

Agenda for Board Readiness Meeting

Theme: Getting Back on Track

Meeting Objective: Harden the Game Plan

1. Discussion: Methodology
We have discussed a methodology of: examining past PDPs → collecting information regarding rejected recommendations → interviewing participants → synthesizing results to determine gaps/ improvements → obtaining feedback

Q: Is there an alternative / parallel path that might also contribute to the result: e.g.,
 - a. a documentation review / analysis, or
 - b. a public comment forum?
2. Discussion: ICANN staff has provided information on rejected recommendation of three PDPs. Should we include other PDPs, e.g., the IOC / Red Cross PDP, the IDN & Transfer Policy PDPs (when ready)?
3. Discussion: review and observations on PDP data provided, e.g.:
 - a. Registration Data Phase I: selected recommendations where Board (1) questioned legality and (2) offered a different approach.
 - b. Registration Data Phase II: Board rejected “all recommendations.” (Except for “Priority 2” recommendations.)
 - c. Subsequent Procedures: Some themes were present across the rejected recommendations:
 - i. the Board provided advice during the initial report public comment period, which was not followed
 - ii. The Board rejected situations where costs could not be estimated or controlled
 - iii. The Board resisted taking on additional legal risk without the impositions of some guardrails
 - iv. The Board is staying out of the content business
 - v. The Board listens to staff concerning implementation complexity
 - vi. Some recommendations are:
 1. Pended (not rejected)
 2. Subsequently adopted through clarification or amendment
 - d. For next week: review list of rejected recommendations to identify trends or insights that might lead to hypotheses or be avenues for investigation
4. Interviews with PDP participants, Board members (incl. liaisons), staff
 - a. Identify possible candidates: should be a mix of active and passive participants. Staff might identify a pool of candidates from which this team could pick
 - b. Create list of questions for each. Review, edit, augment question lists below:

Questions to PDP Chair / members

- Were PDP working group members surprised (or unsurprised) by Board's rejection of certain, specific policy recommendations? Why, e.g., was there information regarding expected Board reaction or a sense that the recommendation was not implementable?
- Did the PDP working group consider Board reaction to potential recommendations during its deliberations? (This could be an expected reaction or explicit reaction (such as in public commentary or Board liaison feedback.) In what ways was this consideration done; was there a specific discussion set aside for this?
- In the opinion of PDP working group members, did the PDP working group believe they had sufficient information to develop a "Board-ready" set of recommendations?
- What are the expectations of the Board liaison role by: the PDP working group members? In what ways were they fulfilled / not fulfilled?
- Even when there is a sense of Board inclination, is it sometimes impossible to gain consensus agreeing with that inclination? Are there times when that is appropriate? Should anything about the PDP process that should be changed to facilitate reaching consensus?
- To what extent is recommendation "implementability" a concern or requirement? How is it measured during the recommendation formulation?
- To what extent is recommendation implementation and operation cost a concern or requirement? How is it measured during the recommendation formulation?

Questions to PDP Chair / members

- How did Board members receive information regarding PDP working group progress, during the Policy Development Process and after recommendations were received?
- What (negatively or positively) surprised Board members in the policy recommendations? At what stage of the PDP did those surprises occur?
- Through what channel (reading the PDP report, reading the summary report, the Board liaison report) did the Board member receive the specific information?
- To what extent is recommendation "implementability" a concern or requirement? How is it measured during the recommendation evaluation?
- To what extent is recommendation implementation and operation cost a concern or requirement? How is it measured during the recommendation evaluation?