**NOTES FROM PIWG DISCUSSION OF DRAFT GNSO PROCESSES FLOW CHARTS**

**30 JULY 2014**

**General:**

* Although the proposed PGP as drafted may incorporate unnecessary/additional procedural matters (e.g. if it uses existing WG Guidelines), there may still be a need to create guidelines nonetheless for such a new process.

**On Voting Thresholds:**

* Requiring voting thresholds will require Councilors to go back to their SG/Cs for guidance; this will serve to highlight the fact that the GNSO Council is not a legislative body and needs to make decisions with reference to the bottom up process; however, defining all or overly-limiting the circumstances for which the new structures can be used may also be unnecessary and restrictive. Nonetheless, all three policy options (PDP, PGP, PIP) need to involve the Council in interacting with the community.
* For PGP: unnecessary and confusing to do anything other than mirror existing rules, i.e. to initiate a PGP, use existing PDP initiation thresholds; similarly, to adopt its outcomes use the thresholds applicable to PDP recommendations.
* For PIP: including the necessity of a vote would add to the accountability of the Council and emphasize its non-legislative function. WG members tended to support this, but emphasized that as a result there is a need to consider the impact of doing so on flexibility for the Council in terms of how nimbly it can act.
* Having lighter-touch, more nimble mechanisms should not be foreclosed as options by these two new processes.

**On Board Adoption of PGP/PIP Outcomes:**

* Need to ensure that the Board understands the differences between the various processes. Only if there's such an understanding should adoption thresholds be different for one or more of these processes.
* It should be mandatory for the Board to respond regardless of which process was followed.

**On a Modified PGP (or similar) following Implementation:**

* May be useful to have a different mechanism rather than reopening the original PDP, but decision whether to launch a new PDP or follow another process must be made transparently.
* Either a PGP or PIP could be requested/recommended to the GNSO Council by an IRT should policy/implementation questions arise during implementation of an adopted policy.
* Should the IRT (if one exists) be only limited to just one of those 2 processes, or should it also be able to recommend a new PDP?