

RECOMMENDATION 14: FEASIBILITY FOR BREAKING PDPs INTO DISCRETE STAGES	
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	
<b>Part One – Which ICANN Objective does this meet</b>	
Promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem rooted in the public interest. . See Strategic Plan, page 23 at: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10Oct14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10Oct14-en.pdf</a>	
<b>Alignment with Strategic Objectives</b>	
<b>Goal</b>	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
<b>Project/Recommendation</b>	That the GNSO further explores PDP ‘chunking’ and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages.

SCOPE DESCRIPTION	
<b>Scope Statement</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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”.</li> <li>The GNSO Review Working Group to determine whether this recommendation has been implemented.</li> </ol>	
<b>Out of Scope</b>	
The above scope is sufficiently clear.	
<b>Assumptions</b>	
That the PDP Manual does not preclude the approach of determining the feasibility for breaking PDPs into discrete stages.	
<b>Deliverables</b>	
Examples of current PDPs that are following this approach.	

OPTION ANALYSIS	
None were considered or were necessary to be considered.	
SOLUTION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In its analysis staff notes that ongoing broad-subject PDPs are often chunked and divided into phases 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: <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/rpm-charter-15mar16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/rpm-charter-15mar16-en.pdf</a>. See the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures wiki at: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/New+gTLD+Subsequent+Procedures+PDP+Home">https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/New+gTLD+Subsequent+Procedures+PDP+Home</a>.</li> <li>Staff reviewed the PDP Manual and the Working Group Guidelines and determined that nothing in those document prevents or discourages the phasing or dividing of a PDP into subgroups. However, the</li> </ol>	

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 approach and ask the Working Group whether specific language should be added in this regard, noting that a phased approach may not be appropriate for all PDPs.](#)
4. Staff hereby presents the results of the review to the Working Group.
5. The Working Group will determine whether the revisions constitute the implementation of the recommendation.

#### KEY DEPENDENCIES

Feasibility of phasing 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

~~As the manager of the PDP GNSO Council is expected to ensure that the PDP process is as efficient as possible.~~  
[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.](#)

Formatted: Strikethrough

#### 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
------	---------	-------------	--------

<a href="#">13 March 2017</a>	<a href="#">V1</a>	Original Draft	Julie Hedlund, Policy Director	Deleted: Insert
<a href="#">29 March 2017</a>	<a href="#">V2</a>	<a href="#">Revised based on the discussion during the meeting on 15 March 2017.</a>	<a href="#">Julie Hedlund, Policy Director</a>	Deleted: X

**Attachments, as applicable:**

- None