

RECOMMENDATION 8: WORKING GROUP ROLE IN IMPLEMENTATION	
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	
Part One – Which ICANN Objective does this meet	
Promote ICANN’s role and multistakeholder approach. See Strategic Plan, page 19 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> .	
Alignment with Strategic Objectives	
<b>Goal</b>	Encourage community role in implementation.
<b>Project/Recommendation</b>	That Working Groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.

SCOPE DESCRIPTION	
Scope Statement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff will review the Final Report of the Policy &amp; Implementation Working Group that was adopted by the GNSO Council. See the Final Report at: <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf</a>. In particular, recommendation #4 of the Final Report recommended that the PDP Manual be modified to require the creation of an Implementation Review Team following the adoption of the PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board. The GNSO Council approved this recommendation on 24 June 2015 and directed that the PDP Manual be revised accordingly.</li> <li>Staff will review the revised GNSO Operating Procedures including the change to the PDP Manual were published on 24 June 2015 as version 3.0 to determine whether this revision gives Working Groups a role in responding to implementation issues as part of the Implementation Review Team. An example is this GNSO Review Working Group that is directing the implementation of the GNSO review recommendations.</li> <li>Staff will present the results of the review to the Working Group, which will determine whether the revisions constitute the implementation of the recommendation that an explicit role for Working Groups in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.</li> </ol>	
Out of Scope	
The above scope is sufficiently clear.	
Assumptions	
The assumption is that implementation requires revisions to the GNSO Operating Procedures.	
Deliverables	
Revised GNSO Operating Procedures.	

OPTION ANALYSIS	
None were considered or were necessary to be considered.	
SOLUTION	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff reviewed the Final Report of the Policy &amp; Implementation Working Group that was adopted by the GNSO Council. See the Final Report at: <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf</a>. In particular, recommendation #4 of the Final Report recommended that the PDP Manual be modified to require the creation of an Implementation Review Team following the adoption of the PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board. Staff confirmed that the GNSO Council approved this recommendation on 24 June 2015 and directed that the PDP Manual be revised accordingly.</li> </ol>	

2. [Staff reviewed the IRT Principles and Guidelines \(Annex L of the Final Report\), which address the composition of the IRT. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irt-principles-guidelines-23aug16-en.pdf.](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irt-principles-guidelines-23aug16-en.pdf) Specifically, they state in Section I IRT Recruitment: “C. The call for IRT volunteers should at a minimum be sent to all members of the PDP working group that was responsible for developing the policy recommendations. The call for volunteers may need to reach beyond the working group members to ensure broad participation by parties directly impacted by the implementation and parties with specialized expertise needed for implementation. In some cases, additional outreach at the start or at a later stage of the IRT may be necessary to ensure that appropriate expertise is available and that directly affected parties are involved in the IRT.” In addition, Section II Composition states, “IRTs should include at least one participant from the original PDP WG who can provide insight into the original reasoning behind consensus policy recommendations.” These Principles and Guidelines appear to address the recommendation that [That Working Groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.](#)
3. Staff reviewed the revised GNSO Operating Procedures including the change to the PDP Manual that were published on 24 June 2015 as version 3.0 to determine whether this revision gives Working Groups a role in responding to implementation issues as part of the Implementation Review Team. Staff suggests that the following text in the revision of the PDP Manual appears to fulfill the implementation of recommendation 8, “The GNSO Council must direct the creation of an Implementation Review Team (IRT) to assist Staff in developing the implementation details for the policy, unless in exceptional circumstances the GNSO Council determines that an IRT is not required (e.g. if another IRT is already in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations. However, in such case the membership of the IRT will need to be reviewed to ensure that adequate expertise and representation is present to take on the implementation of the additional PDP recommendations). In its Final Report, the PDP Team should provide recommendations to the GNSO Council on whether an Implementation Review Team should be established and any other recommendations deemed appropriate in relation to such an Implementation Review Team (e.g. composition).”
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 that an explicit role for Working Groups in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed.

#### 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 24 June 2015.

#### RISK IDENTIFICATION

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

#### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

[That future PDP Working Groups should be aware of the requirements in the PDP Manual with respect to Working Group participation in IRTs as well as the provisions concerning recruitment and composition in the IRT Principles and Guidelines.](#)

#### NECESSARY TO PROCEED

Next Phase Activities/Resources

~~Deleted: 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 that a KPI applies in the implementation of this recommendation.~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

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
22 Feb 2017	V1	Original Draft	Julie Hedlund, Policy Director
23 Feb 2017	V2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Deleted boilerplate information that would be the same for each recommendation (project sponsor, owner, manager, and background). These could be provided for each batch of charters as they are submitted to the GNSO Council when the work is completed.</li><li>Clarified the scope as to what work is expected and by whom, and the solution as to what work has been done and the expected outcome.</li></ol>	Julie Hedlund, Policy Director
<a href="#">29 March 2017</a>	<a href="#">V3</a>	<a href="#">Revised based on the discussion during the meeting on 15 March 2017.</a>	<a href="#">Julie Hedlund, Policy Director</a>
<a href="#">12 April 2017</a>	<a href="#">V4</a>	<a href="#">Revised based on the discussion during the meeting on 30 March 2017.</a>	<a href="#">Julie Hedlund, Policy Director</a>

Deleted: 0

**Attachments, as applicable:**

- None