**Scenario planning – new GNSO Processes (note these are examples based on previous issues that were dealt with using ad-hoc processes)**

**GNSO INPUT PROCESS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | **ATRT2** |
|  | A public comment forum was opened for the ATRT2 to obtain community input on its Draft Report & Recommendations and Correction Issued 7 November 2013, with the goal of producing a Final Report by 31 December 2013. |
|  | Council discusses and agrees it would like to submit a comment  |
|  | Council member submits GIP initiation request via email indicating that a small group of volunteers will prepare draft comments for Council review |
|  | No objections are received to the GIP initiation request |
|  | The GIP Team reaches out to the GNSO Council / SG / C to ask for any input that it should consider in preparing its draft comments |
|  | The GIP Team deliberates via email or call, reviews any input that has been received and prepares the proposed comments |
|  | The GIP Team submits the proposed comments to the GNSO Council for its consideration |
|  | Council members deliberate on proposed comments and provide suggestions for changes which are incorporated by the GIP Team |
|  | Proposed comments are finalized – no objections are received to submitting the comments |
|  | Comments are submitted to public comment forum as GNSO Input. |

**GNSO GUIDANCE PROCESS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | **Specification 13[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
|  | Letter received from the NGPC requesting GNSO Council to advise as to whether the GNSO Council believes that this additional clause is inconsistent with the letter and intent of GNSO Policy Recommendation 19 on the Introduction of New Generic Top Level Domains. In case additional time for review is necessary beyond the 45 days, please advise the NGPC along with an explanation as to why this additional time is required. |
|  | GNSO Council discusses request and determines that it is not the expectation that the Council’s advice will result in new contractual obligations but is expected to provide interpretation or assist in providing clarity with regards to the implementation of GNSO policy recommendations (or if it does expect new contractual obligations, refer to EPDP)  |
|  | Council member submits GGP Initiation Request (motion plus scoping document), including proposal to form a working group to review the Board Request |
|  | Council votes on GGP Initiation  |
|  | GGP Working Group call for volunteers is circulated and GGP WG formed |
|  | GGP WG reaches out to GNSO SG/C and ICANN SO/ACs for input, if deemed appropriate / necessary |
|  | GGP WG deliberates and publishes GNSO Guidance Recommendation Report for public comment |
|  | GGP WG reviews public comments received and updates recommendation, if deemed appropriate |
|  | GGP WG submits Final GNSO Guidance Recommendation Report to the GNSO Council |
|  | GNSO Council adopts Final GNSO Guidance Recommendation Report with supermajority support |
|  | GNSO Council submits GNSO Guidance Recommendation Board Report to the ICANN Board |
|  | Board reviews GNSO Guidance Recommendation Board Report and adopts the guidance unless by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN |

**GNSO EXPEDITED POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | **Defensive Registrations** |
|  | ICANN received comment describing an apparent need to submit gTLD applications for defensive purposes to protect established legal rights. In response the New gTLD Program Committee resolved not to direct 'any changes to the Applicant Guidebook to address defensive gTLD applications at this time, the New gTLD Program Committee directs staff to provide a briefing paper on the topic of defensive registrations at the second level and requests the GNSO to consider whether additional work on defensive registrations at the second level should be undertaken'. |
|  | GNSO Council discusses NGPC request and staff briefing and determines that additional work is needed and will likely result in new contractual obligations. As the issue is specific to the new gTLD program and it has been determined that it has been scoped accordingly, the GNSO Council decides to consider addressing this issue via an EPDP.  |
|  | A GNSO Council member submits a motion accompanied by an EPDP scoping document |
|  | The GNSO Council initiates the EPDP by a Supermajority vote of the Council in favor of initiating the EPDP |
|  | EPDP Working Group call for volunteers is circulated and EPDP WG formed |
|  | EPDP WG reaches out to GNSO SG/C and ICANN SO/ACs for input |
|  | EPDP WG deliberates and publishes EPDP Initial Report for public comment |
|  | EPDP WG reviews public comments received and updates recommendations, if deemed appropriate |
|  | EPDP WG submits EPDP Final Report to the GNSO Council |
|  | GNSO Council adopts EPDP Final Report per PDP voting thresholds |
|  | GNSO Council submits GNSO EPDP Recommendation Board Report to the ICANN Board |
|  | Board reviews GNSO EPDP Recommendation Board Report and considers the recommendations per the requirements of the PDP |

1. Note, under the PI recommendations an IRT would have been in place to deal with this question. If the IRT would not have been able to confirm the intent, it would have referred the issue to the GNSO Council for guidance which could have also resulted in a GGP or EPDP. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)