

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

WG Name: TBD

Section I: Working Group Identification

Chartering Organization(s):	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council	
Charter Approval Date:	<Enter Approval Date>	
Name of WG Chair/Co-Chairs:	<Enter Elected Chair(s)>	
Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):	<Enter Liaison>	
WG Workspace URL:	<Enter Active Project URL from GNSO Site>	
WG Mailing List:	<Enter Mailman archive link>	
GNSO Council Resolution:	Title:	<Enter Resolution Title>
	Ref # & Link:	<Enter Resolution link>
Important Document Links:	•	

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

The GNSO Review Working Group is responsible for developing an implementation plan, containing a realistic timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome for the GNSO Review recommendations adopted by the ICANN Board (thirty-four (34) recommendations of the Final Report (i.e. all recommendations excluding recommendations 23 and 32). This implementation plan is to be submitted for approval to the GNSO Council, followed by the ICANN Board. Following the approval of the implementation plan, the Working Group is also expected to execute and oversee the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations unless specified differently in the implementation plan.

The GNSO Review Working Group will also be responsible for considering any new requests¹ by the GNSO Council concerning issues related to the GNSO Council processes and procedures and to Working Group guidelines that have been identified either by the GNSO Council, or a group chartered by the GNSO Council, as needing discussion. However, the first priority of the Working Group will be the development of an implementation plan and the subsequent implementation so any such

¹ For items that are submitted for review 'on request', the GNSO Review WG expects to receive detailed input from the group affected by the process/operational change concerned. See request template [\[include link\]](#)

requests should be reviewed to determine urgency and/or linkage with the GNSO review recommendations to determine the appropriate timing for dealing with such requests.

It is expected that the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI), the group currently chartered to address these requests, will complete the two tasks assigned to it by the GNSO Council and submit the proposed revisions for approval at the GNSO Council meeting on 01 September. [Option 1: Upon completion of these tasks, and as noted above, any new requests will revert to the GNSO Review Working Group for consideration. Following the completion of these two tasks, the SCI will be disbanded as its work will have been superseded by the GNSO Review Working Group.] [Option 2: during the course of the implementation of the GNSO Review, the SCI will remain dormant until such time the Council identifies a request that needs to be dealt with. Following the completion of the GNSO Review implementation, the SCI will cease to exist and its responsibilities will be taken over by the GNSO Review Working Group as outlined above].

Objectives & Goals:

The objective of the GNSO Review Working Group is to develop an implementation plan; execute and oversee the actual implementation, unless specified differently in the implementation plan, and; be responsible for considering requests by the GNSO Council concerning issues related to the GNSO Council processes and procedures and to the Working Group Guidelines.

In carrying out these activities, the Working Group may opt to use sub-teams or work teams to carry out part of the tasks. However, the GNSO Review Working Group remains responsible for reviewing and approving any recommendations, which are to be submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Deliverables & Timeframes:

The GNSO Review Working Group is expected to deliver the implementation plan to the GNSO Council for consideration at the GNSO Council meeting at ICANN57 at the latest in order to meet the Board set objective of ‘an implementation plan, containing a realistic timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome, shall be submitted to the Board as soon as possible, but no later than six (6) months after the adoption of this resolution’².

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

Each GNSO Stakeholder Group and/or Constituency will identify one primary and one alternate member to serve on the GNSO Review Working Group. Stakeholder Group and Constituencies are asked to identify members that have knowledge of and experience with the GNSO Review and/or GNSO operating procedures and/or processes (for example, previous members of the GNSO Review Working Party and current members of the SCI).

In addition, anyone interested will be able to join this working group as a participant or observer.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

The GNSO should circulate a ‘Call For Volunteers’ as widely as possible in order to ensure broad representation and participation in the Working Group, including:

² The Board resolution was adopted on 25 June 2016

- Publication of announcement on relevant ICANN web sites including but not limited to the GNSO, GAC, and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee web pages; and
- Distribution of the announcement to GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

The methodology used by the GNSO Review Working Group must be transparent, consistent with the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, and take into consideration capacity to ensure adequate resourcing from all stakeholders.

Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:

The ICANN Staff assigned to the GNSO Review Working Group will fully support the work of the Working Group as requested by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.

Staff assignments to the Working Group:

- GNSO Secretariat
- ICANN policy staff

The standard Working Group roles, functions and duties shall be those specified in Section 2.2 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:

Each member and participant of the GNSO Review Working Group is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision-Making Methodologies:

In developing its output, work plan and any other reports, the GNSO Review Working Group shall seek to act by consensus. The chair(s) may make a call for Consensus. If making such a call, they should always make reasonable efforts to involve all Stakeholder Groups/Constituencies appointed Members of the Working Group. The chair(s) shall be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

1. **Full consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus**.
2. **Consensus** - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree.

Only positions that have achieved full consensus or consensus of the Stakeholder Groups/Constituencies appointed members to the Working Group will be forwarded to the GNSO Council for their consideration.

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

1. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.

2. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co- Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
3. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.
4. In rare case, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes.

Consensus calls should involve at a minimum the Stakeholder Group/Constituency appointed members and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all Working Group members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the Working Group. Member(s) of the Working Group should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the Working Group discussion. However, if disagreement persists, members of the Working Group may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a Working Group disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair, copying the Working Group explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the Chartering Organization (CO) liaison(s). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s) must explain their reasoning in the response. If the CO liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the complainants' position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.
3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 below).

Note 1: Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.

Note 2: Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.

Status Reporting:

As requested by the GNSO Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Council liaison to the Working Group.

Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:

The GNSO Review Working Group will adhere to ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior as documented in Section F of the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles, January 2008. If a Working Group member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first to the Chair and Liaison and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to some but are not necessarily intended as such. However, it is expected that Working Group members make every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior as referenced above.

The Chair, in consultation with the CO liaison(s), is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the Working Group. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the CO. Generally, the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed. Any Working Group member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the Working Group or CO should first discuss the circumstances with the Working Group Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the Working Group member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the CO or their designated representative.

In addition, if any member of the Working Group is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked.

Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:

The GNSO Review Working Group will close upon the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO Council, including, for example, continuation of its role to consider any new requests³ by the GNSO Council concerning issues related to the GNSO Council processes and procedures and to Working Group guidelines that have been identified either by the GNSO Council, or a group chartered by the GNSO Council, as needing discussion.

Section V: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description
1.0		

Staff Contact:	<Enter staff member name>	Email:	Policy-Staff@icann.org
-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------	--

³ For items that are submitted for review 'on request', the GNSO Review WG expects to receive detailed input from the group affected by the process/operational change concerned. See request template [[include link](#)]