

RECOMMENDATION 14: FEASIBILITY FOR BREAKING PDPs INTO DISCRETE STAGES
RECOMMENDATION 15: TIMELINESS OF THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

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. See Strategic Plan, page 23 at: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10oct14-en.pdf>

Alignment with Strategic Objectives

Goal	Shared understanding by Board, staff and stakeholders of the allocation of responsibilities for design, development and implementation of policy and operational processes. - Shared understanding of the roles, responsibilities and accountability of the Board, staff and stakeholders. - Board, staff, and stakeholders use
Project/Recommendation	14. That the GNSO further explores PDP ‘chunking’ and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages. 15. That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP.

SCOPE DESCRIPTION

Scope Statement

1. Staff to confirm whether the approach of determining the feasibility for breaking PDPs into discrete stages is already being used by PDP Working Groups and whether there are any provisions in the PDP Manual which would prevent and/or encourage “chunking”.
2. Staff to confirm whether the expedited PDP procedures have been adopted.
3. 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 PDP Manual does not preclude the approach of determining the feasibility for breaking PDPs into discrete stages.

Deliverables

Examples of current PDPs that are following this approach. Possible revisions to the WG Assessment.

OPTION ANALYSIS

None were considered or were necessary to be considered.

SOLUTION

Recommendation 14:

1. In its analysis staff notes that ongoing broad-subject PDPs are often chunked and divided into phases/stages and/or subgroups. In case of the PDP on Review of all RPMs in all gTLDs the phasing has even been added to the PDP Charter. In the case of the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent

Procedures the work has been divided among four work tracks each managed by a sub team. See the RPM Charter: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/rpm-charter-15mar16-en.pdf>. See the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures wiki at:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/New+gTLD+Subsequent+Procedures+PDP+Home>.

2. Staff reviewed the PDP Manual and the Working Group Guidelines and determined that nothing in those documents prevents or discourages the phasing/staging or dividing of a PDP into subgroups. However, the Working Group Guidelines address the potential risk (noted below) of subgroups lacking community representation, but notes that this may not be a barrier to the formation of subgroups. In particular, section 2.2.1 Chair states, "The Chair should make it clear that participation on sub-teams is open to all and he/she should encourage representational balance to the degree possible. However, it should be understood that there will not always be volunteers from every interest group and that it is often acceptable to have a small sub-team that is not totally representational perform an initial role that will later be reviewed by a broader more representational group."
3. Staff notes that the current Working Group Guidelines do not specifically encourage a phased/staged approach and asked the Working Group whether specific language should be added in this regard, noting that a phased approach may not be appropriate for all PDPs. The Working Group noted, however, that as PDPs vary widely such phasing/staging should not be prescribed and should be left to the discretion of the Working Groups to determine.

Recommendation 15:

4. Staff reviewed the Final Report of the Policy & Implementation Working Group that was adopted by the GNSO Council. See the Final Report at: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf>. In particular, recommendation #2 recommended the creation of three additional GNSO Processes, namely a GNSO Input Process, a GNSO Guidance Process and a GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process following the model as outlined in Annex C (GNSO Input Process), Annex D and E (GNSO Guidance Process) and Annex F and G (GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process). In addition, staff noted that on 24 June 2015 the GNSO Council recommended that the ICANN Board of Directors adopt the new GNSO Processes as reflected in the Annexes D and E for the GNSO Guidance Process and Annexes F and G for the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process as outlined in the Policy & Implementation Final Recommendations Report and the motion at <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+24+June+2015>. In addition, the GNSO Council recommended that the GNSO Guidance Process and GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process shall be available for use by the GNSO Council following adoption of any necessary changes to the ICANN Bylaws by the ICANN Board. The revised ICANN Bylaws were completed and posted on 16 February 2016 and the revised GNSO Operating Procedures were posted on 17 February 2016 at version v3.2
5. Staff hereby presents the results of the review to the Working Group.

Working Group Determination:

The Working Group determined that the Working Group Guidelines do not specifically encourage a phased/staged approach, but that as PDPs vary widely such phasing/staging should not be prescribed and should be left to the discretion of the Working Groups to determine. It also determined that the additional GNSO processes adopted on 24 June 2015, along with the current Working Group Guidelines and established practice constitute implementation of recommendation 14 on PDP 'chunking' and 15 on the timeliness of the PDP.

KEY DEPENDENCIES

Feasibility of phasing/staging and improving timeliness of PDPs.

RISK IDENTIFICATION

Risk of volunteer overload if breaking the PDP into subgroups results in a large number of subgroups that lack adequate volunteer participation or community representation.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

If the recommendation is to encourage phasing of PDPs, a KPI could be the measurement of the completion time of phased PDPs versus non-phased PDPs. However, it is not clear that a KPI applies in this instance.

NECESSARY TO PROCEED

Next Phase Activities/Resources

None.

APPROVERS

Name	Completion of Recommendation Approved by Consensus
GNSO Review Working Group	04 May 2017

REVISION HISTORY

Date	Version	Description	Author
12 April 2017	V1	Original Draft	Julie Hedlund, Policy Director
13 April 2017	V2	Revised based on the discussion at the Working Group meeting on 13 April 2017.	Julie Hedlund, Policy Director

Attachments, as applicable:

- None