

PDP Improvements Tracker Overview – 7 June 2022

To provide the Council with the ability to track the different proposed improvements that have come out of different ongoing parallel initiatives and projects, the GNSO Staff Support Team has developed the PDP Improvements Tracker that can be found on the last page of this document. It currently tracks proposed improvements that have come out of the following initiatives:

- Council Strategic Planning Session (SPS) Action Item – how to improve support for and follow up on policy recommendations post-Council adoption
- Operational Design Phase
- Modifying Consensus Policies
- PDP 3.0 Parking Lot Items
- Review of Policy & Implementation Recommendations

For more information about each of these initiatives, please see <https://gns0.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2022/draft/draft-gns0-pdp-improvements-discussion-paper-25apr22-en.pdf>.

For each of the proposed improvements, the tracker includes the following information:

1. **Description of the proposed improvement**
2. **Proposed next steps** – the GNSO Staff Support Team has identified proposed next steps should the Council agree to move forward with the proposed improvement. The Council may decide to modify these proposed next steps and/or identify other next steps.
3. **Consideration status** – this column identifies in which stage of the process the improvement is.
 - a. “To be considered” means that the Council still needs to consider the proposed improvement and proposed next steps.
 - b. “Agreement to move forward” means that the Council has agreed to move forward with the proposed next steps (either in original form or as modified following Council consideration)
 - c. “No agreement to move forward” means that the Council does not agree to move forward with the proposed next steps and the proposed improvement will be discarded.
 - d. “On hold – to be further considered on a later date” means that the Council does not agree to move forward with the proposed next steps at this point in time, but will consider at a later date whether or not to move forward.
4. **Comments** – additional information related to the proposed improvement
5. **Assigned to** – identifies who is responsible for implementing
6. **Impact** [TBD]
7. **% Complete** – once approved, the tracker will also track progress of implementation. Depending on the complexity of the improvement, a separate project sheet may be developed to track progress.

Each of the proposed improvements has been allocated to one of the following categories:

- Category I Improvements – Easy to implement and not requiring any changes to existing processes and/or procedures
- Category II Improvements – Some effort to implement, but not requiring any changes to existing processes and procedures
- Category III Improvements – Higher level of effort to implement and likely requiring changes to existing processes and procedures

As part of the substantive review of the proposed next steps, the Council could decide to recategorize a proposed improvement.

For Council consideration – Practical questions:

1. Does the tracker provide the expected information for Council to consider and keep track of the different proposed improvements? If not, what is missing?
2. At the suggestion of Council members an entry for “impact” has been added. Council to identify who/how to determine impactfulness of each proposed improvement – is this referring to impact on the PDP, impact on resources, a combination of both or something else?
3. As not all improvements are solely within the remit of Council, what is the best way to consult with the broader GNSO community, and possibly beyond that, about this approach and how to enable regular consultation / input?
4. How often should review / updates be planned for?
5. Where should this information be housed – GNSO wiki?
6. How much time is needed for the Council to consider these above questions that need to be addressed before the first substantive review can commence?

PDP Improvements Tracker

	Proposed Improvement	Proposed Next Steps	Consideration Status	Comments	Assigned To	Impact	% Complete
1	CATEGORY I IMPROVEMENTS: Easy to implement and not requiring any changes to existing processes and/or procedures						
2	Enable a process during the PDP to share relevant information and analysis on potential impacts to existing policies, to support consideration by PDP working groups (define this process as part of GDS liaison role) - Origin: Modifying Consensus Policies	GNSO Council to request GDS to instruct the GDS Liaison to share relevant information and analysis on potential impacts on existing policies as part of its input to PDP WGs	To be considered	GDS indicated that they are working on a set of guidelines for a GDS Liaison to PDP Working Groups. These instructions could be incorporated as part of those guidelines	Council Leadership		
3	The Council should consider sharing with the ICANN Board when certain items are expected to move from Council to Board to facilitate advance planning by the ICANN Board - Origin: Council SPS	In combination with sharing its SPS report, the Council would communicate to the Board which items are expected to be forwarded to the ICANN Board for its consideration during that year to allow the ICANN Board to anticipate as part of its planning when it may need to consider GNSO policy recommendations.	To be considered	Note that this is also done through the sharing of announcements in relation to upcoming milestone publications, such as the recent webinar on the Transfers Initial Report.	Council, GNSO Staff Support		
4	Following adoption of a PDP Final Report by the GNSO Council, schedule a meeting with the ICANN Board to allow the GNSO Council, with the assistance of the PDP Chair(s), to present the Final Report and recommendations to the ICANN Board and allow for Q & A. - Origin: Council SPS	Trial if/when the IGO Curative Rights EPDP recommendations are adopted	To be considered		Council, GNSO Staff Support		
5	CATEGORY II IMPROVEMENTS: Some effort to implement, but not requiring any changes to existing processes and procedures						
6	Add to the charter template a general or specific provision / question regarding consideration of impact on existing consensus policies - Origin: Council SPS	Staff support team to create for Council review proposed addition for charter template that would highlight the expectation that a PDP WG is to consider the impact of its recommendation on existing consensus policies.	To be considered		GNSO Staff Support		
7	Include in the Final Report template a section to address any direct or indirect implications for existing policies, to support full consideration by the PDP working groups and the GNSO Council. This may include implementation guidance where appropriate. - Origin: Modifying Consensus Policies	Staff support team to include in the Final Report template a section to address any direct or indirect implications for existing policies	To be considered		GNSO Staff Support		
8	Consider if/how the role of the Board liaison of a PDP can contribute to more effective communication. This could, for example, be done by communicating clearly at the outset of a PDP the expected role of the Board liaison. - Origin: Council SPS	Staff support team to include link to Board Liaison guidelines to charter template so that if Board liaison is included as part of the charter, the role and expectations can be considered in the context of the review of the charter.	To be considered		GNSO Staff Support		
9	CATEGORY III IMPROVEMENTS: Higher level of effort to implement and likely requiring changes to existing processes and procedures						
10	Update CPIF to note that as part of implementing a new policy, ICANN org and the IRT review updates to other policies and incorporate as part of the implementation plan - Origin: Modifying Consensus Policies	Requests GDS to provide an indication of possible timing & consultation of such updates to the CPIF (note, last round of updates were made in 2018 and involved consultation with the GNSO Council / community	To be considered		Council leadership		
11	Review of Policy & Implementation Recommendations - Origin: Review of Policy & Implementation Recommendations & Review IRT Liaison's role description - Origin: PDP 3.0 Parking Lot Item	Request GNSO Staff Support to develop a report, similar to the Policy Status Review (PSR) that sets out the possible scope of the review, issues encountered and proposed approach that the Council & community would then consider to decide on next steps. Similar to the PSR, this report would be published for public comment to allow the community to identify any further issues that should be addressed.	To be considered		GNSO Staff Support		
12	Review of the Operational Design Phase - Origin: ODP	The GNSO Council should request the GNSO Council liaison to the SSAD ODP as well as the small team that was tasked to review the ODP to document its findings so that these can be shared when the review takes place after the second ODP completes. Similarly, the Council Liaison to the SubPro ODP should be notified that there will be this expectation to provide input on the experience with the ODP so that he can prepare and document his findings accordingly.	To be considered	As envisaged, the ODP will become part of the generic top-level domain (gTLD) policy implementation lifecycle and eventually be incorporated into the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework (CPIF). Before modifying the CPIF, ICANN org will conduct a community consultation on the functionality of the ODP after a minimum of two ODPs have concluded, to ensure that the ODP operates effectively and fulfills the needs of the Board, the community, and ICANN org. The first ODP completed recently, with the second ODP, on the SubPro recommendations, currently scheduled to complete by October 2022. Note, this item is also linked to the above mentioned review of the CPIF.	Council, ODP Liaisons		