ICANN | GNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization

Memo: GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Improvements End Report
9 June 2016

Background

Starting in 2013, the Council, in collaboration with ICANN Staff, gathered a number of ideas and suggestions to be explored to improve and streamline the existing Policy Development Process. These ideas and suggestions were translated into 10 PDP Improvements (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/pdp-improvements-table-16jan14-en.pdf). Many of these improvements were also closely aligned with the recommendations of the ATRT2 in relation to the GNSO PDP. Staff was tasked to explore and implement next steps for each item, including in pilot format. Since then, Staff has been providing regular status updates to the GNSO Council in conjunction with ICANN meetings. This memo is intended to provide a final status update, including proposed next steps on how to transform some of the GNSO Improvements that have been determined successful into permanent features of the PDP and close out this project until such time the Council identifies new improvements that are deemed worth exploring and/or revamps some of the improvements that were not deemed suitable for implementation at this stage.

Status of Implementation

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
1. Include proposed charter as part of the Issue Report The GNSO PDP Manual foresees that 'Upon initiation of the PDP, a group formed at the direction of Council should be convened to	A draft charter developed by staff is included as part of the Preliminary Issue Report to allow for public comments and input. Based on the feedback received, the charter is updated as appropriate and submitted to the	Since the introduction of this improvement, the Council has not seen the need to form a drafting team to develop the charter but has instead either adopted the draft charter as proposed in the Final Issue	As this approach has worked well and aids the streamlining of the PDP, without compromising the ability to form a drafting team when needed, Staff recommends that the GNSO Operating Procedures are updated to reflect

---

[1] As outlined in http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/pdp-improvements-table-16jan14-en.pdf

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
draft the charter for the PDP Team'. Applying the suggested approach would not contravene the GNSO PDP Manual. As a result, should there be support from the GNSO Council to try out this approach, it may be instructive to do it for the next PDP as a "trial run", and if over time the Council believes that this approach is helpful, it could be formalized in the GNSO PDP Manual as one of the other alternatives that could be explored for the development of a PDP WG Charter.	GNSO Council for its consideration at the same time as the Final Issue Report. The Council first decides whether to initiate a PDP followed by a consideration of whether to adopt the charter as presented in the Final Issue Report. Should the Council decide that further work is required on the charter it has the ability to propose changes or form a drafting team, which may or may not use the draft charter as a starting point.	Report or made any changes it deemed appropriate as part of the Council deliberations. As a result, this has significantly reduced the amount of time needed to approve the charter for a number of PDPs (see http://gnso.icann.org/basics/pdp-timeline-apr16-en.pdf).	that the Preliminary and Final Issue Report are expected to include a draft Charter and that the Council has the option to consider this draft charter for adoption at the time of initiation of the PDP (which is presented in a motion separately from the motion to initiate the PDP). However, the Council should always have the ability to modify the draft charter as contained in the Final Issue Report as deemed appropriate or form a drafting team to propose a charter instead.
2. Intensity of PDP WG meetings A further breakdown could be made per PDP on how many meeting hours it approximately takes for a PDP WG to deliver its Final Report. Based on this information and specific guidance from the GNSO Council on when it expects a PDP WG to deliver its Final Report, the PDP WG could develop its work plan	Staff determined that, in general, It takes between 32 – 64 hours of conference calls, typically spread out over 12 to 18 months, for a WG to produce its Final Report (note, this does not factor in time that is spent by both staff and WG members outside of conference calls). Increasing intensity may not always be desirable / feasible, especially taking into account	As noted, even though some PDP WGs have implemented longer meetings and/or increased the intensity of their meetings at times, it is difficult to establish requirements in this regard as it depends on the willingness and availability of volunteers to increase the intensity of their volunteer efforts. Participant feedback on the pilot project for F2F facilitated PDP WG meetings	Staff recommends that the Council directs staff to develop guidelines for the use and application for F2F facilitated PDP Working Group meetings on the basis of the experience of the pilot project. These guidelines should be submitted to the GNSO Council for review and adoption.

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
and determine whether any of the above measures should be explored. Furthermore, the GNSO Council could consider requesting, under the SO/AC Additional Budget Requests, additional funding to be used for PDPs, for which it is determined that a F2F meeting outside of ICANN meetings would be essential to the timely? success of that PDP.	current workload. A Pilot project for a full day F2F facilitated PDP WG meetings was approved by the ICANN Board as part of the special Community Budget Requests and has been implemented during the course of FY15 and FY16.	indicates that this has been successful[2] Accordingly, this project has been proposed for inclusion as part of the core FY17 budget. It should be noted, however, that the community experiences with professional facilitation were mixed. Therefore, it is recommended that the need for a professional facilitator be evaluated on a case by case basis. A predictable and timely process for selecting and confirming a PDP WG for a F2F meeting could also be developed.	
3. Increase pool of PDP WG volunteers In addition to many other efforts ongoing elsewhere within ICANN that are currently looking at engagement, training and outreach, the GNSO Council may want to consider whether there are any other measures it could undertake to facilitate the incorporation and recruitment of new volunteers. Also, individual	In addition to efforts outside of the GNSO focused on attracting and retaining newcomers as well as training existing community members, a number of GNSO initiatives were implemented in relation to this improvement. These include GNSO Learn, the GNSO newcomer webinars as well as the Policy Information 'one stop shop' and dedicated ICANN meeting pages. Recent PDPs have seen a significant	The number of PDP WG volunteers has significantly increased when reviewing the sign-ups for the most recent PDPs. However, it will be important to assess how these numbers translate over time; do these new volunteers remain engaged, are the tools that have been implemented sufficient to get newcomers up to speed? Furthermore, the Council may also want to consider whether	Staff recommends carrying out a survey to assess the familiarity that the community has with these tools as well as their perceived usefulness. Such a survey may result in suggestions for improvements and/or additional tools that facilitate the participation and engagement of volunteers in PDPs. Staff could also be directed to develop a report on possible enhancements or additions to the existing tools

[2] See http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/summary-feedback-pdp-09jun16-en.pdf and http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/compilation-survey-responses-pdp-09jun16-en.pdf.

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
invitations to each SG/Constituency Chair & Executive Committee could be sent inviting them to recruit for the particular PDP WG and asking them to make sure the SG/C is kept up to date with the progress of the group.	increase in volunteers both from SG/Cs as well as non-GNSO members, which staff believes can be partially attributed to these efforts.	there is a limit to the number of volunteers a PDP WG can have. For example, is it still possible to carry out policy development in the current format with over a 100 active WG members? How do the current structures scale and if not, what adjustments need to be made? Anecdotal feedback on GNSO Learn has been positive, although there have been requests for translation (at minimum) and consideration of additional modules as well as integration with other general tools/content on ICANN Learn.	that may be desirable based in part on the survey results and cost/budget impact. A clear strategy is also necessary to map out staff's current and future efforts focusing on new members and bridging the gaps between the various levels of familiarity with GNSO WGs.
4. Require WG representative / participant / observer from each SG/C and possible liaison from SO/ACs Currently the GNSO WG Guidelines don't mandate any 'required participation' but note that 'a Working Group should mirror the diversity and representativeness of the community by having representatives from most, if not all, GNSO Stakeholder Groups	Additional outreach is carried out by WG Chairs as well as staff in all cases where the WG leadership deems that there is an underrepresentation of certain groups. Furthermore, many SG/Cs appear to assign representatives to the different WGs who have are tasked to ensure that the respective SG/C is kept up to date and community input is taken back to the PDP WG.	Requiring assigned representatives does not seem to be necessary as recent PDP WGs have seen a significant increase in participation from all SG/C, as well as other SO/ACs and individuals. However, this increasing participation does increase the burden on WG chairs to ensure representativeness and adequate opportunities for participation by all WG members.	None at this time. With the planned implementation of the Working Group Enrollment Tool (currently on-hold), it will become easier to review information concerning participation and representation, which in turn may provide the Council with further insights into this issue and help inform potential further steps. At an appropriate time in the near future (e.g. after the three recent PDP WGs have each been

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
and/or Constituencies'. Should the GNSO Council want to build in a firm requirement for representation from each SG/C this could be written into the GNSO WG Guidelines. Alternatively this could also be done in the form of a commitment by all SG/Cs – perhaps solicited from the respective SG/C leaders at the time the Council votes to initiate the PDP - to do their best to provide, at a minimum, one representative for each PDP effort. Such a representative would not necessarily be an active WG member, but could also serve as a silent observer.			running for a year), the Council may wish to request staff to provide an evaluation as to whether creating the new observer status for WGs has been successful.
5. Improved online tools & training Several activities are being rolled out in this area over the next couple of months. The GNSO Council may want to review how those activities relate to PDP WG efforts and provide input on how such activities may be further improved / modified in order to contribute to the success of the	See #3	See #3	See #3

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
PDP.			
6. PDP WG Rapporteur The GNSO PDP Manual does not prescribe how PDP WGs should conduct their work, so there would be flexibility to try out such an approach should a PDP WG determine that it would be beneficial to its efforts. Alternatively, the GNSO Council could encourage PDP WGs to consider this approach, if it is of the view that this could facilitate the PDP WG deliberations. If over time the Council believes that this approach is helpful, it could be formalized in the GNSO PDP Manual as one of the alternatives a PDP WG could explore in developing its Initial / Final Report.	Some work was carried out to identify a possible tool to facilitate online collaboration especially in relation to document management and editing, but this project is currently on hold. As such, this improvement has not been further pursued, although noting in the PDP Manual would prevent this approach from being adopted by a PDP WG.	Noting the time and commitment it requires to develop an Initial Report, it may not be possible to take on such an obligation for volunteers as part of their participation in a PDP WG. However, as outlined before, nothing in the PDP Manual prevents a PDP WG from exploring this approach if it were deemed helpful and a volunteer were willing and qualified to take on such an assignment.	None at this time.
7. Professional moderation / facilitation & involvement of experts The GNSO Council could consider making a request under the SO/AC Additional Budget Requests for additional funding	See #2	See #2	See #2

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
that could be used if the Council determined that the involvement of a professional facilitator, moderator or expert would be essential to the success of that PDP.			
8. Organize workshops / discussions at the outset The GNSO Council could further consider how it wishes to use this flexibility in the GNSO PDP Manual to encourage additional dialogue amongst the GNSO community and further understanding of the issues involved at the outset of a PDP.	This approach has been successfully applied in two recent PDPs, namely through the creation of a new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group, that helped to prepare the ground for the PDP, and the delay of the publication of the RPMs Preliminary Issue Report, to allow for additional data gathering.	There appears to be recognition of the importance to ensure that all groundwork is done before embarking on a PDP. In both examples noted, the additional pre-work and research has resulted in better preparation and a more effective start of the respective PDPs.	Council to continue encouraging and promoting additional discussion and information gathering as part of its consideration prior to launching a PDP.
9. Better data & metrics The GNSO Council will need to monitor the efforts of the GNSO Metrics & Reporting Working Group closely.	The DMPM WG submitted its Final Report with consensus recommendations, and the GNSO Council unanimously adopted it on 21 October 2015. Staff has since implemented the WG defined metrics request framework, whereby the GNSO and chartered WGs can now submit 'tactical' based request for data that are intended to better inform and enhance the	Because this process was recently implemented, it has yet to process any requests. This is expected to change in the near term, based on the current activities of policy efforts within the GNSO. Throughout the pilot effort, adjustments may occur to optimize and improve this request channel, and at the conclusion of the pilot a review by the Council will occur. While	The GNSO community should seek possible ways to utilize the metrics request pilot effort, either during the Issue Development phase and/or during the Working Group phase of the Policy Development Process. The GNSO Council and staff will review each request on how best to accommodate it. Staff will continually work alongside the GNSO Council until

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
	policy development process. The framework, process, and procedures were documented within the GNSO Operating Procedures (Annexes I & II). One component of the framework is a pilot effort to exercise this new framework for requesting or accessing data for specific issues under deliberation. It is expected that most requests will not require significant resources. However, in some cases funds may be required and should be made available to properly satisfy the GNSO request, based upon vetted requirements by the GNSO Council and in assistance with staff. Further, ICANN is currently reviewing its proposed budget for FY17 to better understand how this effort can be funded through the pilot effort.	this new process is at its outset, it is encouraging to see GNSO stakeholders embrace the need for data and its use to make better informed policy decisions. A key element to the DMPM's work is that a cultural change of continuous improvement takes place within the GNSO, especially as it pertains to policies that were implemented as result of consensus based recommendations. This will be invaluable to make a determination or conclusion as to whether the changes made met desired intent. A number of consensus policy changes have been implemented in recent years, and it is expected for some sort of reviews to occur in the near to medium term.	the conclusion of the pilot effort and a review has been performed to determine next steps, if any are needed. It may be noteworthy that the need for more comprehensive data sources and up-to-date information was emphasized by recent WGs in their initial work (e.g. RDS, RPMs).
10. Explore flexibility in relation to public comment forum duration. Explore what options there are to reduce timeframe for PDP related public comment forums	ICANN-wide improvements to the public comment forum were introduced in January 2015 (see https://www.icann.org/resources/newsletter/policy-update-2014-11-21-en). This included the removal of the reply period	N/A	None at this time A high-level chart of the PCF is posted on ICANN's beta KPI dashboard. It reflects the quantity and duration of public comments and is updated monthly; see Goal 1.3 under the

Proposed Improvement[1]	Status of Implementation	Assessment	Proposed Next Step
especially in those instances where no substantive comments are received during the Initial comment period and where, as a result, a reply period may be necessary, as well as passing comments directly on to the PDP WG responsible, instead of requiring a staff summary.	and the introduction of a standard 40 day public comment period. Furthermore, staff has started using the public comment review tool as part of the staff summary for some of the public comment periods and may do the same for upcoming PDP-related public comment periods.		'Evolve and Further Globalize ICANN' objective. https://www.icann.org/progress Staff also prepares a forecasted timeline for future public comment forums (6 months to 1 year) to inform the community of upcoming public comment periods.