# RECOMMENDATIONS 18: EVALUATE POST IMPLEMENTATION POLICY IMPACT & EFFECTIVENESS

# STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

# Part One - Which ICANN Objective does this meet

Promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest. Also, evolve policy development and governance processes, structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive. See Strategic Plan main web page at: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/strategic-engagement-2013-10-10-en.

netbol/ www.neammorg/resources/ pages/strategie engagement 2010 10 10 en				
Alignment with Strategic Objectives				
Goal	<ul> <li>Shared understanding by Board, staff and stakeholders of the allocation of responsibilities for design, development and implementation of policy and operational processes.</li> <li>Shared understanding of the roles, responsibilities and accountability of the Board, staff and stakeholders.</li> <li>Board, staff, and stakeholders use best practices and exercises</li> </ul>			
Project/Recommendation	appropriate behavioral norms.  Recommendation 18: That the GNSO Council evaluate post implementation			
	policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis (rather than periodically as stated in the current GNSO Operating Procedures); and that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP Charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time.			

# Scope Description

# **Scope Statement**

- 1. Staff to review the policy review roles are outlined in GDD's Consensus Policy Implementation Framework at: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-policy-implementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-policy-implementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf</a>.
- 2. Staff will review how the Expired Registry Recovery Policy (ERRP) review was conducted.
- 3. The Working Group will consider how reviews of Consensus Policies could be included, and reviewed by the Working Group, followed by a determination of whether future reviews should remain periodic, or become ongoing.

Upon completion of the above steps, the GNSO Review Working Group to determine whether this recommendation has been implemented.

## Out of Scope

The above scope is sufficiently clear.

### Assumptions

That the recommendations will require changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures.

## Deliverables

Insert

# **OPTION ANALYSIS**

None were considered or were necessary to be considered.

# SOLUTION

- 4. Staff notes that the Global Domains Division, along with the Policy and Compliance Departments of ICANN, have a role in in terms of reviewing the effectiveness of Consensus Policies beyond Consensus Policy Effective Dates. These roles are outlined in GDD's Consensus Policy Implementation Framework at: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-policy-implementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-policy-implementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf</a>.
- 5. Staff notes also that the Expired Registry Recovery Policy (ERRP) recommended a review of that policy. No time frame was set. Staff is currently acquiring contractual compliance complaint data and other data sources to begin the evaluation. The process will roughly follow:
  - a. Collect appropriate data for review of policy;
  - b. GDD, Compliance, Policy team input;
  - c. External sources where possible;
  - d. Analyze data to determine if intent of policy was met from original WG recommendations;
  - e. Contruct a Policy Review document and share with GNSO Council for consideration;
  - f. If additional policy work is required, the policy development process shall be invoked;
  - g. Else, a review of the policy may occur again in the future.

The WG could consider whether this recommendation could be revisited following the results of the ERRP Review as that is the first of the reviews to be performed.

- 6. Staff review of the GDD Consensus Policy Implementation Framework notes that it appears to complete the implementation of the recommendations, except with respect to this statement: "That the GNSO Council evaluate post implementation policy effectiveness on an **ongoing** [emphasis added] basis (rather than periodically as stated in the current GNSO Operating Procedures)". Staff notes that in accepting recommendation 18 the Working Party assigned the implementation level of "medium/hard" to this aspect of the recommendation, recognizing that it may not be feasible to implement "ongoing" reviews. Staff asks whether the WG would separately consider whether this recommendation is feasible.
- 7. The Working Group agreed to move this recommendation into Phase II of the GNSO Review Implementation Plan.
- 8. Staff hereby presents the results of the review to the Working Group.
- 9. The Working Group will determine whether the revisions constitute the implementation of the recommendations.

# **KEY DEPENDENCIES**

- 1. Approval the recommendations to be included GNSO Operating Procedures by the GNSO Council.
- 2. Publication of the revised GNSO Operating Procedures, which occurred on 17 February 2016.

# RISK IDENTIFICATION

Risk was identified as lack of approval by the GNSO Council.

# **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

As the manager of the PDP GNSO Council is expected to ensure that its GNSO Operating Procedures are followed. It is not clear to staff whether a KPI applies in the implementation of these recommendations.

# NECESSARY TO PROCEED Next Phase Activities/Resources None.

Reviewers						
Name	Title	Date Sent				
GNSO Review Working Group						

Approvers						
Name	Title	Approval Status	Date			
GNSO Review Working Group						
GNSO Council						

REVISION HISTORY					
Date	Version	Description	Author		
13 March	V1	Original Draft	Julie Hedlund, Policy		
2017			Director		
29 March	V2	Modified based on WG discussion during meeting on	Julie Hedlund, Policy		
2017		15 March 2017.	Director		
12 April 2017	V3	Modified based on WG discussion during meeting on	Julie Hedlund, Policy		
		30 March 2017.	Director		

# Attachments, as applicable:

• None