

Advise on proposed Input tracking checklist ccPDP

Proposed decision

The ccNSO Council welcomes the checklist as a tool to meet ATRT recommendation 20. At the same time the Council suggests some changes to the checklist to ensure the policy and policy related activities of the ccNSO resulting in recommendations to the ICANN Board of directors are captured properly. The proposed changes are:

- Include policy and policy related recommendations to the Board
- Include the explicit support for the recommendations, and in case of change of recommendations how negative input was weighed against the support.
- Update ccNSO section to include input from all ccTLD's (members and non-members of the ccNSO) and Recognized Regional Organizations (AFTLD, APTLD, CENTR and LACTLD)
- Include under or related to the GAC input received from individual governments
- Align the section on specific outreach with practice of the ccNSO.

If the council adopts the proposed amendments they should be submitted to rec-20-checklist@icann.org

Background and introduction

The chair of the ccNSO received a request to share any input to improve a checklist for use when the ccNSO submits policy recommendations for Board consideration. The original request is included (Annex A). This checklist was developed as part of the implementation the ATRT recommendations, in particular as a tool to meet ATRT Recommendation 20, which states:

The Board should ensure that all necessary inputs that have been received in policy making processes are accounted for and included for consideration by the Board. To assist in this, the Board should as soon as possible adopt and make available to the community a mechanism such as a checklist or template to accompany documentation for Board decisions that certifies what inputs have been received and are included for consideration by the Board.

The checklist itself is included in Annex B.

With the anticipated closure of the IDN ccPDP and the finalization of the recommendations of the Foi WG in the nearer future, it is advised to propose some amendments to the checklist, to ensure the Board is aware of the public consultations, the input received and the consideration of this input.

Suggested changes

1. Scope of the Input Tracking checklist

Submissions to the Board resulting from Policy making processes in the strict (through a Policy development Process as defined in Annex B of the Bylaws) does not capture the full breadth of ccNSO submissions to the Board of policy related recommendations. The ccNSO has and will submit policy related recommendations to the Board (examples: the recommendations on the Fast Track Process and the Interpretation of the current delegation and redelegation policies). Although not policy in the strict sense, they have been developed going through extensive consultation rounds.

In order to meet the intent of recommendation 20, it is advised to broaden the scope of the input tracking document to include both recommendations to the Board as developed through a PDP, and policy related recommendations that have been developed through a public comment process under auspices of a ccNSO working group chartered to develop .

2. Type of inputs tracked

According to the checklist proposed, any input that was received need to identified, and provide a brief summary of how those inputs were considered. The brief summary should include whether the stakeholder group at issue voiced any opposition to the items under consideration and whether any changes were recommended to the recommendations.

Experience has shown that explicit support for recommendations has been received as well. For that matter the ccNSO Council has made supportive statements itself. It is advised that these statements should also be listed, and in case a proposed recommendation is changed, how the supportive recommendations are taken into consideration and how they have been weighed against any opposition.

3. Input from ccTLD's

The checklist itself refers to the input from the ccNSO and only lists members of the ccNSO. In the ccNSO environment, input provided by individual ccTLD managers, whether they are member or non-member of the ccNSO, is treated equally. It is advised to reflect this in the checklist.

Further, and although potentially part of the entity/group listed in the section Specific Outreach, the recognized Regional Organisations are a part of the PDP process. It therefore advised that they are listed under the heading ccNSO as a separate entity.

4. Input received from individual governments

The proposed checklist proposes to record in put from the Governmental Advisory Committee. Experience has shown this may be too limiting. For example in the context of the IDN ccPDP, individual governments have submitted input through the relevant public comments forum. It is advised that this could be captured as well.

5. Specific Outreach and Emerging Interests

The proposed checklist explicitly lists only working groups and the ccNSO Council as the entities to perform specific outreach activities. In case of the ccPDP, this could also be a Task Force (never been established to date) or the Issue Manager. It is advised to adjust the checklist accordingly.

Annex A

Dear Lesley:

As part of ICANN's implementation of the ATRT Recommendations, ICANN staff has developed and are implementing the attached checklist as a tool to meet ATRT Recommendation 20, which states:

20. The Board should ensure that all necessary inputs that have been received in policy making processes are accounted for and included for consideration by the Board. To assist in this, the Board should as soon as possible adopt and make available to the community a mechanism such as a checklist or template to accompany documentation for Board decisions that certifies what inputs have been received and are included for consideration by the Board.

A checklist was initially generated for the GNSO as a pilot. We are now modifying the checklist for use when other Supporting Organizations submit policy recommendations for Board consideration. This is a tool that staff would have the primary obligation for completing as part of the submission of policy recommendations arising out of the ccNSO PDP, and is not intended to replace any of the existing documentation requirements. We would appreciate your thoughts on if there are improvements that could be made to this checklist to help make sure that this is sufficient to capture the inputs as identified in the ATRT Recommendation. Please provide your inputs to rec-20-checklist@icann.org.

We expect that this checklist will go through iterations as we gain experience working with it.

Thank you for your help and input.

Regards, David

Input Tracking – ccNSO PDP Recommendations

The purpose of this checklist is to assist the Board in assuring that all parties with an interest have had an opportunity to participate and weigh in on the recommendations arising out of the ccNSO PDP, and to provide a summary of how those inputs were considered. This checklist should be prepared by staff and included with the Board paper transmitting the policy recommendations to the Board for decision.

ISSUE:

DATE OF COUNCIL APPROVAL:

Public Comment¹

Identify all documents submitted for public comment as part of the consideration of this issue and the dates of the public comment forums. Also identify the total number of commenters. Also note any open mic/forum sessions on the topic. Include link to the summary and analysis of public comments.² In the “outreach efforts” column, please identify the actions taken to publicize the comment period or meeting to encourage participation.

Comment Period Dates or Meeting Date	Dates opened/closed or Meeting date	Number of commenters	Outreach Efforts

Tracking of Inputs

For each ccNSO member, ICANN Supporting Organization (including GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies) or Advisory Committee identified below, identify if any input was received, and provide a brief summary of how those inputs were considered. The brief summary should include whether the stakeholder group at issue voiced any opposition to the items under consideration and whether any changes were recommended to the recommendations. Note: In some cases, certain

¹ This checklist is not intended as a replacement for full public comment summaries. Rather, this checklist is a supplement to the comment summarization work, to identify in a quick manner that key inputs were received and taken into consideration prior to the issue reaching the Board.

² Required public comment sessions upon presentation of the GNSO Recommendations to the Board will be tracked separately.

Stakeholder Groups may make comments through component constituencies instead of through a collective statement of the Stakeholder Group. Only comments that are provided on behalf of one of the identified SGs or Constituencies should be recorded in this section.

ccNSO

Member ³	Requested	Received	Summary of Action on Input

GNSO

Group	Requested	Received	Summary of Action on Input
GNSO Council			
Registrar Stakeholder Group			
Registry Stakeholder Group			
New gTLD Applicant Interest Group			
Commercial Stakeholder Group			
Business Constituency			
IPC Constituency			
ISP Constituency			
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group			
Non-Commercial Users Constituency			
Not for Profit Operational Concerns Constituency			

Group	Requested	Received	Summary of Action on Input
ASO			
At-Large Advisory Committee ⁴			
Governmental Advisory			

³ Identify comments received from ccNSO members or consolidated comments from groups of ccNSO members.

⁴ If comments are received from any RALOs, identify those comments within this table

Committee ⁵			
RSSAC			
SSAC			

Specific Outreach and Emerging Interests

If the working group or the ccNSO Council performed any specific outreach to groups not identified above for advice or assistance on the issues under discussion, please identify the groups/entities consulted, the inputs received and how they were considered. In addition, if a definable group of collective interests emerge during a PDP and is not listed above, those collective inputs should be identified below. In the “outreach efforts” column, please identify the actions taken to identify key interested parties to encourage their participation. Also note if there are any groups identified as key that did not respond to outreach efforts.

Entity/Group	Outreach efforts	How inputs were considered

⁵ Formal GAC advice to the Board will be tracked through the GAC registry process.