



GNSO Working Session


PDP Improvements

Saturday 17 September 2022



1

Connect your **Zoom Audio** to listen to the meeting.




2

Turn on your **Zoom Video** to be seen by other participants.




3

Raise your hand in **Zoom Reactions** to join the speaking queue.




4

Unmute your **Zoom Audio** when called upon to speak.




1

Do **not** connect your **Zoom Audio**. To disconnect your audio, click on the **Up Arrow** and select **Leave Computer Audio**.



2

Raise your hand in **Zoom Reactions** to join the speaking queue.



3

Use the physical microphone at your seat or in the aisle when called upon to speak.



Background

- Tracker developed to provide the Council with the ability to track the different proposed improvements that have come out of different ongoing parallel initiatives and projects
- Covers improvements that have come out of the following initiatives:
 - Council Strategic Planning Session (SPS) Action Item – how to improve support for and follow up on policy recommendations post-Council adoption
 - Operational Design Phase
 - Modifying Consensus Policies
 - PDP 3.0 Parking Lot Items
 - Review of Policy & Implementation Recommendations
- Survey conducted amongst Council members and SG/C Chairs to help inform this discussion.

High level overview of survey results

Support for the improvement

Improvement	Support	No Support	Other
#1	92.31%	0%	7.69%
#2	92.31%	7.69%	0%
#3	91.67%	8.33%	0%
#4	83.33%	0%	16.67%
#5	66.67%	0%	33.33%
#6	91.67%	8.33%	0%
#7	81.82%	9.09%	9.09%
#8	75%	16.67%	8.33%
#9	75%	0%	25%

High level overview of survey results

Support for the proposed next steps

Improvement	Support	No Support	Other
#1	100%	0%	0%
#2	91.67%	0%	8.33%
#3	80%	0%	20%
#4	100%	0%	0%
#5	87.57%	0%	12.5%
#6	90.91%	0%	9.09%
#7	100%	0%	0%
#8	89.89%	0%	11.11%
#9	100%	0%	0%

Improvement #1

- ❖ Enable a process during the PDP to share relevant information and analysis on potential impacts to existing policies, to support consideration by PDP working groups (define this process as part of the GDS liaison role)
- ❖ Proposed next step: GNSO Council to request GDS to instruct the GDS Liaison to share relevant information and analysis on potential impacts on existing policies as part of its input to PDP WGs" (note, GDS indicated that they are working on a set of guidelines for a GDS Liaison to PDP Working Groups. These instructions could be incorporated as part of those guidelines.

Survey results: General support – one commenter suggest that means for doing this already exist.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the next steps, especially since work on guidelines is already underway. Council can review guidelines and determine whether anything further is needed to consider this improvement complete.

Improvement #2

- ❖ The Council should consider sharing with the ICANN Board when certain items are expected to move from Council to Board to facilitate advance planning by the ICANN Board
- ❖ Proposed next step: In combination with sharing its SPS report, the Council would communicate to the Board which items are expected to be forwarded to the ICANN Board for its consideration during that year to allow the ICANN Board to anticipate as part of its planning when it may need to consider GNSO policy recommendations

Survey results: General support – one commenter does not support as information should already be available by following GNSO meetings.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the proposed next step as this information can be relatively easily derived from the project list and ADR – consider whether this could be done on a yearly and/or 6-9 month timeframe. Council can review a first version during the SPS which also focuses at looking at the year ahead.

Improvement #3

- ❖ Following adoption of a PDP Final Report by the GNSO Council, schedule a meeting with the ICANN Board to allow the GNSO Council, with the assistance of the PDP Chair(s), to present the Final Report and recommendations to the ICANN Board and allow for Q & A.
- ❖ Proposed next step: Trial if/when the IGO Curative Rights EPDP recommendations are adopted". (note, following the adoption of the recommendations report during the July Council meeting, the Council agreed to reach out to the ICANN Board to offer a briefing session on the Final Report & recommendations)

Survey results: General support – one commenter does not support and is of the view that the Board should take an independent look at a Final Report.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. As invitation has already been sent to the Board per the agreement during the July Council meeting, share proposed presentation / slides in advance of the meeting with the Board to ensure that it is a neutral representation of the results and does not interfere with independent review.

Improvement #4

- ❖ The Council should consider sharing with the ICANN Board when certain items are expected to move from Council to Board to facilitate advance planning by the ICANN Board. Add to the charter template a general or specific provision / question regarding consideration of impact on existing consensus policies.
- ❖ Proposed next step: "Staff support team to create for Council review proposed addition for charter template that would highlight the expectation that a PDP WG is to consider the impact of its recommendation on existing consensus policies."

Survey results: General support – with some expressing concern about adding significant work for a WG and the need for ICANN staff support, as well as the need for Council/staff to call out which policies may need to be considered to help guide the WG.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the proposed next step factoring in that the Charter template can always be modified as needed to ensure that it is fit for purpose, including calling out specific existing policies that should be factored in.

Improvement #5

- ❖ Include in the Final Report template a section to address any direct or indirect implications for existing policies, to support full consideration by the PDP working groups and the GNSO Council. This may include implementation guidance where appropriate.
- ❖ Proposed next step: Staff support team to include in the Final Report template a section to address any direct or indirect implications for existing policies

Survey results: Support – some comments indicating not sure if this is a good improvement as well as linkage with previous improvement.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the proposed next step but make clear that inclusion of this section is linked to any charter requirement in this regard.

Improvement #6

- ❖ Consider if/how the role of the Board liaison of a PDP can contribute to more effective communication. This could, for example, be done by communicating clearly at the outset of a PDP the expected role of the Board liaison.
- ❖ Proposed next step: "Staff support team to include link to Board Liaison guidelines to charter template so that if Board liaison is included as part of the charter, the role and expectations can be considered in the context of the review of the charter

Survey results: General support – one commenter expressing concern about whether Board members should be more active in a PDP

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the proposed next step but consider at the outset of a PDP for which a Board Liaison is expected to be appointed to have a dialogue / communication with the ICANN Board to set out the expectations for the Board liaison for that specific effort.

Improvement #7

- ❖ Update CPIF to note that as part of implementing a new policy, ICANN org and the IRT review updates to other policies and incorporate as part of the implementation plan
- ❖ Proposed next step: Requests GDS to provide an indication of possible timing & consultation of such updates to the CPIF (note, last round of updates were made in 2018 and involved consultation with the GNSO Council / community)

Survey results: General support – some comments are concerned about the possible impact on timeline as well as that this could have ICANN org directly involved in modifying existing consensus policy.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the proposed next step as at this point it is solely about a possible timing & consultation of such updates – any changes would be done in consultation with the GNSO Council / community and the concerns expressed should be considered in that context.

Improvement #8

- ❖ Review of Policy & Implementation Recommendations"
- ❖ Proposed next step: Request GNSO Staff Support to develop a report, similar to the Policy Status Review (PSR) that sets out the possible scope of the review, issues encountered and proposed approach that the Council & community would then consider to decide on next steps. Similar to the PSR, this report would be published for public comment to allow the community to identify any further issues that should be addressed

Survey results: Support – one commenter expressing concern that the improvement is too vague, another commenter noting that policy process need less review, and one commenter indicating uncertainty about what this means.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Before moving ahead, staff support team to provide some more detail on what the policy status review is expected to cover as well as making clear that doing a PSR does not mean a review is initiated, but it allows the Council to consider whether or not a review is appropriate (and what should be considered as part of a review, if initiated).

Improvement #9

- ❖ Review of the Operational Design Phase
- ❖ Proposed next step: The GNSO Council should request the GNSO Council liaison to the SSAD ODP as well as the small team that was tasked to review the ODP to document its findings so that these can be shared when the review takes place after the second ODP completes. Similarly, the Council Liaison to the SubPro ODP should be notified that there will be this expectation to provide input on the experience with the ODP so that he can prepare and document his findings accordingly.

Survey results: General support – one commenter is concerned about resource impact – this should just be about assembling input, another commenter notes that this is not about a formal review but feedback to Board about usefulness, another commenter noting that this is not urgen.

Staff support team suggestion:

1. Move ahead with the proposed next step but make sure that this is not resource intensive nor following a strict deadline. Consider whether a template questionnaire or survey would assist in gathering such input.