Draft Recommendation 18

> ⚠️ **Draft 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.

Working Party (initial assessment of feasibility and usefulness):	CG - Accept as is.
Staff (initial assessment of feasibility and usefulness):	☐ Accept As-Is ☐ Accept With modification ☐ Reject Rationale: MK: accept as-is.
Basis for Assessment:	
Work in Progress:	GNSO Data and Metrics Working Group
Expected Completion Date for Work in Progress:	
Milestones:	
Responsibility:	GNSO Council/Staff

Public Comments Received

Comment #	Submitted By	Affiliation	Comment
Recommendation 18 (Continuous Development): That the GNSO Council evaluate post implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis (rather than periodically as stated in the current GNSO Operating Procedures); and that these evaluations are analysed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP Charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.			
22	Paul Diaz	gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group	(Support)
59	Osvaldo Novoa	ISPCP	(Support) This Recommendation is supported by the ISPCP who view this as a prime issue for Council. This is the key role for Council, managing and improving the process. Whilst there is a degree of concern over the time required to address this in the correct manner and the follow through required, an effective Council would see this issue as a priority and devote far more time to it, as opposed to the amount of time rediscussing PDP outcomes successfully developed within WGs.
123	Will Hudson	Google	If adopted would add greater accountability to the policy development process, increase metrics-driven policy decisions, and increase the efficacy of the process by leveraging the services of professional moderators, especially in circumstances where working group members may be conflicted. Additionally, we believe it is crucial that the GAC be involved earlier in the process.
183	Laura Covington, J. Scott Evans, Marie Pattullo	Business Constituency	The BC welcomes the suggestion of KPIs although notes that we will need to define both the KPIs themselves and their benchmarks
211	Stephanie Perrin	NCUC /NCSG	Sounds good, but folks are already having trouble making all the meetings and calls. More administrative tasks are not necessarily welcome, and may lack sufficient participation to be valid.
255	Greg Shatan	IPC	(Support)

3 01	Amr Elsadr		Not certain that this recommendation would be of any real value. The Westlake report does not offer any evidence to support that it would. If the WHOIS reviews are an indicator, they may suggest that periodic reviews are preferable to ongoing ones. The evaluation of the effectiveness of policies post-implementation on a periodic basis will likely provide more data for more objective consideration, as well as not impose a burden on a limited number of volunteers to manage continuous ongoing reviews.
3 29	Olivier Crepin-Leblond	ALAC	(It Depends) This recommendation is nice in theory, but due to the ongoing substantive activities load, this is unlikely to be implemented. If it is implemented, such reviews are likely to be done by people with little real knowledge of WG activities.