**REVISED WORK PLAN AND SCHEDULE FOR JURISDICTION SUBGROUP**

1. **GENERAL APPROACH**
	1. The Subgroup will identify **Issues** before it goes on to explore **Remedies.**
	2. There must be broad agreement in the Subgroup that a proposed issue is in fact an **Issue** and that the **Issue** is one that falls within the remit of the Subgroup.
	3. For each **Issue,** the group will then look at proposed remedies.
		1. The group should not discuss a **Remedy** until an **Issue** has been identified that requires discussion of that **Remedy**.
		2. The Subgroup needs to consider how a proposed remedy would resolve the **Issue** (or fail to resolve the Issue or even make it worse)..
		3. The Subgroup also needs to consider the effects and consequences of the **Remedy**.
		4. The Subgroup needs to consider how the **Potential Remedy** would enhance ICANN’s accountability (or have no effect on ICANN’s accountability or even hamper ICANN’s accountability).
2. **OVERVIEW OF WORK AND DOCUMENTS TO DATE**
	1. The Subgroup worked to Identify each of the Multiple Layers of Jurisdiction, including:[[1]](#footnote-1)
		1. The "influences" of "multiple layers" of ICANN's jurisdiction(s), i.e. how each of the multiple layers affects ICANN’s accountability mechanisms and the actual operation of policies (in ways that affect ICANN’s accountability)..
			1. These influences may be positive (the effect on ICANN’s accountability mechanisms and the actual operation of policies enhances ICANN’s accountability), neutral or negative (the effect on ICANN’s accountability mechanisms and the actual operation of policies hampers ICANN’s accountability).
		2. The Subgroup did not reach agreement on the scope of the Subgroup’s work, so a topic was chosen that was clearly within scope.
		3. The Subgroup agreed to first discuss and try to answer the following question "What is the influence of ICANN’s existing jurisdiction(s) relating to resolution of disputes (i.e., governing law and venue) on the actual operation of ICANN’s policies and accountability mechanisms?" (the “Influence of ICANN’s Dispute Jurisdiction” document).
			1. This topic was chosen because the Subgroup could agree that this topic was within the scope of the Subgroup.
			2. The Subgroup spent considerable time on this document.
			3. The document remains a work in process.
	2. The Subgroup discussed whether the CCWG could ever recommend that ICANN change its place of incorporation or headquarters location.
		1. The Subgroup did not agree on an answer.
			1. However, the Subgroup did agree that this was being proposed as a remedy, and should therefore be *set aside* until an **Issue** is identified that would potentially be remedied by one or both of these proposals. (See “General Approach,” above).
	3. The Subgroup began discussing one hypothetical proposed issue, dubbed Hypothetical #1.
		1. The Subgroup spent quite some time on this document.
		2. This document remains a work in process.
	4. The Subgroup developed a Questionnaire for the community to provide factual information that would help inform the Subgroup.
		1. The Questionnaire was published February 9 and the response period closes on April 17.
		2. A small group has been formed to review and evaluate responses using a method to be proposed by the small group and approved by the Subgroup.
	5. The Subgroup also developed a series of Questions for ICANN Legal.
		1. The Questions were sent to ICANN legal on March 2.
		2. Responses were received on April 10.
	6. The Subgroup began a comprehensive review of the litigations in which ICANN has been a party (listed on ICANN’s website).
		1. Members of the Subgroup will volunteer to review all of the litigations.
		2. A summary sheet was developed to be completed by the reviewer of each case.
		3. The cases will be reviewed with the entire Subgroup.
		4. This project is currently underway.
	7. The Subgroup stopped active deliberation on the Influence of ICANN’s Dispute Jurisdiction and Hypothetical #1 documents until the responses were received from the Questionnaire and the Questions for ICANN Legal, and until the Litigation Review was completed, for the following reasons.
		1. The Subgroup would be better able to move forward on these documents with the additional information provided by these inputs.
		2. The documents remain open for contributions by the Subgroup. If there are substantial contributions they will be discussed by the Subgroup.
3. **OPEN ISSUES**
	1. Scope of the Subgroup has not been resolved.
		1. Need to better define questions to answer and work to be done.
		2. Need to clarify “mandate” of the Subgroup, including “gap analysis” to be "confirmed" per Annex 12.
		3. Need to clarify deliverable(s).
		4. Need to revise timeline and target.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Month** | **Meetings** | **Activities and Milestones** | **Detailed Overview of Work** |
| Aug 2016 | 1st Meeting | Initial discussion | Discuss processOverview of Issues |
| Sep 2016 | 4 Meetings | Subgroup discussionsBegin work on Work Plan and Schedule | Close reading of Staff Paper (as revised by Subgroup)Detailed discussion of ScopeInitial discussion of GoalsDevelop Work PlanDevelop Schedule |
| Oct 2016 | 4 Meetings | First discussion with CCWGBegin work on Multiple Layers of JurisdictionBegin work on Influence of ICANN’s existing jurisdiction(s) relating to resolution of disputes on operation of ICANN’s policies and accountability mechanisms | Complete Scope discussionDetailed discussion of GoalsContinue work on Work Plan & ScheduleInitial discussion of DeliverableHyderabad Planning  |
| Nov 2016ICANN57 | 4 Meetings | Plenary F2F and discussion of work of SubgroupInitial Work Plan and Schedule completedBegin work on Questionnaire | Continue work on Influence of ICANN’s existing jurisdiction(s) relating to resolution of disputes on operation of ICANN’s policies and accountability mechanismsContinue work on Multiple Layers of Jurisdiction |
| Dec 2016 | 3-4 Meetings | Second discussion with CCWG (first SUBSTANTIVE) | Continue work on Influence of ICANN’s existing jurisdiction(s) relating to resolution of disputes on operation of ICANN’s policies and accountability mechanismsContinue work on Questionnaire |
| Jan 2017 | 4 Meetings | Refining work; deliverable getting close to readyBegin Review of ICANN Litigation |  Continue work on Influence of ICANN’s existing jurisdiction(s) relating to resolution of disputes on operation of ICANN’s policies and accountability mechanismsContinue work on QuestionnaireBegin work on Review of ICANN Litigation (24 Jan) |
| Feb 2017 | 2 Meetings | Questionnaire published 9 FebQuestions for ICANN Legal sent to Plenary on 24 Feb | Finalize and publish QuestionnaireWork on Questions for ICANN LegalContinue work on Influence of ICANN’s existing jurisdiction(s) relating to resolution of disputes on operation of ICANN’s policies and accountability mechanismsBegin work on Jurisdiction Hypothetical #1 |
| Mar 2017ICANN58 | 3 Meetings | Questions for ICANN Legal sent to ICANN Legal 2 March | Continue review of ICANN’s litigation |
| Apr 2017 | 3 Meetings | Questionnaire Response Period Closes 17 AprilResponses to Questions for ICANN Legal received by Subgroup 10 April | Review and evaluation questionnaire responses (complete by end of month?)Review and evaluate responses from ICANN LegalContinue review of ICANN’s litigation (complete by end of month?)Subgroup revisits scope issue? |
| May 2017 | 4 Meetings |  | Return to work on deliverable, with goal of a discussion draft for ICANN59 |
| Jun 2017ICANN59 | 4 Meetings |  | Revision of draft and submission to CCWG Plenary by end of month? |
| Jul 2017 | 4 Meetings |  | Public comment period |
| Aug 2017 | 4 Meetings |  | Review comments and revise deliverable |
| Sep 2017 | 4 Meetings |  |  |
| Oct 2017 | 4 Meetings |  |  |
| Nov 2017ICANN60 | 4 Meetings? |  |  |

1. Underlining indicates a document prepared by the Subgroup. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)