|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/strategic-plan-2016-2020-10oct14-en.pdf | |
| Alignment with Strategic Objectives | |
| **Goal** | Encourage community role in implementation. |
| **Project/Recommendation** | Recommendation 8 states: That Working Groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed. |

|  |
| --- |
| Scope Description |
| Scope Statement |
| 1. Staff will review the Final Report of the Policy & Implementation Working Group that was adopted by the GNSO Council. See the Final Report at: <https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf>. 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. 2. 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. 3. 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. |
| **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 |
| 1. Staff reviewed the Final Report of the Policy & Implementation Working Group that was adopted by the GNSO Council. See the Final Report at: <https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf>. 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. 2. 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).” 3. Staff hereby presents the results of the review to the Working Group. 4. 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 |
| As the manager of the PDP GNSO Council is expected to ensure that its GNSO Operating Procedures are followed. |

|  |
| --- |
| Necessary to proceed |
| Next Phase Activities/Resources |
| None. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewers** | | |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Date Sent** |
| GNSO Review Working Group |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Approvers** | | | |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Approval Status** | **Date** |
| GNSO Council |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Revision History** | | | |
| **Date** | **Version** | **Description** | **Author** |
| 22 Feb 2017 | V1 | Original Draft | Julie Hedlund, Policy Director |
| 23 Feb 2017 | V2 | 1. 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. 2. 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. | Julie Hedlund, Policy Director |
|  |  |  |  |

**Attachments, as applicable:**

* None