| **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  -----  Jen Wolfe | Working Party  -----  Working Party | Confirm.  -----  Yes, Recommendation 21 should be changed to yellow based upon Council feedback. |
| Rec 4 - Explain the thinking/concern behind travel funding as a form of "financial reward". | Chuck Gomes  -----  Wolf-Ulrich Knoben  -----  Jen Wolfe | Working Party  -----  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.  -----  The WP was concerned that recruitment should not be focused on financial rewards, but rather focus on outreach and training to generate broader interest to participate in the GNSO. Any other comments on this would be welcome. |
| 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  -----  Jen Wolfe | Working Party  -----  Working Party | I don’t think that necessarily follows nor do I think that the recommendation precludes such performance reviews.  -----  I’m a little confused by this question, but I think the concept was that we identify what makes a good WG leader. I don’t see an objection, though, to assessing leader performance at the end of each PDP. |
| 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  -----  Jen Wolfe | Working Party  -----  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.  -----  Yes, the additional criteria was intended to mean identifying what circumstances would suggest that outside facilitation would be appropriate. For example, certain issues or level of complexity, or perhaps to help with language barriers for non-English speakers. |
| 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  -----  Jen Wolfe  -----  Marika Konings | Working Party  -----  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.  -----  I’d like to invite staff to assist with this one, I am not aware of anything outside of the approval of the PDP that is done to verify it is properly constituted, but ask for clarification. The question to the GNSO Council would need to be posed to Council.  -----  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  -----  Jen Wolfe  -----  Marika Konings | Working Party  -----  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 WP believes that to participate in GNSO Council, technical knowledge should be a pre-requisite and that this training should not focus on DNS or technical training, but rather ensuring that those appointed to Council come with the technical background or level of knowledge expected to serve in the role.  -----  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  -----  Jen Wolfe | Working Party  -----  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.  -----  The intention is that any outreach programs are measured in terms of how many volunteers subsequently engage in the GNSO as a result. |