Standing Committee for Continuous Improvement – Review of Input Received

The Council leadership team appreciates all the input received to date. In the overview below, we have tried to capture the different comments and suggestions in combination with responses and proposals for how these might be addressed. We would like to note that we are in no way wedded to the idea of creating a standing committee or other structure, but we are looking for the most effective and efficient way to undertake the work items that are on the Council's and GNSO community's list. We also appreciate that a further detailed outline and approach may be helpful to determine whether or not this approach is broadly supported.

Input received (summarized version)	By	Response / Proposal for how to address
Why is a distinction needed between GNSO wide and SG/C specific activities?	Carlton	If there are work items that are SG/C specific, there is no need for Council oversight and/or a community wide committee / task force. SG/Cs should handle these items themselves but could choose to collaborate with other SG/Cs if deemed necessary. However, if SG/Cs are of the view that there are items that are handled better collectively, these can be brought to the Council / Standing Committee.
As part of the scoping effort, a risk analysis should be included that focuses on risks of not addressing the issue in a timely manner to ensure the Council focuses on those items that are most urgent.	Carlton	Agreed – this should be an important consideration when determining the priority order in which work items are undertaken. In addition, activities should be scoped in a way that the improvement can be deliberated and implemented in a reasonable timeframe.
Any issues taken up by SCCI should be approved by Council.	Jeff	Agreed – the idea is that the Council provides oversight to ensure that issues are taken up that are broadly supported and considered a priority in light of other activities underway. This does not mean that issues cannot be brought up by the SCCI or SG/Cs, but these should go through an assignment process by Council, factoring in resourcing, priority and urgency, before the SCCI would

		take on new work (either directly or through assignment to a task force or sub-committee).
Composition of Standing Committee: Should there be a Council liaison and if so, should / could that liaison be the Nominating Committee Appointee?	Jeff, Olga	There were some other comments / suggestions in relation to the structure so it may be modified as a result of those but having a liaison does seem to be a good idea. There is no prohibition of a Nominating Committee Appointee serving in this role so there should not be a reason for the Nominating Committee representatives to not be represented on the committee (note, the liaison serves in a different capacity than 'members' of the committee).
Decisions should be taken by consensus	Jeff	Noted, although the door could be left open that certain issues under consideration could be subject to a different consensus threshold (for example, full consensus). In any event, any recommendations that do not have full consensus should clearly document which groups do not support the recommendation(s) and why.
The SCCI should not undertake any policy and policy implementation tasks like ● Implementation of WS2 recommendations that are not SG/C specific (if policy related) ● Review of Policy & Implementation WG recommendations	Wolf-Ulrich, Heather	The rationale for not assigning these work items to the SCCI seems to be that implementation is the remit of ICANN org, with the support of the community, but in case of: ● WS2 – there are a number of items that have been specifically assigned to the community to implement. The SCCI would also take on those items, as long as these are not SG/C specific, not any items that ICANN org will or is implementing. ● Policy & Implementation – the exact scope of work would need to be determined, but similarly to how these were originally developed by the

		GNSO Policy & Implementation Working Group, it would be foreseen that ICANN org would be involved in the review of these recommendations. The Council committed when it adopted the original recommendations to commence a review within 5 years of implementation, which is what this item is responsive to. The project plan could further detail how this engagement is expected to take place to make sure sufficient engagement and involvement of others involved in implementation, such as org and ACs, is addressed.
Topics may only be covered by specialized sub-teams. For which purpose is the SCCI needed? Couldn't the council themselves lay the ground for these sub-teams?	Wolf-Ulrich, Heather, Kurt	Having the full Council deal with this may create too much overhead, but indeed, maybe a full-blown Standing Committee is not needed but instead the Council would form a small representative committee that would be responsible for overseeing and providing guidance, as needed, to specific sub-teams or task forces that consist of SG/C representatives to carry out the work. The idea would be to have an overarching framework charter that would guide the work of these sub-teams / task forces so that there would not be a need to re-do some of the basics every time a new sub-team or task force kicks off.
Support the idea of "continuous improvement" and the need to institutionalize it, but don't overload it.	Wolf-Ulrich, Kurt	Agreed – that is why it will be very important to have the work items clear at the outset as well as the priority assigned to these.
The first task of the SCCI should be to review the recommendations of the SCI which could also be used to identify further improvements.	Heather, Jeff, Kurt	This would be a new assignment that is currently not planned for as part of the ADR. As a reminder, the SCI was originally formed to address any unforeseen issues

		coming out of the 2008 GNSO Review implementation. It delivered recommendations on a number of very specific items such as submission of reports and motions, voting outside of a Council meeting and waiver of ten-day motion deadline. All these items were also within the scope of the 2014 GNSO Review. Unless there are any urgent issues identified with the SCI recommendations, it does not seem a priority to do a review of these as there appear to be more pressing items. If/when the next GNSO Review kicks off, the SCI recommendations could also be specifically flagged as needing review?
Further details are necessary to be able to make a final decision	Heather	Agreed – based on the input received the leadership team will work with the staff support team to develop a further detailed proposal.
It will be important to ensure that the right skills and knowledge are present with those undertaking the work efforts.	Heather	Agreed - as part of the project charter, specific expertise and knowledge could be identified to assist with that process. SG/Cs would be expected to factor this in when assigning representatives to the sub-teams / task forces. It should be noted that none of the activities identified may be particularly short-term so in addition to skills and knowledge, there will also be a time commitment needed to complete the assigned tasks.
Instead of creating a standing committee, consider using task forces for particular topics. This enables those with expertise on particular matters to selectively volunteer their time to relevant efforts, while a generally-themed SCI-like body may actually repel such subject matter experts. A small	Heather	As noted above, having a Standing Committee may indeed create too much overhead, and an alternative approach has been suggested to be further explored.

committee within the GNSO (not necessarily Council) could be set up to oversee this work – many of the topics are not purely in the Council's remit and should not be solely dealt with by the Council.		
This is an opportunity for Council and SG/C. One of the ways to make Council more efficient and effective is to slough off those tasks which are GNSO-related but not PDP- or EC-related to the GNSO community.	Heather	Maybe it was not made sufficiently clear, but the work is expected to be undertaken by the GNSO community. The Council would provide oversight and direction at the outset (as needed and in consultation with SG/C Chairs). SG/Cs would be expected to assign members that they know are knowledgeable about the subject under discussion. As part of the project charter, specific expertise and knowledge could be identified to assist with that process.
Won't the SCCI, another committee, just put a drain on already scarce community resources?	Kurt	Yes, this will require community and staff resources, but the SCCI would undertake work that has already been identified in the ADR as needing to be done, so whether it is through an SCCI type of organization, or something else, resources will be needed to undertake the topics identified.