

Working Group Approach

Deliverable V: Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams, as defined in the PDP Manual, are expected to function and operate.
Objective: Provide guidance on how feedback from the policy apparatus is needed in the implementation process, including mechanisms to adjust policy in response to learning from implementation

Deliverable I: A set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures.
Objective: Provide a clearer understanding of the potential goals and end states of the PDP and any alternatives to the PDP.

- A1. What guidance do ICANN core values (Bylaws Article 1, Section 2) directly provide with regard to policy development work and policy implementation efforts? (e.g., multi-stakeholder participation)
- B2. What guidance do other ICANN Core values provide that relate *indirectly* to policy development and policy implementation? (e.g., effective & timely processes)
- C3. Questions for discussion' contained in the Policy versus Implementation Draft Framework prepared by ICANN staff (<http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/policy-implementation-31jan13-en.htm>)

Deliverable II: A process for developing gTLD policy, perhaps in the form of "Policy Guidance", including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process (for developing policy other than "Consensus Policy") instead of a GNSO Policy Development Process.
Objective: Improve the collection/documentation of gTLD- related policies and best practices created by the GNSO

- A3. 'Questions for discussion' contained in the Policy versus Implementation Draft Framework prepared by ICANN staff (<http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/policy-implementation-31jan13-en.htm>)
- B4. What lessons can be learned from past experience?
 - a. What are the consequences of an action being considered "policy" vs. "implementation"?
 - b. Why does it matter if something is "policy" or "implementation"?
 - c. Under what circumstances, if any, may the GNSO Council make recommendations or state positions to the Board on matters of policy and implementation as a representative of the GNSO as a whole?
 - d. How do we avoid the current morass of outcome-derived labeling (i.e., I will call this policy because I want certain consequences/"handling instructions" to be attached to it)?
 - e. Can we answer these questions so the definitions of "policy" and "implementation" matter less, if at all?
- C5. What options are available for policy ("Consensus Policy" [2] or other) and implementation efforts and what are the criteria for determining which should be used?
 - a. Are policy and implementation on a spectrum rather than binary?
 - b. What are the flavors of "policy" and what consequences should attach to each flavor?
 - c. What happens if you change those consequences?

Deliverable IV: Criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation.
Objective: Provide a framework for implementation work that is predictable, consistent, efficient and timely and that includes appropriate multi-stakeholder feedback

Deliverable III: A framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO Policy Recommendations.
Objective: Provide a better understanding of the transition between policy and implementation stages, with expected outcomes from each

- A4. What lessons can be learned from past experience?
 - a. What are the consequences of an action being considered "policy" vs. "implementation"?
 - b. Why does it matter if something is "policy" or "implementation"?
 - c. Under what circumstances, if any, may the GNSO Council make recommendations or state positions to the Board on matters of policy and implementation as a representative of the GNSO as a whole?
 - d. How do we avoid the current morass of outcome-derived labeling (i.e., I will call this policy because I want certain consequences/"handling instructions" to be attached to it)?
 - e. Can we answer these questions so the definitions of "policy" and "implementation" matter less, if at all?
- B5. What options are available for policy ("Consensus Policy" [2] or other) and implementation efforts and what are the criteria for determining which should be used?
 - a. Are policy and implementation on a spectrum rather than binary?
 - b. What are the flavors of "policy" and what consequences should attach to each flavor?
 - c. What happens if you change those consequences?

- A4. What lessons can be learned from past experience?
 - a. What are the consequences of an action being considered "policy" vs. "implementation"?
 - b. Why does it matter if something is "policy" or "implementation"?
 - c. Under what circumstances, if any, may the GNSO Council make recommendations or state positions to the Board on matters of policy and implementation as a representative of the GNSO as a whole?
 - d. How do we avoid the current morass of outcome-derived labeling (i.e., I will call this policy because I want certain consequences/"handling instructions" to be attached to it)?
 - e. Can we answer these questions so the definitions of "policy" and "implementation" matter less, if at all?

- B5. What options are available for policy ("Consensus Policy" [2] or other) and implementation efforts and what are the criteria for determining which should be used?
 - a. Are policy and implementation on a spectrum rather than binary?
 - b. What are the flavors of "policy" and what consequences should attach to each flavor?
 - c. What happens if you change those consequences?

- C6. Who determines the choice between whether something is policy or implementation?
 - a. How is policy set/recommended/adopted and do different paths lead to different "flavors"?
 - b. Who makes these determinations and how?
 - c. How are the policy vs implementation decisions reviewed and approved?
 - d. What happens if the reviewing bodies come to a deadlock?

- D7. What is the process by which this identification, analysis, review and approval work is done?
 - a. How are "policy and implementation" issues first identified (before, during and after implementation)?
 - b. What is the role of the GNSO in implementation?
 - c. In order to maintain multi-stakeholder processes, once policy moves to implementation how should the community be involved in a way that is meaningful and effective?
 - d. Should policy staff be involved through the implementation process to facilitate continuity of the MSM process that already occurred?