constituencies
- LSE Rec 4. Appoint a GNSO Constituency Support Officer to help constituencies develop their operations, websites and outreach activity
- LSE Rec 5. Increase balanced representation and active participation in constituencies proportional to global distributions
- LSE Rec 6. Change GNSO participation from constituency-based to direct stakeholder participation.
- LSE Rec 7. Improve the GNSO website and monitor traffic to understand better the external audience
- LSE Rec 8. Improve GNSO document management and make policy development work more accessible
- LSE Rec 9. Develop and publish annually a two-year GNSO Policy Development Plan that dovetails with ICANN's budget and strategic planning.
- LSE Rec 10. Provide (information-based) incentives to encourage stakeholder organisations to participate.
- LSE Rec 11. Make the GNSO Chair role more visible and important.
- LSE Rec 12. Strengthen GNSO conflict of interest policies, such as by permitting no-confidence votes in Councilors
- LSE Rec 13. Establish term limits for GNSO Councilors
- LSE Rec 14. Increase use of project-management methodologies in PDP work
- LSE Rec 15. Rely on more F2F meetings for the GNSO Council
- LSE Rec 16. Provide travel funding for GNSO Councilors to attend Council meetings.

- LSE Rec 17. Make greater use of task forces (described in Annex A of the Bylaws on GNSO Policy-Development Process).
- LSE Rec 18. Create a category of “Associate Stakeholder” to establish a pool of available external expertise.
- LSE Rec 19. Simplify the GNSO constituency structure in order to respond to rapid changes in the Internet, including by substituting 3 larger constituency groups representing Registration interests, Business and Civil Society.
- LSE Rec 20. Reduce the size of the GNSO Council (which can result from restructuring the constituency groupings).
- LSE Rec 21. Increase the threshold for establishing consensus to 75% and abolish weighted voting
- LSE Rec 22. Change the GNSO’s election of two Board members to use a Supplementary Vote system (in which Councilors vote for 2 candidates at the same time).
- LSE Rec 23. Reduce the amount of prescriptive provisions in the Bylaws about GNSO operations and instead develop GNSO Rules of Procedure.
- LSE Rec 24. Assess periodically the influence of the GNSO’s policy development work, e.g., once every five years

## Attachment 4 - SUMMARY of ATRT2 REVIEW 2013

### Background

The Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) provides for periodic reviews of four key ICANN objectives:

1. Commitment to accountability & transparency
2. DNS security and stability
3. Promoting competition and consumer trust & choice and
4. WHOIS policy.

Three reviews were set up to address objectives 1, 2, and 4 above. Accountability and Transparency Review Team 1 (ATRT1) was set up to address the first objective and was completed in 2010. This review includes:

- the governance and performance of the Board,
- the role and effectiveness of the Governmental Advisory Committee,
- public Input and public policy processes, and
- review mechanisms for Board decisions.

All ATRT1 recommendations were accepted by the ICANN Board and directed to be implemented.

ATRT2 was initiated in 2013. Two of its tasks were:

- to assess ICANN's implementation of Recommendations of previous three AOC reviews including ATRT1 and
- to offer new Recommendations to the ICANN Board to further improve ICANN's accountability and transparency.

In conducting its review, ATRT2 has sought input from various stakeholders and the community, and also engaged an Independent Expert, InterConnect Communications (ICC), to provide analysis and recommendations concerning the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Policy Development Process (PDP).

The Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directed to proceed with implementation.

ATRT2 provides **eleven** recommendations relating to Accountability and Transparency. Of these, Recommendations No 1 to No 9 arose out of reviewing implementation of ATRT1 recommendations.

Recommendation 10 and Recommendation No 12 are new. The former specifically relates to the PDP process and the latter relates to Financial Accountability and Transparency.

The first ten recommendations are listed below together with some explanation (the eleventh one – Recommendation No 12 has not been included in this write up). The most relevant recommendation is ATRT2 Recommendation No 10 as it specifically relates to GNSO. All other recommendations directly and indirectly affect GNSO, but some are more relevant than others.

#### ATRT2 Recommendation No 10 – Cross Community Deliberations

1. The Board should improve the effectiveness of cross-community deliberations.
  - 1.1 To enhance GNSO policy development processes and methodologies to better meet community needs and be more suitable for addressing complex problems, ICANN should:
    - a. In line with ongoing discussions within the GNSO, the Board should develop funded options for professional services to assist GNSO policy development WGs. Such services could include training to enhance work group leaders' and participants' ability to address difficult problems and situations, professional facilitation, mediation, negotiation. The GNSO should develop guidelines for when such options may be invoked.
    - b. The Board should provide adequate funding for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, wiki and teleconferences for GNSO policy development processes. Such face-to-face meeting must also accommodate remote participation, and consideration should also be given to using regional ICANN facilities (regional hubs and engagement centers) to support intersessional meetings. Moreover, the possibility of meetings added on to the start or end of ICANN meetings could also be considered. The GNSO must develop guidelines for when such meetings are required and justified, and who should participate in such meetings.
    - c. The Board should work with the GNSO and the wider ICANN community to develop methodologies and tools to allow the GNSO policy development processes to utilize volunteer time more effectively, increasing the ability to attract busy community participants into the process and also resulting in quicker policy development.



- 1.2 The GAC, in conjunction with the GNSO, must develop methodologies to ensure that GAC and government input is provided to ICANN policy development processes and that the GAC has effective opportunities to provide input and guidance on draft policy development outcomes. Such opportunities could be entirely new mechanisms or utilization of those already used by other stakeholders in the ICANN environment. Such interactions should encourage information exchanges and sharing of ideas/opinions, both in face-to-face meetings and intersessionally, and should institutionalize the cross-community deliberations foreseen by the AoC.
- 1.3 The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need for ensuring more global participation in GNSO policy development processes, as well as other GNSO processes. The focus should be on the viability and methodology of having the opportunity for equitable, substantive and robust participation from and representing:
- a. All ICANN communities with an interest in gTLD policy and in particular, those represented within the GNSO;
  - b. Under-represented geographical regions;
  - c. Non-English speaking linguistic groups;
  - d. Those with non-Western cultural traditions; and
  - e. Those with a vital interest in gTLD policy issues but who lack the financial support of industry players.
- 1.4 To improve the transparency and predictability of the policy development process the Board should clearly state to what degree it believes that it may establish gTLD policy (not referring to Temporary Policies established on an emergency basis to address security or stability issues, a right that the Board has under ICANN agreements with contracted parties) in the event that the GNSO cannot come to closure on a specific issue, in a specified time-frame if applicable, and to the extent that it may do so, the process for establishing such gTLD policies. This statement should also note under what conditions the Board believes it may alter GNSO Policy Recommendations, either before or after formal Board acceptance.
- 1.5 The Board must facilitate the equitable participation in applicable ICANN activities, of those ICANN stakeholders who lack the financial support of industry players.

## **Findings from ATRT2**

“There appears to be a growing sense that professional facilitation of PDPs would contribute to the proper addressing of complicated policy issues. Although such support will incur costs, many stakeholders have expressed doubt that the more difficult and contentious problems will be satisfactorily addressed without such support. That would result in either poor policy or a situation where the ICANN Board must intervene and set policy itself. Even that, however, would be inadequate in cases where formal Consensus Policy – which can only be developed by the GNSO PDP – is required.

The current PDP WG model also presumes that virtually all of the work can be done via e-mail and conference calls. Experience within ICANN indicates that face-to-face meetings are extremely beneficial. Of course, this too will require increased budget support.

It is unclear how one provides the incentive to negotiate in good faith and make concessions when stakes are high. In the ICANN context, this has at times involved a Board-imposed deadline with the potential for indeterminate Board action if agreement cannot be reached. This has been effective in achieving an outcome at times, but it is less clear the outcomes achieved have been good ones. In some instances, the Board has given instructions regarding timeframes for which a PDP should provide guidance, and then altered that position before the deadline has past, significantly perturbing the PDP process. Such lack of certainty must be avoided. Similarly, the potential for Board action nullifying outcomes of a PDP is one of the issues that impact the viability of the PDP. If such intervention is viewed as possible or even likely, it impacts the need for good-faith negotiations and for participation in general.

As noted by many observers, the time and effort necessary to effectively participate in a PDP often is too great for many potential volunteers. As a result, many PDPs end up relying on the same handful of active participants. Even then, many of these workers believe that their time is not being well spent due to lack of organization, good methodologies, and effective leadership. While some report that this situation is improving due to the development of new processes that will be available to successive PDPs, it seems clear that more needs to be done.”

## **Public Comment on ATRT2 Recommendations**

In general there was strong support throughout the community for the recommendations:

- There was some concern with the term “facilitators,” and poor experiences with facilitators in other venues. Other methodologies may be of benefit.

- Strong support for wider and more balanced participation in the GNSO policy development processes.
- There was support in At-Large, NCSG and SSAC for generalizing the recommendation on support for those who do not have industry financial backing. The rationale is that many segments of the ICANN community have business activities in the ICANN-related ecosystem, and it is thus to their business and financial advantage to have employees and associates participate in ICANN activities. Those with a strong interest in ICANN, but who lack business-related funding opportunities, are at a distinct disadvantage, and this has the potential to negatively impact the ICANN multi-equal stakeholder model. ICANN currently funds travel costs for many (but not all) AC and SO members, for selected Regional At Large Organization (RALO) leaders, and more recently, for GNSO Constituency and Stakeholder Group leaders.
- Poor participation in policy development processes is not just the lack of participation noted by the independent expert report, but a lack of participation from within the communities that are well represented within ICANN and the GNSO. PDPs rely far too much on a very small and possibly shrinking group of volunteers.

#### **ATRT2 Recommendation No 1 - Board performance and work practices**

##### *Recommendation*

The board should develop objective measures for determining the quality of ICANN board members and the success of Board improvement efforts, and analyze those findings over time.

#### **ATRT2 Recommendation No 2 - Board performance and work practices**

##### *Recommendation*

The Board should develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of the Board's functioning and improvement efforts, and publish the materials used for training to gauge levels of improvement.

#### **ATRT2 Recommendation No 3- Board performance and work practices**

##### *Recommendation*

The Board should conduct qualitative/quantitative studies to determine how the qualifications of Board candidate pools change over time, and should regularly assess Director's compensation levels against prevailing standards.

#### **ATR2 Recommendation No 4 – Policy/Implementation/Executive Function Distinction**

*Recommendation*

The Board should continue supporting cross-community engagement aimed at developing an understanding of the distinction between policy development and policy implementation. Develop complementary mechanisms whereby the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/AC) can consult with the Board on matters, including but not limited to policy, implementation and administrative matters, on which the Board makes decisions.

**ATRT2 Recommendation No 5 - Decision making transparency and appeals processes***Recommendation*

The Board should review redaction standards for Board documents, Document Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) and any other ICANN documents to create a single published redaction policy. Institute a process to regularly evaluate redacted material to determine if redactions are still required and if not, ensure that redactions are removed.

**ATRT2 Recommendation No 6 - GAC operations and interactions***Recommendation*Increasing transparency of GAC-related activities

6.1. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI working group), to consider a number of actions to make its deliberations more transparent and better understood to the ICANN community. Where appropriate, ICANN should provide the necessary resources to facilitate the implementation of specific activities in this regard. Examples of activities that the GAC could consider to improve transparency and understanding include:

- a. Convening “GAC 101” or information sessions for the ICANN community, to provide greater insight into how individual GAC members prepare for ICANN meetings in national capitals, how the GAC agenda and work priorities are established, and how GAC members interact intersessionally and during GAC meetings to arrive at consensus GAC positions that ultimately are forwarded to the ICANN Board as advice;
- b. Publishing agendas for GAC meetings, conference calls, etc., on the GAC website seven days in advance of the meetings and publishing meeting minutes on the GAC website within seven days after each meeting or conference call;

- c. Updating and improving the GAC website to more accurately describe GAC activities, including intersessional activities, as well as publishing all relevant GAC transcripts, positions and correspondence;
  - d. Considering whether and how to open GAC conference calls to other stakeholders to observe and participate, as appropriate. This could possibly be accomplished through the participation of liaisons from other ACs and SOs to the GAC, once that mechanism has been agreed upon and implemented;
  - e. Considering how to structure GAC meetings and work intersessionally so that during the three public ICANN meetings a year the GAC is engaging with the community and not sitting in a room debating itself;
  - f. Establishing as a routine practice agenda setting calls for the next meeting at the conclusion of the previous meeting;
  - g. Providing clarity regarding the role of the leadership of the GAC; and,
  - h. When deliberating on matters affecting particular entities, to the extent reasonable and practical, give those entities the opportunity to present to the GAC as a whole prior to its deliberations.
- 6.2. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC formally adopting a policy of open meetings to increase transparency into GAC deliberations and to establish and publish clear criteria for closed sessions.
- 6.3. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI, to facilitate the GAC developing and publishing rationales for GAC Advice at the time Advice is provided. Such rationales should be recorded in the GAC register. The register should also include a record of how the ICANN Board responded to each item of advice.
- 6.4. The Board, working through the BGRI working group, should develop and document a formal process for notifying and requesting GAC advice.
- 6.5. The Board should propose and vote on appropriate bylaw changes to formally implement the documented process for Board-GAC bylaws consultation as developed by the BGRI working group as soon as practicable.

Increase support and resource commitments of government to the GAC

- 6.6. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to identify and implement initiatives that can remove barriers for participation, including language barriers, and improve understanding of the ICANN model and access to relevant ICANN information for GAC members. The BGRI working group should consider how the GAC can improve its procedures to ensure more efficient, transparent and inclusive decision-making. The BGRI working group should develop GAC engagement best practices for its members that could include issues such as: conflict of interest; transparency and accountability; adequate domestic resource commitments; routine consultation with local Domain Name System (DNS) stakeholder and interest groups; and an expectation that positions taken within the GAC reflect the fully coordinated domestic government position and are consistent with existing relevant national and international laws.
- 6.7. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to regularize senior officials' meetings by asking the GAC to convene a High Level meeting on a regular basis, preferably at least once every two years. Countries and territories that do not currently have GAC representatives should also be invited and a stock-taking after each High Level meeting should occur.
- 6.8. ATRT2 recommends that the Board work jointly with the GAC, through the BGRI working group, to work with ICANN's Global Stakeholder Engagement group (GSE) to develop guidelines for engaging governments, both current and non-GAC members, to ensure coordination and synergy of efforts.
- 6.9. The Board should instruct the GSE group to develop, with community input, a baseline and set of measurable goals for stakeholder engagement that addresses the following:
- a. Relationships with GAC and non-GAC member countries, including the development of a database of contact information for relevant government ministers;
  - b. Tools to summarize and communicate in a more structured manner government involvement in ICANN, via the GAC, as a way to increase the transparency on how ICANN reacts to GAC advice (e.g. by using information in the GAC advice register);
  - c. Making ICANN's work relevant for stakeholders in those parts of the world with limited participation; and,

- d. Develop and execute for each region of the world a plan to ensure that local enterprises and entrepreneurs fully and on equal terms can make use of ICANN's services including new gTLD's.

#### **ATR2 Recommendation No 7 - Decision-making, transparency and appeals processes**

##### *Recommendation*

##### Public Comment Process

1. The Board should explore mechanisms to improve Public Comment through adjusted time allotments, forward planning regarding the number of consultations given anticipated growth in participation, and new tools that facilitate participation.
2. The Board should establish a process under the Public Comment Process where those who commented or replied during the Public Comment and/or Reply Comment period(s) can request changes to the synthesis reports in cases where they believe the staff incorrectly summarized their comment(s).

#### **ATR2 Recommendation No 8 - Multilingualism**

##### *Recommendation*

To support public participation, the Board should review the capacity of the language services department versus the community need for the service using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and make relevant adjustments such as improving translation quality and timeliness and interpretation quality. ICANN should implement continuous improvement of translation and interpretation services including benchmarking of procedures used by international organizations such as the United Nations.

#### **ATR2 Recommendation No 9 - Decision-making, transparency and appeals processes**

##### *Recommendation*

1. Consideration of decision-making inputs and appeals processes
  - 1.1 ICANN Bylaws Article XI should be amended to include the following language to mandate Board Response to Advisory Committee Formal Advice:

*The ICANN Board will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all Advisory Committees, explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.*

## 1.2 Explore Options for Restructuring Current Review Mechanisms

The ICANN Board should convene a Special Community Group, which should also include governance and dispute resolution expertise, to discuss options for improving Board accountability with regard to restructuring of the Independent Review Process (IRP) and the Reconsideration Process. The Special Community Group will use the 2012 Report of the Accountability Structures Expert Panel (ASEP) as one basis for its discussions. All recommendations of this Special Community Group would be subject to full community participation, consultation and review, and must take into account any limitations that may be imposed by ICANN's structure, including the degree to which the ICANN Board cannot legally cede its decision-making to, or otherwise be bound by, a third party.

## 1.3 Review Ombudsman Role

The Board should review the Ombudsman role as defined in the bylaws to determine whether it is still appropriate as defined, or whether it needs to be expanded or otherwise revised to help deal with the issues such as:

- a. A role in the continued process of review and reporting on Board and staff transparency.
- b. A role in helping employees deal with issues related to the public policy functions of ICANN, including policy, implementation and administration related to policy and operational matters.
- c. A role in fair treatment of ICANN Anonymous Hotline users and other whistleblowers, and the protection of employees who decide there is a need to raise an issue that might be problematic for their continued employment.

## 1.4 Develop Transparency Metrics and Reporting

The Board should ensure that as part of its yearly report, ICANN include, among other things, but not be limited to:

- a. A report on the broad range of Transparency issues with supporting metrics to facilitate accountability.
- b. A discussion of the degree to which ICANN, both staff and community, are adhering to a default standard of transparency in all policy, implementation and administrative actions; as well as the degree to which all narratives, redaction, or other practices used



to not disclose information to the ICANN community are documented in a transparent manner.

- c. Statistical reporting to include at least the following elements:
  - i. requests of the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) process and the disposition of requests.
  - ii. percentage of redacted-to-unredacted Board briefing materials released to the general public.
  - iii. number and nature of issues that the Board determined should be treated confidentially.
  - iv. other ICANN usage of redaction and other methods to not disclose information to the community and statistics on reasons given for usage of such methods.
- d. A section on employee “Anonymous Hotline” and/or other whistleblowing activity, to include metrics on:
  - i. Reports submitted.
  - ii. Reports verified as containing issues requiring action.
  - iii. Reports that resulted in change to ICANN practices.
- e. An analysis of the continued relevance and usefulness of existing transparency metrics, including
  - i. Considerations on whether activities are being geared toward the metrics (i.e. “teaching to the test”) without contributing toward the goal of genuine transparency.
  - ii. Recommendations for new metrics.

- 1.5 The Board should arrange an audit to determine the viability of the ICANN Anonymous Hotline as a whistleblowing mechanism and implement any necessary improvements.

The professional external audit should be based on the Section 7.1 and Appendix 5 - Whistleblower Policy of the One World Trust Independent Review of 20076 recommendations to establish a viable whistleblower program, including protections for employees who use such a program, and any recent developments in areas of support and protection for the whistleblower. The professional audit should be done on a recurring

basis, with the period (annual or bi-annual, for example) determined upon recommendation by the professional audit.

The processes for ICANN employee transparency and whistleblowing should be made public.

## Appendix 5: PDP Timelines

## GNSO PDP Timelines – Updated 19 May 2014

	IRTP Denials	IRTP Part A	Fast Flux	Domain Tasting	IRTP Part B	PEDNR	IRTP Part C	UDRP Lock	Thick Whois	IGO/JINGO	IRTP Part D	Median
Request for an Issues Report	0 (20 Sep07)	0 (8 May08)	0 (6 March08)	0 (9 May07)	0 (16 April09)	0 (20 Nov08)	0 (22 Jun11)	0 (3 Feb11)	0 (22 Sept11)	0 (12 Apr12)	0 (17 Oct12)	
Preliminary Issue Report <sup>1</sup>							34 (25 Jul11)	114 (27 May11)	61 (21 Nov11)	54 (4 Jun12)	27 (12 Nov12)	54
Submission of Final Issue Report	29 (19 Oct07)	15 (23 May08)	19 (25 March08)	36 (14 June07)	29 (15 May09)	15 (5 Dec08)	69 (29 Aug11)	243 (3 Oct11)	134 (2 Feb12)	173 (1 Oct12)	84 (8 Jan13)	36
Initiation of PDP	61 (20 Nov07)	48 (25 June08)	63 (8 May08)	175 (31 Oct07)	69 (24 June09)	168 (7 May09)	93 (22 Sept11)	316 (15 Dec11)	175 (14 Mar12)	189 (17 Oct12)	93 (17 Jan13)	93
Approval of WG Charter		70 (17 July08)	84 (29 May08)		98 (23 July09)	216 (24 June09)	93 (22 Sept11)	406 (14 Mar12)	383 (8 Oct12)	218 (15 Nov12)	93 (17 Jan13)	98
Publication Initial Report	179 (17 March08)	245 (8 Jan09)	326 (26 Jan09)	243 (7 Jan08)	408 (29 May10)	557 (31 May10)	346 (1 Jun12) <sup>2</sup>	772 (15 Mar13)	639 (21 Jun13)	429 (14 Jun13)	503 (3 Mar14)	408
Publication Final Report	202 (9 April08) <sup>3</sup>	315 (19 March09)	518 (6 August09)	332 (4 April08)	775 (30 May 2011)	937 (14 June11)	476 (9 Oct 12)	884 (5 July13)	761 (21 Oct13)	578 (10 Nov13)		548
Council Vote	392 (16 Oct08)	343 (16 April09)	546 (3 Sept09)	345 (17 April08)	798 (22 June 2011)	1005 (21 July 2011)	484 (17 Oct 12)	911 (1 Aug13)	771 (31 Oct13)	588 (20 Nov13)		567
Board Vote	415 (7 Nov08)	No board vote	No board vote	415 (26 June08)	862 (25 Aug11)	1073 (28 Oct11)	548 (20 Dec12)	969 (28 Sept13)	870 (7 Feb 2014)	749 <sup>4</sup> (30 Apr14)		805.5
Implementation Effective Date	543 (15 Mar09)	N/A	N/A	694 (1 Apr09)	1143 (1 June 2012) <sup>5</sup>	1746 (31 Aug 2013)						918,5

<sup>1</sup> Required per the revised GNSO PDP approved in December 2011

<sup>2</sup> Target date

<sup>3</sup> Followed by launch of drafting team on 17 April 2008, which produced its final report on 4 June 2008, whose recommendations were adopted by the GNSO Council in October 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Part of the recommendations were considered by the ICANN Board on that date

<sup>5</sup> Part of the recommendations were implemented by this date

## Appendix 6: GNSO Operating Procedures – proposed revision of Section 6

*Proposed changes are shown in **bold** type.*

### 6.1 Participation Rules and Operating Procedures

The following sections address the BGC WG's recommendation that Groups shall establish and abide by a set of participation rules and operating procedures.

#### 6.1.1 Participation Principles

All Stakeholder Groups/Constituencies (here-in-after called Groups) **must** adopt the rules below for participation. Such rules and procedures **are to** be part of their Charters.

a. All Groups **are to** adopt these rules for participation to encourage openness, transparency and accountability. These rules and any other rules governing participation should be objective, standardized and clearly stated. For the avoidance of doubt, while commonality is encouraged in the interest of simplification, Groups are not required to have identical rules and variation between Groups is acceptable, as appropriate.

b. Groups **are to** have their participation rules based on common principles developed by the GNSO. Groups should avail themselves of ICANN staff services to make these rules available in English and the five United Nations languages – Chinese, Russian, Arabic, Spanish, and French – so that ICANN's global audience can understand them.

c. All Groups should strive to improve inclusiveness and representativeness. Groups should have either a differential fee structure based on the ability to pay, in order to encourage increased representation from those living in less developed economies, or hardship provisions that entitle any potential member to apply for relief from the normal fee scale.

d. All Groups should strive to remove information barriers and put in place well- structured outreach programs so that many potential stakeholders come to know of their existence and also of the benefits in being part of the ICANN policy process, thereby becoming more aware of the value of joining the **Group**.

#### 6.1.2 Membership

a. All Groups **must** make and publish rules and procedures for admission requirements of interested parties as Members in clear and simple terms. Such rules and procedures **are to** be part of their Charters.

b. All Groups **must** abide by rules governing membership, which are based on common principles. All Group members should have rights, duties and responsibilities and in particular rights to vote as applicable as per Group membership rules.

c. All Groups must offer membership to natural persons or individuals (if applicable) as well as to entities with legal personality such as corporations. However, any person or organization applying for membership **must** meet the membership criteria laid down by the Group with ICANN's approval.

d. All Groups should stipulate the rights, duties, and responsibilities of its members in clear and simple terms and publish the same.

e. A simple application form should be devised for membership and it should be publicly available on the Group's website.

i. Admission criteria should be predictable and objective and not arbitrary or discretionary. Where eligibility depends on participation in a certain sector of business, then applicants should be entitled to submit evidence of their participation in that sector.

ii. The **Group's** general membership **may** object to an application for membership provided that such objection is based on predictable and objective membership criteria. Such an objection should be published to the Group members.

iii. In applying for membership an applicant thereby agrees to abide by the written rules and regulations, including charters and bylaws, of the Group and terms and conditions laid down by it.

f. Status of a new application and admission decision, as far as possible, should be publicly available at the option of the applicant and an applicant should be advised of any objection to the application, be given the opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the objection, and be given the opportunity to reply with clarification or to reply in general.

g. In case of unfair treatment resulting in the rejection of an application or a dispute, the applicant may lodge a complaint with the ICANN Ombudsman or a mutually agreed upon non-biased neutral third party. The process for lodging a complaint with the Ombudsman is set forth in Article V of the ICANN Bylaws and in the Ombudsman Framework.

h. Every member should remain in good standing until the Group has decided otherwise as per its Charter provisions. The reasons that such status can be imperiled should be certain and predictable and objective and not arbitrary or discretionary. In such an event, the member **is to** be given an opportunity to be heard. Appropriate procedures **are to** be made for such an eventuality. The affected party should have right of appeal to a neutral third party.

i. List of members and their contact details **must** be publicly available on the Group website.

Individual members should have the right to have publication of address and other contact details withheld to protect their privacy. All members, unless otherwise stated, should be eligible to participate in the business of the Group and have voting rights as applicable.

j. No legal or natural person should be a voting member of more than one Group.

### 6.1.3

#### Policy and Consensus

a. All Group members should be eligible to participate in the Policy work of the Group and to join Committees formed to deal with policy issues and other Group issues, including eligibility of membership in the Group's committees.

b. Groups should refer to the GNSO Working Group model and guidelines for the purpose of reaching consensus and to improve accessibility, transparency, and accountability all Groups should establish and publish a consensus-building model or process that is publicly available to their membership and the community. Whatever consensus-building model or process a Group uses, the Group must describe the process and ensure that is publicly available to their membership and the community so it is visible and transparent.

#### Operating Principles

### 6.2

The following sections address the BGC WG's recommendations for clear operating principles for each Group to ensure that all Groups function in a representative, open, transparent and democratic manner.

Groups should adhere to the following common operating principles: representativeness, process integrity, flexibility, transparency, participation, openness, and other norms common to the GNSO.

#### 6.2.1 Term Limits

a. No person should serve in the same Group Officer position for more than four consecutive years. A member who has served four consecutive years must remain out of office for one full term prior to serving any subsequent term in the same Group Officer position. Any exception to this policy would require approval by the Group membership.

### 6.2.2 Executive Committees

- a. All Executive Committees must promptly publish action points, decisions, and any resolutions to Group members. It is recommended that prompt publication means within a reasonable period and a guideline is between 72 hours and 1 week of the relevant meeting.
- b. All Executive Committees must publish to Group members their rules and procedures, decision making process and criteria.

### 6.2.3 Committees

- a. Groups should adopt a standard set of rules and procedures to govern Group Committee constitution and operations. Whatever model is adopted, it **is to** be published to the entire Group membership and maintained.
- b. The formation of all Committees **must** be made known to the entire Group membership and eligibility to participate should be open to all members.
- c. The fact a Committee has been established and its membership **is to** be made available to the entire Group membership and should be published on the Group website.
- d. Action points, decisions and any resolutions and final work products should be made available to the entire Group membership within a reasonable period of any given meeting.
- e. **Groups** should publish to the Group membership a list of all active and inactive Committees and their final decisions, resolutions and final work products.

### 6.2.4 Communications

- a. Group mailing lists **must** be open to the entire Group membership and, at the election of the Group in any given case, to the public. The Group may have reserved lists if needed.
- b. The outcome of all Group policy decisions **are to** be open and publicly archived with posting rights limited to members at the election of the Group.
- c. Group business, work products, finance and accounts, and submissions to Staff and other ICANN entities **are to** be made available to the entire Group membership unless there are valid grounds for restricting distribution.
- d. All Groups **are to** have a published Privacy Policy providing for the protection of the private data of members.

### 6.2.5 Elections

Groups **must** publish and maintain a list of all Office holders, past and present, to inform Group members and to provide transparency for term limits.

#### 6.2.6 Voting

- a. All Group Charters **must** clearly delineate the voting rights of all of their members.
- b. All Groups **must** permit all voting members in good standing to vote in elections as delineated in their Charters.
- c. Members may be entitled to appoint proxies.
- d. No legal or natural person should be a voting member of more than one Group.

#### 6.2.7 Charter Amendments

The procedure for amending Group Charters should be stipulated therein.

#### 6.2.8 Meetings

Groups should adopt simple and accessible basic meeting procedures. Groups also may refer to the GNSO Bylaws, Operating Procedures, and the GNSO Council Working Group Guidelines.

Minutes **are to** be taken at meetings of the general Group membership and action points, decisions and any resolutions or minutes be published to the entire Group membership within a reasonable period.

#### 6.2.9 Policy

- a. Eligibility to participate on Policy Committees should be open to all members in good standing.
- b. Any Member of a Group should be able to propose the Policy Committee consider a Policy issue in accordance with the Group Charter.
- c. Policy Committee meetings should be open for attendance by all Group members.

#### 6.2.10 GNSO Working Group (WG)

- a. Any individual participant of a Group should be entitled to join any GNSO WG in an individual capacity and Groups **must** publish and advise all members of the call for WG participants.
- b. Groups **must** adopt and publish to the Group membership their rules and procedures for selecting and appointing Group representatives to GNSO WGs. It is recommended that these appointments be open to the entire membership to increase opportunities for participation.



c. Group Members may participate in an individual or representative capacity, but Group representatives must advise the entire Group membership of the WG activity from time to time.

## Appendix 7: About Westlake Governance Limited

Westlake Governance Limited is a New Zealand-based, globally focused company, specialising in organisational governance.

### 1. Lead Reviewer – Richard Westlake, Managing Director and Senior Consultant

Richard Westlake, MA (Oxon), FloD, FNZIM, established Westlake Governance in 1999 and has been Lead Reviewer and Project Team Leader for this Project.

With over 20 years' boardroom experience, as chair and director, Richard has gained particular expertise in governance of complex and fast growing organisations, and in leading transformational change.

Richard has been the Lead Reviewer for:

- The ALAC review 2008,
- The RSSAC review 2009,
- The DNS Risk Management Framework assignment 2012- 2014
- A governance review of .au 2011 for .au Domain Administration Ltd, and
- A structural review of InternetNZ (delegated manager of .nz), 2007.

He is an acknowledged authority on governance in types of organisation other than the traditional limited liability company, and previous work has included a range of Non-Governmental Organisations, not-for-profit structures and incorporated societies.

During the last twenty years, he has held chairmanships and been a board member in the private, public and not-for-profit sectors, including seven years as Chair of the Standards Council of New Zealand (New Zealand's member body of ISO) and software company InterGen Limited.

Further information on Richard's background can be obtained at <http://www.westlakegovernance.com/who-we-are/richard-westlake/>

### 2. Team Member – Vaughan Renner, Senior Consultant

Vaughan Renner, MBA, BE Hons, BSc has worked with Westlake Governance since 2006. He was a key member of the team working on the DNS Risk Management project for ICANN and has

been on the Westlake team as a reviewer for our earlier work with ICANN and other Internet Governance projects.

He has had a 20-year executive career that has included senior leadership and general management positions. Vaughan's key strengths are in seeking practical solutions to complex problems, and defining and leading change.

Vaughan has extensive board experience and currently serves on a number of boards, including private and not-for-profit organisations, and on New Zealand Government advisory panels. He represents BusinessNZ on the Standards Council of New Zealand.

He was appointed Chair of the newly-composed board of Westlake Governance Limited in 2014.

Vaughan holds an MBA (Massey, 1991), BE Hons Chemical (Canterbury, 1985) and a BSc Chemistry (Canterbury, 1983).

Further information on Vaughan's background can be obtained at <http://www.westlakegovernance.com/who-we-are/vaughan-renner/>

### **3. Team Member – Colin Jackson, Senior Consultant**

Colin is a member of the Westlake team that undertook the ALAC and RSSAC reviews. He has had a long involvement with ICANN since its early days, having attended many ICANN meetings, and has represented New Zealand in the ccNSO and in the GAC.

He is an internationally recognised strategic technology consultant with over thirty years' experience as an IT practitioner, and has held senior positions in Internet governance locally and internationally.

Colin is a founder of InternetNZ and has been deeply involved in its policy and its leadership. From 2003 to 2007 Colin served on the committee which set .nz domain name policy. Colin was InternetNZ's President from 2005-2007, when it hosted the ICANN meeting in 2006. He was also heavily involved as a member of the InternetNZ Task Force during the Westlake Structural Review of 2006-2007.

Prior to starting his own consulting business, Colin was a policy-maker for the New Zealand government on Internet and new economy matters.

Originally from the UK, Colin holds an MA and a BA in Mathematics from the University of Cambridge.

Further information on Colin's background can be obtained at <http://www.westlakegovernance.com/who-we-are/colin-jackson/>

#### **4. Team Member – Nancy Ward-McKenzie, Consultant and Researcher**

Nancy is new to the Westlake team. She has over 25 years' chief executive and general manager experience. She has spent much of this in the non-profit and government sectors as part of the leadership team in several organisations, including 12 years as chief executive of a not-for-profit organisation with 400 volunteers.

She has extensive experience in organisational development and change. Her key skills include leadership from strategy to delivery, strong financial management skills and working across diverse stakeholder groups. Among earlier roles she established and headed the e-learning unit of one of New Zealand's largest polytechnics.

Nancy is a chartered accountant, and has an MBA from Henley Management College (UK). She is a member of the Institute of Directors and is currently on the board of a polytechnic.

#### **5. Team Member – Elaine Porter, Consultant and Researcher**

Elaine is a Director of Westlake Governance, and joined the company after nine years' running an online retail business established in the early days of Internet shopping.

She works mainly on our board and governance review projects, and also acts as Board Secretary. She is also on the board of a non-profit organisation.

She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree and two post-graduate diplomas, and in her earlier career, held several research and analysis roles in the private and public sectors, including working at classified levels.