

# ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

## GNSO Policy Development Process 3.0

*How to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the GNSO Policy Development Process*

### Status of This Document

---

This document proposes incremental improvements to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) following discussions commenced in January 2018 at the GNSO Council's inaugural Strategic Planning Session and continued throughout 2018.

# Table of Contents

## Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Background	5
3	Challenges Identified	6
3.1	Working Group Dynamics - Challenges	6
3.2	WG Leadership - Challenges	6
3.3	Complexity of subject matter - Challenges	7
3.4	Consensus Building - Challenges	7
3.5	Role of Council as the Manager of the PDP - Challenges	8
4	Potential Incremental Improvements for Consideration	9
4.1	Working Group Dynamics – Incremental Improvements	9
4.2	WG Leadership – Incremental Improvements	10
4.3	Complexity of Subject Matter – Incremental Improvements	11
4.4	Consensus Building – Incremental Improvements	12
4.5	Role of Council as Manager of the PDP – Incremental Improvements	13
5	Proposed Next Steps	17
	Annex A – WG Membership Numbers	18

# 1 Executive Summary

This paper synthesizes the challenges as well as possible improvements related to the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Policy Development Process (PDP) that were identified as the result of a number of discussions throughout 2018. At its heart, the paper recommends a number of immediate improvements and documents longer term possible improvements that the Council and PDP Working Groups could consider implementing to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of GNSO policy development activities.

The challenges and possible improvements cover the following categories:

- Working Group dynamics
- Working Group leadership
- Complexity of subject matter
- Consensus building
- Role of the Council as the manager of the PDP

Of these, the following improvements, which have support from the full Council, are proposed to the GNSO Council for its immediate adoption:

**Improvement #1: Terms of participation for WG members**

**Improvement #2: Consider alternatives to open WG model**

**Improvement #3: Criteria for joining of new members after a PDP WG's formation**

**Improvement #4: Capture vs. Consensus Playbook**

**Improvement #5: Active role for and clear description of Council liaison to PDP WGs**

**Improvement #6: Document expectations for WG leaders that outlines role & responsibilities as well as minimum skills / expertise required**

**Improvement #9: Provide further guidance for section 3.6 (Standard Methodology for Decision Making)**

**Improvement #11: Enforce deadlines and ensure bite size pieces**

**Improvement #12: Notification to Council of changes in work plan**

**Improvement #13: Review of Chair(s)**

**Improvement #14: Make better use of existing flexibility in PDP to allow for data gathering, chartering and termination when it is clear that no consensus can be achieved**

**Improvement #15: Independent conflict resolution**

**Improvement #16: Criteria for PDP WG Updates**

**Improvement #17: Resource reporting for PDP WGs**

It is intended that, following adoption by the GNSO Council, the Council will further develop and take action on the proposed implementation strategies documented here.

The following improvements, which have varying degrees of support from the full Council, are recorded to be further developed and considered by the GNSO Council.

**Improvement #7: Creation of Cooperative Teams**

**Improvement #8: PDP Plenary or Model**

**Improvement #10: Document positions at the outset**

Additional proposed improvements stemming from comments received during consultations of these recommendations which are documented in this report should be considered alongside these three improvements.

The GNSO Council acknowledges and wishes to thank all those who have contributed to this initial phase of the GNSO PDP 3.0 Project.

## 2 Background

In January 2018, the GNSO Council held an inaugural three-day Strategic Planning Session. On Day 3 of this meeting, the GNSO Council reviewed the workload for the year ahead and spent time discussing the five PDPs currently underway and reflected upon their respective challenges and progress. It was noted that the current average timeline for delivery of an Initial Report, an important milestone in any PDP effort, had increased at least 2-4 times compared with previous PDPs and that the duration of the current PDPs range in duration from 1000 days to 2200 days, with three of these not even having published their Initial Report.

In addition to noting the increased duration of the PDP lifecycle, the Council began to identify challenges being encountered in PDPs, informed by [a staff discussion paper](#) on optimizing increased engagement and participation while ensuring efficient and effective policy development. Concerns were shared in relation to the challenges raised by the paper for bottom-up participation in ICANN's policy making processes, with broad agreement that the situation at present in Working Groups was not ideal. Key among the challenges that the various GNSO Working Groups face are increasing PDP participant and observer numbers, onboarding new participants, divergent motivations and desired outcomes, and difficulties in reaching consensus. Critical discussions centered on how the GNSO Council, as manager of the policy development process pursuant to ICANN's Bylaws, can and should act in addressing these and other challenges as they arise in PDP Working Groups. See <https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/gns0-council-to-chalaby-07mar18-en.pdf>.

In order to engage the broader GNSO community in this discussion, the GNSO Council organized [a collaborative session](#) in ICANN61 San Juan involving the members of the current PDP Leadership Teams as well as the broader community to summarize key points from the Strategic Planning Session, elaborate on the challenges that PDPs presently face and begin to brainstorm possible solutions.

This paper aims to synthesize the challenges that were identified as part of these discussions as well as possible improvements — both immediate and longer term — that the Council and PDP Working Groups could consider implementing to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of GNSO policy development activities.

## 3 Challenges Identified

The first GNSO Review, completed in 2012, brought significant changes to the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP), moving from a task force model in which only a select number of GNSO appointed members could participate to an open working group model in which anyone interested could participate. Outreach activities and the international attention given to ICANN through the IANA Stewardship Transition have contributed to a significant increase in GNSO PDP Working Group membership numbers. From an average of 15-25 WG members pre-2015, currently PDP WGs have a membership of around 200 WG members (see Annex A). In addition, topics under discussion are arguably more complex and divisive compared to previous efforts, and as a result, the work of some PDPs have been broken into various phases that is considered to also have an impact on the overall duration. As a result of these changed dynamics, a number of overarching challenges were identified.

### 3.1 Working Group Dynamics - Challenges

**'Social loafing'**: As highlighted in the [staff discussion paper](#), 'social loafing', a commonly observed phenomenon in which members of larger groups exert less effort towards group goals, can be observed. This appears to frustrate the ability to focus on finding consensus and instead seems to have the effect of discussions turning into zero sum games rather than efforts at compromise. Furthermore, with growing size, teams and groups may experience reduced cooperation, higher levels of member dissatisfaction, and increased turnover in membership. At the same time, the bulk of the work still appears to continue to fall on a relatively small number of community members partly because some community newcomers lack the skills, knowledge, and/or resources to contribute meaningfully from the start, which may frustrate more experienced volunteers. The longer the PDP lifecycle, the more WG members drop out, potentially resulting in a 'consensus by exhaustion' situation.

**Communications**: Finding a balance between input / decisions during WG meetings versus email list conversations is also proving challenging. Most groups have the practice of not taking a decision on the basis of a single call, but if WG members do not review call recordings and/or transcripts or only express their opinion on the mailing list, it may result in conversations dragging out or being redone. By the same token, there seems to be a tendency for list or chat conversations to be more provocative and controversial.

### 3.2 WG Leadership - Challenges

**Leadership appointment and review**: Large working groups are difficult to moderate, even for the most experienced leaders in the ICANN community. Similarly, a significant time commitment is demanded from those volunteering for leadership positions (as well as WG members) as the overall timeframe for a PDP can span several years. To a certain extent, this concern has been addressed by creating leadership teams that – in theory – facilitate spreading the workload. In reality, most WG chairs participate in all meetings and are involved in the review and sign-off of all related documents / messages. At the same time, larger leadership teams require more co-ordination and more support. Even though leadership training programs are available, leaders

are selected by PDP members (Council would not ordinarily do this) without reference to documented prerequisite skills or requirements. Likewise, there are no established practices or processes for reviewing leadership roles nor a formal process whereby a WG can request or appoint new leadership. The skills and expectations of chairs evolved over time and their role now includes more tasks such as project management related.

### 3.3 Complexity of subject matter - Challenges

**Interdependencies:** The complexity of PDPs is in part caused by interdependencies between issues and how to break PDPs into workable pieces while addressing these interdependencies. The complexity of the subject matter under consideration has also resulted in PDP Working Groups that now typically operate in multiple phases, using chunking as an approach creating sub-teams and/or work tracks responsible for different subjects within those phases. Any outcomes from sub-teams / work tracks subsequently need to be assessed by the full Working Group, which increases the risk of redoing the work of a sub-team / work track, especially if a sub-team / work track membership was unbalanced or dominated by certain viewpoints.

**Preparation and keeping current:** There is also a substantial amount of information that is expected to be reviewed and digested by WG members – not everyone is able to prepare and stay current in a timely manner and this can hamper progress. Equally, for those WG members for whom English is not their native language it may make reviewing complex materials even more difficult. For WG members joining later in the process, there is a substantial amount of history and materials to be reviewed in order to contribute in an effective and timely manner; depending on where a WG is in the process, this may not even be possible which in turn results in rehashing issues that were already addressed or dealt with.

Should there be minimum requirements when it comes to knowledge and expertise as well as certain commitments made by WG members who want to participate?

**External support:** In addition, many PDP Working Groups require external support either in the form of legal advice and/or data / research that is deemed necessary to help inform the deliberations. Often highly complex and/or technical issues are under consideration and there is currently no requirement to have a demonstrable basic knowledge of the issues at hand before one can start actively participating. In combination with the ability to join at any point during the WG process, this often results in a substantial amount of time being spent on education and repeating basic knowledge that could potentially be more effectively done in a different setting.

### 3.4 Consensus Building - Challenges

Consensus building is not an exact science but an art. It requires patience, dedication and a willingness by all parties to find consensus. The GNSO Working Group Guidelines provide guidance to WG Chairs on the process to determine whether or not consensus has been achieved, but there is significant room for interpretation as to how this is applied in practice. Similarly, the appeal process set out in Section 3.7 of the Working Group Guidelines, which lacks detail on such points as the standard of review in appeals, the timeline for such processes, whether third parties (such as legal representatives) are directly involved, and any further

escalation from these procedures, could benefit from detailed examination and clarification of the steps involved.

**Willingness and ability to compromise:** In order to build consensus, WG members need to be willing and able to compromise on previously established positions. Recently, WGs have seen a significant increase in individual members who do not represent anyone but themselves and individuals who have been engaged to represent the interests of a third party. There appears to be a fear of giving in and giving up ground at the expense of others. This leads at times to an apparent difficulty (sometimes unwillingness) to listen and meaningfully consider others' viewpoints. As noted in the staff discussion paper, this could be the result of social loafing and decreased levels of trust in larger groups. There needs to be an incentive to compromise – if concerns expressed by others are not shared, accepted or understood, it is unlikely that those happy with the status quo are willing to compromise.

### 3.5 Role of Council as the Manager of the PDP - Challenges

The Council provides its directions to a PDP Working Group in the form of a charter, but at times the questions posed leave room for interpretation, or insufficient guidance is provided in relation to topics falling outside a charter's scope. Also, data needs are hardly ever addressed at the outset, and as a result need to be dealt with by the WG, leading to unforeseen delays and costs.

**PDP WG liaison role:** The Council does appoint a Council liaison to the PDP Working Group, but until recently this role was merely a formality. A key outcome of the 2018 Strategic Planning Session was the documentation of Council's expectations of the liaison role to make sure that there is a clear understanding as to the role and responsibilities of a Council liaison vis-à-vis the Council as well as a PDP Working Group.

**PDP timelines:** PDP Working Groups are required to develop and regularly report to Council on progress against work plans, but there is little oversight of whether work is completed against the plan, and the Council is lacking the mechanism to enforce meeting milestones and/or mitigate risks. There are no examples in recent history where the Council has established a firm timeline or deadline at the outset of a PDP.

**Circumvention:** Addressing these challenges is important, because if the PDP is perceived as being ineffective or inefficient, this provides incentives to work around and outside of the PDP, for example, by petitioning the Board or working through respective governments. When this occurs, the GNSO fails to deliver on its mandate as set out in ICANN's Bylaws.

What role, if any, does the GNSO Council have in preventing such circumvention?

## 4 Potential Incremental Improvements for Consideration

This section records the ideas and suggestions proposed during the discussions to date to potentially address the challenges outlined in the previous section. Some of these may be immediately implementable without requiring any changes to PDP WG charters or GNSO Operating Procedures, while others may require further work and/or consideration. Similar to the previous PDP Improvements effort, the Council could decide to test and try a number of these approaches as a continuous improvement, and then regularly assess the outcome to determine what works and what doesn't, before incorporating these in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines or PDP Manual.

### 4.1 Working Group Dynamics – Incremental Improvements

Improvement	#1. Terms of participation for WG members
Description	Require those joining a WG to sign up to a WG member terms of participation outlining the commitment expected from WG members as well as the expectation with regards to multi-stakeholder, bottom up, consensus policy development. This could also include, in certain cases, expected knowledge / expertise required to participate (with options being provided to those not having the requested knowledge / expertise to obtain relevant knowledge / expertise). Different levels of commitment could be attributed to full membership versus observer status.
Objective	Ensure that WG members are committed to working together to find consensus, respecting the ICANN standards of behavior
Focus	Current and future WGs.
Possible Implementation Steps	Further develop the EPDP Team Statement of Participation ( <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/EOTSFGRD/EPDP+Team+Statement+of+Participation">https://community.icann.org/display/EOTSFGRD/EPDP+Team+Statement+of+Participation</a> ) in consultation with ICANN Ombudsman to produce a template for seeking affirmative commitment from WG members before they can participate in a WG.

Improvement	#2. Consider alternatives to open WG model
Description	The PDP Manual provides the flexibility to consider different types of PDP Team structures, for example, reference is made to working group, task force, committee of the whole or drafting team. To ensure representation as well as empowerment of WG members, different team structures should be considered, for example, having members designated by SO/AC/SG/Cs while individuals can join as participants or observers. This model has worked efficiently in recent Cross-Community Working Groups. At the same time, there may not be a one-size fits all model, so different alternatives should be explored so that the best fit approach for each PDP can be utilized.

<b>Objective</b>	Identify and document the basic characteristics of various model(s) (including current open model, EPDP Team Composition, Review Teams) that balance representation, inclusivity, expertise, empowerment, accountability and participation.
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Council to identify and consider the various model options documented when commencing new PDP to determine which best fits a particular PDP effort.

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#3. Criteria for joining of new members after a PDP WG's formation</b>
<b>Description</b>	Consider how to efficiently and effectively upskill new PDP WG members joining after the PDP has commenced its work.
<b>Objective</b>	Limit disruption as a result of members joining after the WG has already been engaged in deliberations for quite some time but allow for flexibility in case new volunteers bring new perspectives or are currently underrepresented in the WG.
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Document a set of basic template of requirements for upskilling new members newly joining after the PDP's formation with a view to preventing disruption of PDP progress and re-opening settled issues.

## 4.2 WG Leadership – Incremental Improvements

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#4. Capture vs. Consensus Playbook</b>
<b>Description</b>	A playbook or expansion of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines to help WG leaders, members, or participants identify capture tactics as such, along with a toolkit of possible responses to help the WG get back on track without escalating the situation. Example: “Die in the ditch” test - is this a position you are willing to die in a ditch for or is it just an opinion that you are expressing, and you are happy to move on if no one else supports that opinion?
<b>Objective</b>	Empower WG Chairs with additional tools and support to ensure effective and efficient leadership
<b>Focus</b>	Future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Drafting team (include current and former PDP WG leadership) to review existing provisions of the GNSO WG Guidelines for gap analysis and develop amendments to WG Guidelines or a standalone playbook for future PDPs.

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#5. Active role for and clear description of Council liaison to PDP WGs</b>
<b>Description</b>	Ensure that there is a clear understanding with regards to the role of the Council liaison and how he/she can assist the WG leadership. This may require PDP WG leadership teams to actively involve the liaison in leadership / preparatory meetings.
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure optimal use of GNSO Council liaisons to PDP WGs

<b>Focus</b>	Current and future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	<p>Develop clear role description (COMPLETED – see <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/gns0-liaison-wg-22feb18-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/gns0-liaison-wg-22feb18-en.pdf</a>); Council to evaluate whether this updated role description is fit for purpose in light of concerns around Chair neutrality and multi-phase PDP structures.</p> <p>Develop a briefing document for new Council liaisons including the role description and highlighting relevant provisions of GNSO Procedures on the role and responsibilities of the liaison.</p> <p>Build into PDP timeline milestones at which the WG leadership team should consider how to best utilize the Council liaison. Support staff to include liaison in scheduling PDP WG leadership team meetings. Exiting Council liaisons to conduct handover with incoming Council liaisons, and report to Council that this has taken place before the next Council meeting.</p>

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#6. Document expectations for WG leaders (Chairs/Co-Chairs/Leads) that outlines role &amp; responsibilities as well as minimum skills / expertise required</b>
<b>Description</b>	The GNSO WG guidelines provide a general description of the role of a WG chair, but this is not generally considered in WG Chair selection processes. WGs would benefit from a more detailed description of the role and responsibilities, including expected time commitment of a WG chair. This could then be coupled with a list of skills and expertise that would also be desirable. This would be helpful for WG selection of, and potential candidates for, leadership positions. WG Chair(s) would be expected to sign off on this job description and agree to the role & responsibility as outlined, and would also serve as a means to hold the Chair accountable to the WG. Similarly, it could be indicated whether there are any incompatibilities that should be considered such as whether someone can be in a leadership role in multiple PDPs at the same time.
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure clear understanding of what the role of a WG chair entails as well as what are considered some of the qualifying skills and criteria.
<b>Focus</b>	Future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Review GNSO Operating Procedures to evaluate and amend, where appropriate, the role and responsibilities descriptions of PDP Chair. Develop a briefing document and/or training for newly appointed PDP Chairs highlighting relevant provisions of GNSO Procedures on the role and responsibilities of WG Chairs that can be tailored for working groups.

### 4.3 Complexity of Subject Matter – Incremental Improvements

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#7. Creation of Cooperative Teams [For further discussion, not submitted to GNSO Council in October 2018]</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Description</b>	WG members could form “Cooperative Teams”, which would be distinct from subgroups and drafting teams. “Cooperative Teams” would be comprised of a minimum number of active, committed WG members who attend the majority of WG meetings and are committed to catching up others that are not able to attend meetings. The active members would assist the WG members who are unable to attend all meetings in staying up-to-date on the WG’s progress. The teams could be formed at SG/C level, but this would be for SG/Cs to consider.
<b>Objective</b>	Provide a mechanism for observers / less active members to stay up to date and engaged in a PDP.
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	To be developed.

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#8. PDP Plenary or Model PDP [For further discussion, not submitted to GNSO Council in October 2018]</b>
<b>Description</b>	For those that are new to the subject matter and/or PDPs, provide the opportunity to first learn and observe before being able to join the PDP team. This could be done, for example, in the form of a PDP plenary during which the PDP leadership team explains the status of work and briefs newcomers on the topics under review (this could be done in combination with expert briefings) or a model PDP which would introduce newcomers to GNSO policy development as well as the consensus building.
<b>Objective</b>	Create a mechanism whereby newcomers can observe and learn before getting involved in active PDPs.
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	To be developed.

#### 4.4 Consensus Building – Incremental Improvements

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#9. Provide further guidance for sections 3.6 (Standard Methodology for decision making)</b>
<b>Description</b>	Provide further guidance for WG Chairs and WG membership with regards to what is consensus, how consensus designations are made and what tools can or cannot be used. Similarly, further guidance may be welcome in case there is an appeal under section 3.7 that would result in a faster response to allow a WG to move forward more efficiently during and after the appeal process. Lessons could potentially be learned from other organizations applying consensus as a decision-making methodology or techniques learned during the ICANN leadership academy program concerning mediation and consensus building.
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure there is clarity around how consensus is established and what tools can be used in that regard.

<b>Focus</b>	Future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Staff should develop material for familiarizing members of PDP WG regarding the “consensus” in the PDP at the beginning of the process. Add clarification to GNSO OP to indicate a 3.7 appeal does not stop ongoing work

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#10. Document positions at the outset [For further discussion, not submitted to GNSO Council in October 2018]</b>
<b>Description</b>	Scope the different positions at the outset of a PDP so that it is clear from the start where a possible middle / common ground lies. Any restating of positions established at the outset of a PDP should as a result be minimized as these are already known at the outset which will allow focus on finding consensus.
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure that the focus is on finding a consensus position instead of digging in and only defending one’s own position.
<b>Focus</b>	Future WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	

## 4.5 Role of Council as Manager of the PDP – Incremental Improvements

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#11. Enforce deadlines and ensure bite size pieces</b>
<b>Description</b>	A PDP should have a narrow scope and, in those cases where a subject is broad, it needs to be broken into manageable pieces to make the deadline pressure more understandable and achievable. This may require a more regular use of a drafting team to prepare a charter for Council consideration. There is a need for pressure, but it must be coupled with limited scope, so that pressure for data and dependency would be able to produce results. This would also require the Council to regularly review PDP WG work plans.
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure clear expectations concerning deliverables as well as a manageable scope of work.
<b>Focus</b>	Future PDP WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	At the outset of the PDP, the Council or Council leadership meets with the PDP WG to brief the PDP WG on the charter and its expectations. This would allow for any clarifications and/or confirmations at the outset of the process. Council to review PDP WG charters and determine what works well and what doesn’t. This could include discussions with current PDP leadership teams to establish what helped PDP WGs in their efforts and what did not. PDP WG leadership should engage with GNSO Council in post-PDP evaluation for lessons learnt and sharing experiences.

	<p>Staff should develop a standardized summary template to provide GNSO council with relevant data regarding the effectiveness and efficiency against the scope and work plan</p> <p>Staff will investigate set of project management tools to help WG leadership and council for managing PDPs</p>
--	---

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#12. Notification to Council of changes in work plan</b>
<b>Description</b>	Require PDP WGs to notify the Council when a work plan, and in particular the expected delivery dates for the different PDP milestones, are revised with a rationale for why these changes were made and how this impacts interdependencies.
<b>Objective</b>	Enhance accountability of PDP WGs and oversight by GNSO Council
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future PDP WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	<p>GNSO Council to review all current PDP WG work plans and advise PDP leadership teams that any changes to timeline for deliverables are expected to be communicated to the GNSO Council for approval, including a rationale for these changes.</p> <p>Make better use of project management skills and expertise when developing the work plan</p> <p>Council to provide additional guidance and/or timeframe with regards to the expected delivery of milestones. The council or drafting team should add clear milestones that can be measured and assess progress.</p>

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#13. Review of Working Group Leadership</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>Despite running possibly for multiple years, there is currently no system in place that allows for the regular review of the functioning of PDP WG leadership teams. The Council could run an anonymous survey amongst the PDP WG to obtain feedback on the WG Chair(s) on a regular basis to facilitate its role as a manager of the PDP.</p> <p>Similarly, there is no process in place that allows a WG to challenge and/or replace its leadership team.</p>
<b>Objective</b>	Allow for regular review of PDP leadership team to be able to identify early on potential issues
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future PDP WGs
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Commence a practice of appointing WG leadership for a 12 month period, and require reconfirmation by the WG to continue for subsequent 12 month period/s.

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#14. Make better use of existing flexibility in PDP to allow for data gathering, chartering and termination when it is clear that no consensus can be achieved.</b>
<b>Description</b>	<p>The existing PDP procedures provide for a lot of flexibility with regards to work that is undertaken upfront, such as data gathering to establish whether there is really an issue that needs to be addressed, chartering - creation of a charter drafting team to ensure that the charter questions are clear and unambiguous but also the</p>

	ability to terminate a PDP in case of deadlock. As the manager of the PDP, the GNSO Council should make optimal use of this flexibility to facilitate its role as a manager of the PDP as well as setting up PDP teams as best as possible for success. Care should be taken that PDPs are not used to prove / disprove theories – such information should be gathered beforehand.
<b>Objective</b>	Make use of existing flexibility in PDP procedures to ensure that each PDP is set up for success from the outset, and provide regular opportunities for Council to evaluate a PDP's progress with the power to initiate termination if required.
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future PDP WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Council with support from staff should develop set of criteria to evaluate request for data gathering, and document this as a checklist to be used by a PDP WG. Drafting teams should indicate in the charter if there is a possibility that data gathering may be required in order to respond to the charter questions

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#15. Independent conflict resolution.</b>
<b>Description</b>	In those cases where conflict in WGs is preventing progress and/or existing conflict mechanisms have been exhausted, the Council should have access to independent conflict resolution and/or mediation experts.
<b>Objective</b>	Provide additional mechanisms for conflict resolution for those cases where existing tools have not delivered results.
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future PDP WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Council liaison to be proactive in identifying potential issues / challenges at early stage that may need mitigation and Council attention. Council should consider the establishment of panel of volunteer mediators that can be called upon when appropriate.

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#16. Criteria for PDP WG Updates</b>
<b>Description</b>	GNSO Council to provide criteria for information that needs to be provided by PDP WG leadership teams as part of their updates to be in a position to closely track progress and identify issues at an early stage. This would include a requirement for a PDP WG to provide early warning as well as identify potential risks that could hamper progress.
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure standardized set of information provided by PDP WGs
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future PDP WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Staff should develop a template for reporting with criteria and information to be shared in PDP WG updates such as issues, risks, progress against work plan

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>#17. Resource reporting for PDP WGs</b>
--------------------	--

---

<b>Description</b>	Require PDP WGs to provide regular resource reporting updates to allow for a better tracking of the use of resources and budget as well as giving leadership teams the responsibility for managing these resources.
<b>Objective</b>	Allow for resource tracking and oversight, enhancing accountability
<b>Focus</b>	Current and future PDP WGs.
<b>Possible Implementation Steps</b>	Staff should collect information regarding budget and resources to be allocated for PDP. Charter drafting team should identify the resources and needs during the chartering process GNSO Council to work with ICANN Staff to adapt fact sheets used for review teams and EPDP to monitor and report on progress as well as resources for PDP WGs.

## 5 Proposed Next Steps

This completes the initial phase of the GNSO PDP 3.0 Project.

It is intended that, following adoption by the GNSO Council of the recommendations noted in the Executive Summary as having support of the Council as a whole, the Council will further develop and take action on the various proposed implementation strategies documented here.

The following improvements, which have varying degrees of support from the full Council, are proposed to be further developed and considered by the GNSO Council for potential adoption in the near term:

**Improvement #7: Creation of Cooperative Teams**

**Improvement #8: PDP Plenary or Model**

**Improvement #10: Document positions at the outset**

Additional proposed improvements stemming from comments received during consultations of these recommendations which are documented in this report should be considered alongside these three improvements.

# Annex A – WG Membership Numbers

