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ICANN Bylaws and Policy Development Process (PDP) Manuel set out the prescribed steps and requirements for a GNSO PDP, but outside of those required steps, there is substantial flexibility.

Through organizational reviews as well as initiatives such as PDP 3.0, numerous improvements have been developed and implemented.

Recently a number of parallel conversations that have highlighted that there may be other aspects of the PDP for which improvements should be considered.

There are also some items on the ADR related to PDP improvements.

Paper aims to provide a clear picture of these parallel initiatives and proposes an approach for managing these to avoid overlap and ensure complementarity.
Recent improvement discussions / initiatives & Pending work

1. **Background**
2. **Overview**
3. **Categories**
4. **Tracker**
5. **Examples**
6. **Discussion**
Not all improvements are equal

Proposed Categorization

1. Improvements that are easy to implement and not requiring any changes to existing processes and/or procedures;

2. Improvements that require some effort to implement, but not requiring any changes to existing processes and procedures;

3. Improvements that require higher level of effort to implement and/or likely requiring changes to existing processes and procedures.
PDP Improvements Tracker

Staff Support Team to create Tracker (Living Document)

Staff Support Team to include suggested improvements

Staff Support Team to include proposed category & next steps

GNSO Council to review and confirm

Staff Support Team to coordinate next steps

Schedule regular review sessions
### CATEGORY I: EASY TO IMPLEMENT AND NOT REQUIRING ANY CHANGES TO EXISTING PROCESSES AND/OR PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relates to Initiative / Improvement</th>
<th>Proposed Next Step</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Council Input / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council SPS:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATEGORY II: SOME EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT, BUT NOT REQUIRING ANY CHANGES TO EXISTING PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relates to Initiative / Improvement</th>
<th>Proposed Next Step</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Council Input / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modifying Consensus Policies:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Discussion

- Is this approach helpful? If yes:
  - How to ensure broader community input as not all improvements may be Council specific?
  - How regular should review take place?
  - How to best plan for items that fall in category 3 (Improvements that require higher level of effort to implement and/or likely requiring changes to existing processes and procedures)?
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