| **OEC Question** | **Respondent** | **WP/Staff** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Confirm that – following the GNSO Council's Recommendation - Rec 21 should now be marked ‘yellow’ as it looks that there are modifications proposed by the GNSO Council and WP (in addition to it now being ‘low priority’). | Chuck Gomes | Working Party | Confirm. |
| Rec 4 - Explain the thinking/concern behind travel funding as a form of "financial reward". | Chuck Gomes  -----  Wolf-Ulrich Knoben | Working Party  -----  Working Party | Some people may view receiving funding to attend meetings and travel around the world as a reward.  -----  The idea was that rewards could be taken into consideration but not in terms of cash (financial). Travel support is therefore seen as being non-financial. |
| Rec 9 - Developing a needs assessment for WG leadership is good, but does this mean that an assessment of each WG leader's performance would not be done for each PDP WG? | Chuck Gomes | Working Party | I don’t think that necessarily follows nor do I think that the recommendation precludes such performance reviews. |
| Rec 10 - Elaborate on "additional criteria" to be developed. Would it cover (for example) situations where facilitation would be required and where external/independent facilitators may add value in case internal facilitation fails? | Chuck Gomes | Working Party | I don’t think that there was any intent to absolutely require facilitation in certain situations but rather to provide guidelines when it might be useful. |
| Rec 19 - Does the GNSO Council currently issue a confirmation post-PDP that the WG has been properly constituted, has fulfilled the terms of its charter and has followed due process? Would the GNSO Council consider adding the diversity of WG aspect of Rec 36 to its post-PDP confirmation as information for the Board? | Chuck Gomes  -----  Wolf-Ulrich Knoben  -----  Marika Konings | Working Party  -----  Working Party  -----  Staff | I don’t believe this formally happens but I think it is assumed when the Council approves PDP recommendations.  This question probably should be asked of the Council as well.  -----  These kinds of confirmations are usually part of the “Wheras” of council resolutions. But re the diversity aspect the council should be asked.  -----  The Final Report of a PDP Working Group contains amongst others information on the WG membership / make-up, the different process steps that have been taken as well as an overview of the WG deliberations. As the manager of the process, the GNSO Council is expected to review this information and flag should it have any concerns in relation to any aspects of the PDP (and of course, it is expected to do so throughout the PDP). This same information is also provided to the ICANN Board in the GNSO Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board. The issue with adding diversity as a criteria is that we currently do not have a definition of what diversity means (is this geographic diversity, gender diversity, skills diversity, SG/C diversity?). As per the GNSO WG Guidelines, it is the responsibility of the WG Chair to assess whether there is sufficient participation and representation in the WG throughout the course, and staff usually assists in this effort. Some of the recent PDP WGs have also carried out an expertise assessment to ensure that the necessary expertise was present in the WG, or whether additional outreach should be planned for. It could also be problematic if this would become a ‘hard’ requirement – some topics are by nature of less interest and as a result may attract less people (think for example Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy). It is more important to ensure that there are no obvious barriers to participation and ensure that any recommendations have been sufficiently socialised and commented on by the broader community. |
| Rec 22 - Why is technical training not addressed? Would guidance/reference be provided to new GNSO Council members who may be lacking technical experience/background to go to for training? | Chuck Gomes  -----  Marika Konings | Working Party  -----  Staff | I don’t believe there was any intent to exclude technical training.  If technical training is needed to improve policy development, it could be provided.  -----  The main role of the GNSO Council is to serve as the manager of the Policy Development Process. Technical skills are nice to have, but not necessarily a requirement. It is of much greater importance for PDP Wgs to ensure that everyone has a basic understanding of the topic that is being discussed, which on a regular basis does require technical / expert briefings. |
| Rec 23 - Explain/elaborate on concern no. 2 in Working Party Comments and Rationale. | Chuck Gomes | Working Party | Does the OEC think that all constituencies are equal in terms of mission clarity, member engagement and contributions to GNSO work?  That would be ideal but it probably isn’t real.  More importantly, constituencies vary in terms of how well they represent their communities and how they document their processes of involving their members.  Of the four rationales, this one may be the least important. |