GNSO Improvements – Opportunities for Streamlining & Improvements (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/pdp-improvements-22aug13-en.pdf for full details)

Updated ~~14 November~~8 January 201~~3~~4

Proposed Improvement	Council Feedback	Possible Changes	Proposed Implementation	ATRT2 ~~Draft~~ Recommendation	Proposed Next Step
1. Include proposed charter as part of the Issue Report	Could be perceived as handing over some of the responsibility of the GNSO policymaking process to ICANN staff What would happen if Staff does not recommend initiating a PDP? Would a draft charter still be provided?	- Council to specifically request inclusion of draft Charter at the time of the request of the Issue Report - Treat consideration of draft Charter as consent agenda item – if anyone objects, without needing to specify a reason, the task of chartering will automatically move to a DT.	**The GNSO PDP Manual foresees that 'Upon initiation of the PDP, a group formed at the direction of Council should be convened to draft the charter for the PDP Team'. Applying the suggested approach would not contravene the GNSO PDP Manual. As a result, should there be support from the GNSO Council to try out this approach, it may be instructive to do it for the next PDP as a "trial run", and if over time the Council believes that this approach is helpful, it could be formalized in the GNSO PDP Manual as one of the other alternatives that could be explored for the development of a PDP WG Charter.**		1) Update Issue Report Request Form to include option to request draft charter as part of the Preliminary Issue Report 2) Clarify when a new Issue Report is requested without completing the form, whether a draft Charter needs to be included in the Preliminary Issue Report or not. 3) Communicate that at the time of consideration of initiation of a PDP, any Council member may request for any reason to form a DT to develop the Charter instead of considering the Charter that was included in the Issue Report.

Proposed Improvement	Council Feedback	Possible Changes	Proposed Implementation	ATRT2 ~~Draft~~ Recommendation	Proposed Next Step
					4) Review in 6 – 12 months the impact this approach has had on the overall PDP timeline and effectiveness.
2. Intensity of PDP WG meetings	Increased intensity may not be possible due to workload and may prevent volunteers from participating if they are not able to meet for 2-3 hours per week.		**A further breakdown could be made per PDP on how many meeting hours it approximately takes for a PDP WG to deliver its Final Report. Based on this information and specific guidance from the GNSO Council on when it expects a PDP WG to deliver its Final Report, the PDP WG could develop its work plan and determine whether any of the above measures should be explored. Furthermore, the GNSO Council could consider requesting under the SO/AC Additional Budget Requests additional funding to be used for PDPs for which it is determined that a F2F meeting outside of ICANN meetings would be essential to the success of that PDP.**	The Board should ~~P~~provide adequate funding for face-to-face meetings to augment e-mail, wiki and teleconferences for GNSO ~~PDP~~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~~ should develop guidelines for when such ~~meetings are required~~	1) Staff to gather further information on the duration of the WG phase in number of hours. 2) Review recent efforts that have worked on an intensive schedule (IGO-INGO PDP) 3) Analyze the different options that exist to increase the intensity of meetings, including pros and cons of each option 4) Based on this analysis, Council to review which options it would like to pursue further, if any.

Proposed Improvement	Council Feedback	Possible Changes	Proposed Implementation	ATRT2 ~~Draft~~ Recommendation	Proposed Next Step
				~~and justified~~<ins>options may be invoked</ins>.	

| **3. Increase pool of PDP WG volunteers** | | | | In addition to many other efforts ongoing elsewhere within ICANN that are currently looking at engagement, training and outreach, the GNSO Council may want to consider whether there are any other measures it could undertake to facilitate the incorporation and recruitment of new volunteers. Also, individual invitations to each SG/Constituency Chair & Executive Committee could be sent inviting them to recruit for the particular PDP WG and asking them to make sure the SG/C is kept up to date with the progress of the group. | The Board and the GNSO should charter a strategic initiative addressing the need ~~of~~ for ensuring more global participation in GNSO P~~DP~~olicy 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;
 ~~a.~~ ~~u~~Under-represented geographical regions;
 b.
 ~~b.~~ ~~n~~Non-English speaking linguistic groups;
 c.
 ~~c.~~ ~~t~~Those with non-Western cultural traditions; and
 d. ~~t~~ | 1) Review existing outreach efforts and determine whether there are any actions the GNSO Council should be taking to increase the pool of PDP volunteers.
 2) Send invitations to each SG/Constituency Chair / Executive Committee to encourage them to recruit for the particular PDP WG and asking them to make sure the SG/C is kept up to date with the progress of the group
 3) Set up a welcome webinar for new PDP WG members to provide them with an introduction and tools to make participation easier and ensure their continued engagement in GNSO activities (first pilot to be launched webinar was held shortly ~~shortly~~ after BA with the assistance of Mikey O'Connor) |

				d.e. Those with a vital interest in gTLD policy issues but who lack the financial support of industry players.	
4. Require WG representative / participant / observer from each SG/C and possible liaison from SO/ACs				**Currently the GNSO WG Guidelines don't mandate any 'required participation' but note that 'a Working Group should mirror the diversity and representativeness of the community by having representatives from most, if not all, GNSO Stakeholder Groups and/or Constituencies'. Should the GNSO Council want to build in a firm requirement for representation from each SG/C this could be written into the GNSO WG Guidelines. Alternatively this could also be done in the form of a commitment by all SG/Cs – perhaps solicited from the respective SG/C leaders at the time the Council votes to initiate the PDP - to do their best to provide at a minimum one representative for each PDP**		1) Discuss with SG/C Chairs whether the option of requiring at least one representative / observer per SG/C per PDP WG would be acceptable. 2) Jonathan to discuss with SO/AC Chairs whether assigning 'informal' liaisons to each PDP Working Group would be welcomed / an option to ensure early engagement and communication.

			effort. Such a representative would not necessarily be an active WG member, but could also serve as a silent observer.		
5. Improved online tools & training	There should be at least the option for working group chairs to be trained not only in sharing capabilities, and moderating capabilities but also with respect to drafting agendas and, you know, conducting consensus calls and other complexities that might arise during the life circle of a PDP		**Several activities are being rolled out in this area over the next couple of months. The GNSO Council may want to review how those activities relate to PDP WG efforts and provide input on how such activities may be further improved / modified in order to contribute to the success of the PDP.**	The Board should ~~W~~work with the GNSO and the wider ICANN community to develop methodologies and tools to allow ~~make~~ the GNSO ~~PDP~~ policy development process~~process~~ to utilize volunteer time more effectively, increasing the ability to attract busy community participants into the process and also resulting in quicker policy development. ~~more time effective, resulting in quicker policy development as well as increasing the ability to attract busy community participants in the process.~~	1) Review existing online tools & training efforts and determine whether there are any additional actions should be taken by the GNSO Council and/or provide input on how existing activities may be further improved / modified in order to contribute to the success of the PDP.
6. PDP WG Rapporteur			**The GNSO PDP Manual does not prescribe how PDP WGs should conduct their work, so there would be flexibility to try out such an approach should a PDP WG determine**		1) Staff to explore this option further by providing details of how this would/could work in practice (e.g. how would a

			that it would be beneficial to its efforts. Alternatively, the GNSO Council could encourage PDP WGs to consider this approach, if it is of the view that this could facilitate the PDP WG deliberations. If over time the Council believes that this approach is helpful, it could be formalized in the GNSO PDP Manual as one of the alternatives a PDP WG could explore in developing its Initial / Final Report.		rapporteur be elected, how would interaction with staff/WG go, etc.) 2) Council to review staff feedback and decide whether or not to pursue this option further.
7. Professional moderation / facilitation & involvement of experts	External facilitation may not always be successful and would need to be carefully assessed.		The GNSO Council could consider making a request under the SO/AC Additional Budget Requests for additional funding that could be used if the Council determined that the involvement of a professional facilitator, moderator or expert would be essential to the success of that PDP.	In line with ongoing discussions within the GNSO, the Board should ~~D~~develop funded options for professional ~~facilitators~~ services to assist GNSO ~~PDP~~ policy development WG. 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~~s, and also draft explicit~~	1) Staff to gather further information on potential costs of involving professional facilitators and issues that would need to be considered should the Council decide to pursue this option further. 2) Council to review staff feedback and decide whether or not to pursue this option further

				guidelines for when such options may be invoked.	
8. Organize workshops / discussions at the outset				**The GNSO Council could further consider how it wishes to use this flexibility in the GNSO PDP Manual to encourage additional dialogue amongst the GNSO community and further understanding of the issues involved at the outset of a PDP.**		1) When a request for an Issue Report is received, Council to consider / discuss in close collaboration with the requestor whether there would be value in organizing a workshop / discussion on the issue before formally considering the request.
9. Better data & metrics				**The GNSO Council will need to monitor the efforts of the GNSO Metrics & Reporting Working Group closely.**		1) Monitor the efforts of the GNSO Metrics and Reporting Working Group closely
10. Explore flexibility in relation to public comment forum duration.				**Explore what options there are to reduce timeframe for PDP related public comment forums especially in those instances where no substantive comments are received during the Initial comment period and where as a result, a reply period may be necessary, as well as passing comments directly on to the PDP WG responsible, instead of requiring a staff summary.**	7.1. 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. 7.2. The Board should establish a process under the Public Comment Process where those who	Monitor the Board action on the ATRT2 recommendations and work with staff assigned to possible implementation of changes to explore options to allow for additional flexibility on PDP related public comment forums.

				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).	