

GNSO Review Recommendations Implementation Plan – **Strawman Draft**

Status of This Document

This Implementation Plan Straw Man has been developed by ICANN Policy Support Staff and provided for consideration to the GNSO Review Working Group.

Preamble

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council adopted the [Charter](#) of the GNSO Review Working Group during its meeting on 21 July 2016. This Working Group is tasked to develop an implementation plan for the [GNSO Review recommendations](#) which were recently [adopted](#) by the ICANN Board.

Table of Contents

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
- 1. OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS 4
- 2. PRIORITIZATION AND DEPENDENCIES 6
- 3. METHODOLOGY 25
- 4. TIMELINE 26
- ANNEX 1: BACKGROUND 27
- ANNEX 2: GNSO REVIEW RECOMMENDATION CHARTER 29

Executive Summary

On 14 April 2016 the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the [GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis](#). On 21 July 2016 the GNSO Council adopted the [Charter](#) of the GNSO Review Working Group. This Working Group is tasked to develop an implementation plan for the [GNSO Review recommendations](#) which were recently [adopted](#) by the ICANN Board. This implementation plan will be submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration, following which it will be submitted to the ICANN Board.

[INSERT SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PLAN]

1. Overview of Recommendations

The scope of the GNSO review was to assess the extent to which the improvements resulting from the 2008 review have been implemented and whether they successfully addressed the concerns that led to the review, and to consider whether the GNSO, as it is currently constituted, can respond to its changing environment. The GNSO review recommendations were organized into the following themes:

1. Participation & Representation;
2. Continuous Development;
3. Transparency; and
4. Alignment with ICANN's future.

In its evaluation of the 36 recommendations, GNSO Review Working Party evaluated them based upon several criteria:

- Ease or difficulty of implementation,
- Cost of implementation,
- Whether it is aligned with the strategic plan of the GNSO,
- Whether it impacts existing or other work,
- Whether the Working Party required additional information, and,
- Whether the recommendation was a low, medium, or high priority.

The GNSO Review Working Party reviewed the recommendations and conducted a [Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis](#), which it submitted to the GNSO Council on 28 February 2016. In its analysis document, the Working Party recommended to adopt all but three recommendations (#21, #23 and #32).

On 14 April 2016 the GNSO Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis. In its adoption the GNSO Council amended the Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis to support the implementation of recommendation 21, to which the Working Party in turn agreed. In June 2016 the ICANN Board of Directors approved the Final Report including 34 recommendations.

The GNSO Review Working Group suggests the following grouping of the recommendations based on subject matter and dependencies:

- PDP Improvements, Effectiveness, and Implementation;
- GNSO Council, Stakeholder Group, and Constituency Appointments, Members, Membership, Statements of Interest, Procedures, and Support; and
- Working Group Performance, Participation, Meeting Tools, Self-Evaluation, Outreach, Volunteers, and Leadership.

In addition, the GNSO Review Working Group suggests following the prioritization of the recommendations as proposed by the GNSO Review Working Party, but to also simultaneously address those recommendations that it has deemed are already underway or which the GNSO Review Working Group may deem completed. This would then be the order of priority, with recommendations grouped within each phase by category:

1. **Phase One: Work Already Underway;**
2. **Phase Two: High Priority Recommendations;** and
3. **Phase Three: Medium and Low Priority Recommendations.**

See detailed descriptions of each phase in Section 2 below, and a timeline for each phase in Section 3.

2. Prioritization and Dependencies

The recommendations are in a suggested order of priority based on the guidance provided by the GNSO Review Working Party in Annex A of its report to the ICANN Board.

In addition, the recommendations are grouped by the following categories, coded by color for ease of identification:

- PDP Improvements, Effectiveness, and Implementation;
- GNSO Council, Stakeholder Group, and Constituency Appointments, Members, Membership, Statements of Interest, Procedures, and Support; and
- Working Group Performance, Participation, Meeting Tools, Self-Evaluation, Outreach, Volunteers, and Leadership.

Each recommendation includes sections for dependencies, information on who will implement the recommendations, resource requirements, and budget effects. Examples include:

- **Dependencies:** list any other projects or activities that are dependent on the implementations of this recommendation or which this recommendation is dependent on. These also could include studies, metrics, and data collection.
- **Who will implement:** indicate whether staff or the community, or a combination will implement the recommendations.
- **Resource requirements:** indicate the resources required to accomplish the recommendations, include staff and volunteer considerations.
- **Budget effects:** indicate whether costs are associated with the implementation of the recommendation and in what areas, such as staff increases, translations, studies, etc.

Finally, the GNSO Review Working Group suggests the following phases for implementation, some of which may overlap depending on the workload identified:

Phase One: Work Already Underway. Create sub-groups as recommended (i.e. PDP Improvements color coded Blue, Membership color coded Brown and Working Groups color coded magenta). This would allow the WG to address the “low hanging fruit” because much of this work is already underway or recently completed and may just require oversight or confirmation that the work underway meets the intent of the GNSO Review WG recommendations.

Phase Two: High Priority Recommendations. Again, create sub-groups as above. This would allow the WG to secondarily address those priorities the Working Party, Council and the OEC have all recognized as priority work.

Phase Three: Medium and Low Recommendations. Using the same sub group categories as above. This would allow the WG to place as the final phase those recommendations that were deemed a medium or lower priority.

3.1 Phase 1: Work Already Underway

The suggestion is to dispatch those items that were identified by the Working Party as already underway first and simultaneously with the implementation of those recommendations identified in the first batch. As some work is already being performed and/or recently completed it would seem logical to address these recommendations at the same time as those identified in the first batch. These also are organized into the three categories identified above, and then by high, medium, and low priority within each category.

Comment [A1]: This section will need to be updated to reflect the current status of work for those projects that have been identified as meeting the intent or part thereof of the GNSO Review recommendations.

PDP Improvements, Effectiveness, and Implementation

| Recommendation 8 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That Working Groups should have an explicit role in responding to implementation issues related to policy they have developed. |
| Prioritization | High |
| Working Party Comments | Agree but work is already done elsewhere. The already approved Policy & Implementation Working Group recommendations cover this. Ongoing GNSO action item: ensure it happens in all future policy implementation efforts. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | GNSO Council is overseeing implementation of final recommendations of the Policy & Implementation Working Group. Final Report: http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-final-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf Workspace: http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2015/policy-implementation Staff support: Marika Konings |
| Dependencies | Implementation of the recommendations of the Policy & Implementation Working Group. |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | Staff will indicate actions taken to implement the Policy & Implementation Working Group recommendations. The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

| Recommendation 15 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO continues current PDP Improvements Project initiatives to address timeliness of the PDP. |
| Prioritization | High |
| Working Party Comments | Already being done. GNSO action items: ensure that efforts to improve the timeliness of PDPs continue. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement | The GNSO Council, as the manager of policy development processes, |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| effort / staff lead | oversees this ongoing effort. There is also now the possibility to create a 'expedited PDP' in place: https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/annex-4-epdp-manual-16feb16-en.pdf Staff support: Marika Konings |
| Dependencies | None |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | Staff has confirmed that the procedures have been adopted. The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

| Recommendations 16 and 18 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | Recommendation 16: That a policy impact assessment (PIA) be included as a standard part of any policy process. Recommendation 18: That the GNSO Council evaluate post implementation policy effectiveness on an ongoing basis (rather than periodically as stated in the current GNSO Operating Procedures); and that these evaluations are analyzed by the GNSO Council to monitor and improve the drafting and scope of future PDP Charters and facilitate the effectiveness of GNSO policy outcomes over time. |
| Prioritization | High |
| Working Party Comments | GNSO action items: i) Develop an analytical framework for assessing policy impacts; ii) determine what should be measured and corresponding metrics. iii) Change the PDP Guidelines to make post-implementation policy effectiveness evaluation an ongoing rather than a periodic process and to include an assessment period at the start of the implementation process; iv) develop guidelines for how implementation of policies should be evaluated. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | The GNSO Council, as the manager of policy development processes, oversees this ongoing effort; also featured in the Final Report of the Data and Metrics for Policy-Making (DMPM) Working Group DMPM Final Report: http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/dmpm-final-09oct15-en.pdf PDP Manual: http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/annex-2-pdp-manual-16feb16-en.pdf PDP Manual prescribes in Article 17: "Periodic assessment of PDP recommendations and policies is an important tool to guard against unexpected results or inefficient processes arising from GNSO policies. PDP Teams are encouraged to include proposed timing, assessment tools, and metrics for review as part of their Final Report. In addition, the GNSO Council may at any time initiate reviews of past policy recommendations." Staff lead: Marika Konings, Steve Chan |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Dependencies | Implementation of the DMPM recommendations. |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | <p>Staff will indicate when the DMPM recommendations are complete and whether these actions have been taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop an analytical framework for assessing policy impacts. 2. Determine what should be measured and corresponding metrics. 3. Change the PDP Guidelines to make post-implementation policy effectiveness evaluation an ongoing rather than a periodic process and to include an assessment period at the start of the implementation process. 4. Develop guidelines for how implementation of policies should be evaluated. <p>Staff will provide recent experience to review some policies that have been implemented. Look at DMPM strawman to assist the community in identifying metrics that can be used to test policy effectiveness.</p> <p>The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented.</p> |

| Recommendation 14 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO further explores PDP 'chunking' and examines each potential PDP as to its feasibility for breaking into discrete stages. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Allow GNSO flexibility to determine when chunking (or phases) is appropriate; needs refinement. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | <p>The GNSO Council, as the manager of policy development processes, oversees this ongoing effort. Ongoing broad-subject PDPs are often chunked and divided into phases and/or subgroups. In case of the PDP on Review of all RPMs in all gTLDs the phasing has even been added to the PDP Charter. In the case of the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures the work has been divided among four work tracks each managed by a sub team.</p> <p>RPM Charter: http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/rpm-charter-15mar16-en.pdf</p> <p>Staff lead: Marika Konings, Mary Wong</p> |
| Dependencies | None. |
| Who Will Implement? | Already implemented. PDP Working Groups decide whether to adopt. |
| Resource Requirements | Depends on each PDP Working Group. |
| Budget Effects | Staff resources. |
| Actions | The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

| Recommendation 31 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in the GNSO Policy Development Process continue its two work streams as priority projects. As a part of its work it should consider how the GAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the Working Group of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Ongoing work. The Working Party encourages the ongoing work of the Consultation Group and suggests that it consider whether 'the GAC could appoint a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.' GNSO action item: Send a letter to the GAC expressing appreciation for the work of the Consultation Group, encourage continuation of the group and ask whether it might be worthwhile for the GAC to consider appointing 'a non-binding, non-voting liaison to the WG of each relevant GNSO PDP as a means of providing timely input.' (An alternative approach here may be to first test this with the GNSO GAC liaison.) |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | GNSO Council holds the lead to send letter and coordinate with GAC. GAC-GNSO Consultation Group wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg Staff support: Marika Konings |
| Dependencies | Send letter as described above to the GAC. |
| Who Will Implement? | GNSO Council and GAC. |
| Resource Requirements | Community volunteer resources. |
| Budget Effects | Minimal. |
| Actions | GNSO Council sends a letter, or tests this approach with the GNSO GAC liaison. The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

GNSO Council, Stakeholder Group, and Constituency Appointments, Members, Membership, Statements of Interest, Procedures, and Support

| Recommendation 33 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies, and the Nominating Committee, in selecting their candidates for appointment to the GNSO Council, should aim to increase the geographic, gender and cultural diversity of its participants, as defined in ICANN Core Value 4. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Working Party believes work is already being done but |

| | |
|---|--|
| | improvements/metrics need to be made in this area |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | Each Stakeholder Group and Constituency holds the lead for itself. Assistance is provided to them by the GNSO Secretariat and the GNSO policy support staff. Staff lead: Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry |
| Dependencies | Stakeholder Group and Constituency procedures to track diversity. Depends on how diversity is defined. |
| Who Will Implement? | Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. |
| Resource Requirements | Community volunteer resources. |
| Budget Effects | Staff time. |
| Actions | Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies will provide an update on their procedures. The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

| Recommendations 24 and 25 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | <p>Recommendation 24: That the GNSO Council and Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies adhere to the published process for applications for new Constituencies. That the ICANN Board in assessing an application satisfy itself that all parties have followed the published process, subject to which the default outcome is that a new Constituency is admitted. That all applications for new Constituencies, including historic applications, be published on the ICANN website with full transparency of decision-making.</p> <p>Recommendation 25: That the GNSO Council commission the development of, and implement, guidelines to provide assistance for groups wishing to establish a new Constituency</p> |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | <p>Recommendation 24: GNSO action items: i) Determine whether new Constituency application processes are clearly posted and easily accessible, ii) determine what steps are taken to ensure compliance with those processes and whether those steps are adequate; iii) determine if all Constituency applications, including historic ones, are publicly posted along with full transparency of the decision-making process; iv) determine whether or not there is a presumption that a new Constituency should be admitted if all requirements are met and if such a presumption is appropriate; v) determine what process the Board uses to evaluate new Constituency applications and whether they are ensuring process compliance; vi) make recommendations for any modifications to the process, if any.</p> <p>Recommendation 25: GNSO action items: i) Evaluate the effectiveness and accessibility of guidance for new Constituency applications; ii) recommend improvements to the guidance and the available assistance as appropriate.</p> |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | No specific owner for this project. New Constituency/Stakeholder Group application process can be found here: http://gns0.icann.org/en/about/form-new-constituency.htm |
| Dependencies | Completion of the action items identified above. |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff and GNSO Council. |
| Resource Requirements | Staff and community volunteers. |
| Budget Effects | Staff time. |
| Actions | Staff will undertake an evaluation as follows and provide a report to the GNSO Council and the Working Group: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine whether new Constituency application processes are clearly posted and easily accessible. 2. Determine what steps are taken to ensure compliance with those processes and whether those steps are adequate. 3. Determine if all Constituency applications, including historic ones, are publicly posted along with full transparency of the decision-making process. 4. Determine whether or not there is a presumption that a new Constituency should be admitted if all requirements are met and if such a presumption is appropriate. 5. Determine what process the Board uses to evaluate new Constituency applications and whether they are ensuring process compliance. 6. Evaluate the effectiveness and accessibility of guidance for new Constituency applications. 7. Recommend improvements to the guidance and the available assistance and modifications to the applications process, as appropriate. <p>The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented.</p> |

| Recommendation 30 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO develop and implement a policy for the provision of administrative support for Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies; and that Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of administrative support they receive. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | The Working Party believes that there is already a procedure for providing some forms of administrative support to Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies but that there is not a procedure for Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to evaluate the effectiveness of the support provided. GNSO action items: i) Identify and review the existing procedures for Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to obtain administrative support; ii) evaluate the adequacy & effectiveness of the existing procedures including whether additional forms of support might be beneficial; iii) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | develop recommendations for improvements to the procedures and new types of support, if any. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | In 2010, a formal "GNSO Toolkit" was developed by ICANN staff that clearly and specifically identified the administrative support that ICANN would provide to GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency communities. Over the next few years, in collaboration with the community, staff developed a specific set of items that would be provided under a "pilot program" by ICANN to provide additional level of admin support service to the community under staff management. In 2014, ICANN introduced a "pilot" contract secretariat program to determine if those services could be effectively and efficiently offered to ICANN community under ICANN management. The pilot effort focused on the non-contracted community, is ongoing, and will continue 2014 can be found here . Staff lead: Rob Hoggarth |
| Dependencies | Evaluation of the "GNSO Toolkit" and "pilot program" |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Staff |
| Actions | Staff will evaluate the "GNSO Toolkit" and "pilot program" and provide a report to the GNSO Council and Working Group. The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

Working Group Performance, Participation, Meeting Tools, Self-Evaluation, Outreach, Volunteers, and Leadership

| Recommendations 10 and 11 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | Recommendation 10: That the GNSO Council develop criteria for Working Groups to engage a professional facilitator/moderator in certain situations. Recommendation 11: That the face-to-face PDP Working Group pilot project be assessed when completed. If the results are beneficial, guidelines should be developed and support funding made available. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | What does it mean to "engage"?; could be costly; develop criteria such as using an internal facilitator; should review existing pilot program already underway and that additional criteria be developed. The PDP Pilot Project has been done for two years. Need to evaluate. GNSO action items: i) Develop guidelines; ii) encourage support funding in the ICANN budget. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement | A pilot program with full-day face-to-face PDP Working Group |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| effort / staff lead | meetings (usually the Friday before an ICANN meeting), led by a facilitator, is already in place. The GNSO Council determines which Group is selected for each meeting. Staff lead: Marika Konings |
| Dependencies | Evaluation of the PDP Working Group Pilot Project. This is work in progress and will go back to the Council for approval, but could pass through this Working Group. |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff |
| Budget Effects | Depends on whether a PDP Working Group requests a moderator/facilitator |
| WG Actions | Staff will provide the results of the reevaluation of the PDP Working Group Pilot Project to the GNSO Council and the GNSO Council may ask this Working Group to review the results. The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

| Recommendation 13 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO Council evaluate and, if appropriate, pilot a technology solution (such as Loomio or similar) to facilitate wider participation in Working Group consensus-based decision making. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Working Party believes in continuous improvement; no specific tool is being recommended; tool must meet need that is currently not being met. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | This is part of the wider remit of the GNSO Review Working Group (taking over from the Standing Committee on GNSO Improvements Implementation (SCI)), which is managed by the GNSO Council SCI wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/5ILT Staff lead: Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund |
| Dependencies | GNSO Review Working Group could consider in its role as the replacement for the SCI. Some Working Groups, such as the PDP Working Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, are exploring the use of Google docs for collaboration. |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Depends on the tool. Tools such as Google Drive are free. |
| Actions | The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented, but may also decide to review this issue in its role as a reviewer of GNSO procedures. |

| Recommendation 19 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | As strategic manager rather than a policy body the GNSO Council should continue to focus on ensuring that a Working Group has been properly constituted, has thoroughly fulfilled the terms of its |

| | |
|---|---|
| | charter and has followed due process. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | Work is already being done. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Status of improvement effort / staff lead | The GNSO Council, as the manager of policy development processes, oversees this ongoing effort. Updates of each PDP are given to the GNSO Council during each ICANN meeting. A post-PDP Working Group self-assessment is undertaken and the results are forwarded to the Council. Staff lead: Marika Konings |
| Dependencies | None |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | The Working Group will determine whether this recommendation has been implemented. |

3.2 Phase 2: High Priority Recommendations

These are the recommendations that were assessed by the Working Party as high priority. They were considered to have agreement by the Working Party to adopt them without modification. These recommendations could be placed in the first batch to be implemented within the first year and could overlap with the implementation of those recommendations that are considered to be underway / and or completed as a result of other activities, but which might need modifications to existing procedures. These also are organized into the three categories identified above, and then by high, medium, and low priority within each category.

GNSO Council, Stakeholder Group, and Constituency Appointments, Members, Membership, Statements of Interest, Procedures, and Support

| Recommendations 26, 27, 28, and 29 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | <p><u>Recommendation 26</u>: That GNSO Council members, Executive Committee members of Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies and members of Working Groups complete and maintain a current, comprehensive Statement of Interest on the GNSO website. Where individuals represent bodies or clients, this information is to be posted. If not posted because of client confidentiality, the participant's interest or position must be disclosed. Failing either of these, the individual not be permitted to participate.</p> <p><u>Recommendation 27</u>: That the GNSO establish and maintain a centralized publicly available list of members and individual participants of every Constituency and Stakeholder Group (with a link to the individual's SOI where one is required and posted).</p> <p><u>Recommendation 28</u>: That section 6.1.2 Membership of Chapter 6.0 Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies: Operating Principles and Participation Guidelines of the GNSO Operating Procedures be</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| | revised to clarify that key clauses are mandatory rather than advisory, and to institute meaningful sanctions for non-compliance where appropriate. Recommendation 29: That Statements of Interest of GNSO Council Members and Executive Committee members of all Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies include the total number of years that person has held leadership positions in ICANN. |
| Prioritization | High -- Recommendations 26 and 27 |
| | Medium -- Recommendation 29 |
| | Low -- Recommendation 28 |
| Working Party Comments | Adopt |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Incorporate into Chapter 5.0 of the GNSO Operating Procedures and Chapter 6.0: Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies: Operating Principles and Participation Guidelines. |
| Who will implement? | The GNSO Review Working Group and GNSO Council. |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Determine whether increased staff resources are necessary |
| Actions | The Working Group will review current procedures and will work with staff on modifications, which will be published for public comment and then provided to the GNSO Council for approval. Staff will amend the GNSO Operating Procedures with the new revisions. |

Working Group Performance, Participation, Meeting Tools, Self-Evaluation, Outreach, Volunteers, and Leadership

| | |
|---|--|
| Recommendation 6 | |
| Independent Examiner’s Final Recommendation | That the GNSO record and regularly publish statistics on Working Group participation (including diversity statistics). |
| Prioritization | High |
| Working Party Comments | Adopt |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Agree on definition of diversity; development of metrics; data collection |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Determine whether increased staff resources are necessary |
| Actions | The GNSO Review Working Party will work with staff to develop a definition of diversity, metrics, and data collection guidelines and present these to the GNSO Council for consideration. Upon approval staff will begin the collect and publish statistics. |

3.3 Phase 3: Medium and Low Priority Recommendations

These are the recommendations that were assessed by the Working Party as medium to low priority. Some also were considered to have agreement by the Working Party to adopt them, but with modifications. These recommendations could be placed in the third batch to be implemented within the second to third years and could overlap with the implementation of the second batch. These also are organized into the three categories identified above, and then by high, medium, and low priority within each category.

PDP Improvements, Effectiveness, and Implementation

| Recommendation 20 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO Council should review annually ICANN's Strategic Objectives with a view to planning future policy development that strikes a balance between ICANN's Strategic Objectives and the GNSO resources available for policy development. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | Modify recommendation - input from GNSO should go into the Strategic Planning process. |
| Working Party Recommendation | That the GNSO Council should participate in developing ICANN's Strategic Objectives and plan future policy development that aligns the Strategic Objectives with GNSO resources. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | None |
| Who Will Implement? | GNSO Council |
| Resource Requirements | GNSO Council resources |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | The Working Group will work with staff to develop a light-weight process for the GNSO Council to participate in the development of ICANN's Strategic Objectives and guidance for planning future policy development that aligns the Strategic Objectives with GNSO resources. |

| Recommendation 21 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO Council should regularly undertake or commission analysis of trends in gTLDs in order to forecast likely requirements for policy and to ensure those affected are well-represented in the policy-making process. |
| Prioritization | N/A - Low |
| Working Party Comments and Rationale | This recommendation is not well phrased and does not conform to what is in the Final Report; additionally, the GNSO Review Working Party does not feel that it is appropriate to implement the recommendation at this time and would be difficult to implement. We did not believe it was in scope for the GNSO to collect and analyze trend data and would be more appropriately completed elsewhere within ICANN such as in other Reviews. |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Working Party Recommendation | Initially, the Working Party recommended to 'not implement' this recommendation. However, the GNSO Council changed this to 'implement with low priority', to which the Working Party agreed. |
| Council Comments | <p>Adopted by Council as 'implement (low priority) in contradiction to Working Party recommendation; Working Party supported Council action.</p> <p>Additional feedback: The Council recommends staff working with the GNSO to institute methods of information sharing of highly relevant research related to gTLDs to help the GNSO community members increase their knowledge base and ability to analyze potential impact (low priority)". The GNSO Working Party agrees that this modification addresses its concerns with the original recommendation and supports the modification because it benefits the community for the GNSO to be better informed about the trends and developments in the gTLD space.</p> |
| Dependencies | <p>Develop staff briefings: Aiming for the GNSO to be better informed on policy discussions. GNSO should consider working with staff to ensure that adequate briefings are provided on work being done, as opposed to the GNSO undertaking or commissioning the work itself. General information about the elements of the gTLD space regardless of what PDP happens to be taking place at the time would be valuable general information and knowledge sharing for the GNSO community.</p> <p>Consider recommendations of the Data and Metrics for Policy-Making (DMPM) Working Group: There is a lot of information out there which may generate empirical data that will help inform the community. Concern with the recommendation is that it effectively creates a commitment on the part of the GNSO Council, which was not supported by the study conducted by Westlake.</p> <p>Recommendation is not about studies to help inform PDPs, but rather to forecast the need for future PDP work. There have been a number of studies in the past that have informed PDPs.</p> <p>Consider CCT-RT Data: There is a considerable amount of data being collected to inform the CCT-RT that could serve as a baseline for future collection.</p> |
| Who Will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | Staff will work with the GNSO to institute methods of information sharing of highly relevant research related to gTLDs to help the GNSO community members increase their knowledge base and ability to analyze potential impact (low priority)". These could include regular staff briefings, implementing the recommendations of the DMPM Working Group, and CCT-RT data. |

GNSO Council, Stakeholder Group, and Constituency Appointments, Members, Membership, Statements of Interest, Procedures, and Support

| Recommendation 7 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies engage more deeply with community members whose first language is other than English, as a means to overcoming language barriers. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Include summaries in multiple languages; combine with other similar recommendations; further discussions with representatives from Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies together and see what needs are before the Working Party makes a recommendation. |
| Working Party Recommendation | That Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies strive to overcome language barriers by participating in the Working Group established under Recommendation 35 . |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Rewording may need to be adjusted as it refers to the Working Group mentioned under recommendation 35 , which was deemed impractical during feedback. Consultation with Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies. Dependencies with Recommendations 6 -- definition of diversity, metrics, and data collection guidelines, 33, 35; 12 (re: real-time translation); and also possibly 1. |
| Who will implement? | Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies |
| Resource Requirements | Community volunteer and staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Depends on the solution; costs could be high |
| Actions | Implement following the implementation of recommendation 6. The GNSO Review Working Party will work with staff to develop possible solutions to reduce language barriers. |

| Recommendation 35 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO Council establish a Working Group, whose membership specifically reflects the demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity of the Internet as a whole, to recommend to Council ways to reduce barriers to participation in the GNSO by non- English speakers and those with limited command of English. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | The metrics used to measure diversity should be specified with more consideration to what can actually be defined and measured. |
| Working Party Recommendation | That the GNSO Council establish a Working Group to recommend ways to reduce barriers to participation by non-English speakers and those with limited command of English. To the extent practicable, the members of the Working Group should be diverse and reflect demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Dependencies | <p>Develop and Gather Metrics: Metrics needed at Stakeholder Group/Constituency, Working Group, and Council levels on what people feel are the key metrics that matter on supporting diversity commitment.</p> <p>Data Storage Considerations: How would the data be stored? Under what privacy policy?</p> <p>Feasibility of Real-Time Translation: So long as PDP calls are in English and convenient to specific time zones, current meeting procedures and tools may discourage diverse participation. Actions such as translations of calls need to be put in place to encourage diverse participation.</p> <p>Dependencies with Recommendations 6 (which must first be implemented) and 33; 12 (re: real-time translation); and also possibly 1.</p> |
| Who will implement? | GNSO Council with staff support |
| Resource Requirements | Staff and community volunteer resources |
| Budget Effects | Depends on level of data collection and also cost of real time translation |
| Actions | Implement following the implementation of recommendation 6. The GNSO Council should establish a charter drafting team to for the Working Group; once approved staff will issue a call for volunteers. |

| Recommendation 22 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO Council develop a competency-based framework, which its members should use to identify development needs and opportunities. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | Reword recommendation: develop a framework to identify training needs for PDPs so that members have appropriate skills and background to participate effectively in the PDP. This training is not intended to address technical issues. |
| Working Party Recommendation | That the GNSO Council develop a technical competency-based expectation of its members and provide training on the PDP. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | None |
| Who will implement? | GNSO Council and staff |
| Resource Requirements | GNSO Council and staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Depends on the training options |
| WG Actions | Staff will develop a competency framework implementation plan and provide it to the GNSO Review Working Group and GNSO Council for approval. |

Working Group Performance, Participation, Meeting Tools, Self-Evaluation, Outreach, Volunteers, and Leadership

| Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | <p>Recommendation 1: That the GNSO develop and monitor metrics to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of current outreach strategies and pilot programs with regard to GNSO Working Groups.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: That the GNSO develop and fund more targeted programs to recruit volunteers and broaden participation in PDP WGs, given the vital role volunteers play in Working Groups and policy development.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: That the GNSO Council reduce or remove cost barriers to volunteer participation in Working Groups.</p> |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | <p>Adopt – Need strategic goals, objectives, and KPIs - themes around problems that we want to solve. Should measure the shared effectiveness between ICANN and community.</p> <p>In-depth program should be developed; stronger volunteer drive that includes metrics to capture volunteers based on outreach efforts.</p> <p>GNSO Council should not determine how finances are allocated to Working Group members; what are cost barriers (time and costs); training (wiki for example); identify cost barriers.</p> |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Some overlap with recommendations 12, and 34; definition and development of metrics. |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Determine whether increased staff resources are necessary |
| Actions | <p>With the GNSO, staff will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop strategic goals, objectives, and KPIs. Develop measurements of the shared effectiveness between ICANN and community. 2. Develop in-depth program with a stronger volunteer drive that includes metrics to capture volunteers based on outreach efforts. 3. Determine cost barriers and solutions. |

| Recommendations 5 and 9 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | <p>Recommendation 5: That, during each Working Group self-assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered.</p> <p>Recommendation 9: That a formal Working Group leadership assessment program be developed as part of the overall training and development program.</p> |
| Prioritization | Medium |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Working Party Comments | Adopt |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Modify Working Group Self-Assessment Survey and include leadership assessment. |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Determine whether increased staff resources are necessary |
| Actions | Staff will modify the Working Group Self-Assessment Survey. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Recommendation 12 | |
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That ICANN assess the feasibility of providing a real-time transcription service in audio conferences for Working Group meetings. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Adopt and consider work already done in the ALAC. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Need to determine feasibility and cost |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Cost could be significant |
| Actions | Staff will review work already done in the ALAC and propose possible approaches for the GNSO. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Recommendation 17 | |
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the practice of Working Group self-evaluation be incorporated into the PDP; and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP. |
| Prioritization | Medium |
| Working Party Comments | Adopt |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Modify the PDP manual to include Working Group self-evaluation. |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | The Working Group will review current procedures and will work with staff on modifications, which will be published for public comment and then provided to the GNSO Council for approval. Staff will amend the GNSO Operating Procedures with the new revisions. |

| Recommendation 4 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That the GNSO Council introduce non-financial rewards and recognition for volunteers. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | Adopt; no financial rewards - such as travel funding. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | None |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | Staff will develop suggestions for non-financial rewards and recognition for GNSO Council and Working Group consideration. |

| Recommendation 34 | |
|---|---|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That PDP Working Groups rotate the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | Adopt; some groups already do this, but it's not a standard. Add some language to flag that this should be tested for effectiveness. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Test with existing Working Groups for effectiveness |
| Who will Implement? | Staff |
| Resource Requirements | Staff resources |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | Staff should review Working Groups where rotations are used and determine effectiveness. |

| Recommendation 36 | |
|---|--|
| Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation | That, when approving the formation of a PDP Working Group, the GNSO Council requires that its membership represent as far as reasonably practicable the geographic, cultural and gender diversity of the Internet as a whole. Additionally, that when approving GNSO Policy, the ICANN Board explicitly satisfy itself that the GNSO Council undertook these actions when approving the formation of a PDP Working Group. |
| Prioritization | Low |
| Working Party Comments | Reword recommendation so that it corresponds to the process that Council goes through in terms of approving a PDP, forming a working group, etc. and that Council review accomplishment toward achieving diversity and proper representation of all stakeholders; begin data collection as soon as possible. The metrics used to measure diversity should be specified with more consideration to what can actually be defined and measured. |
| Working Party Recommendation | That, when approving the formation of a PDP Working Group, the GNSO Council strive for its membership to be diverse and reflect demographic, cultural, gender and age diversity. When approving |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| | GNSO Policy, the Board should take into consideration if reasonable measures were taken to achieve such diversity. |
| Council Comments | Adopted by Council as recommended by Working Party. |
| Dependencies | Dependencies with Recommendations 6 -- definition of diversity, metrics, and data collection guidelines, 33, 35; 12 (re: real-time translation); and also possibly 1. |
| Who will Implement? | GNSO Council and ICANN Board |
| Resource Requirements | None |
| Budget Effects | Minimal |
| Actions | The Working Group should review this recommendation following implementation of Recommendations 6 -- definition of diversity, metrics, and data collection guidelines, 33, 35; 12 (re: real-time translation); and also possibly 1. |

3. Methodology

ICANN has developed project plan charter templates for implementing recommendations. These were originally developed for the ATRT2 implementation, but can easily be applied to the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations. This format follows best practices under project management principles and guidelines and is a standard practice that ICANN is using across all implementations. Keep in mind that since there are 34 recommendations it is not necessary to create a project plan for each recommendation. Rather, several recommendations could be combined into one project charter plan. See the template in Annex 1 below.

The GNSO Review Recommendation Charter recognizes the existence of a project and supports the decision to further refine the project solution. This charter signifies consensus on the vision, scope, authority and overall deliverables of the project.

The template includes the following details:

- Recommendation Team;
- Background;
- Scope, assumptions, and deliverables;
- Solution analysis: options and proposed solution;
- Key dependencies;
- Risk identification; and
- Key performance indicators.

[further description to be provided after consultation with GNSO Review Working Group]

4. Timeline

[Placeholder timeline. The timeline will be refined once the WG looks at the batches and dependencies. Likely to be much more overlap between first batch and second batches. Timeline will be more specific and deadlines for deliverables should be incorporated.]



ANNEX 1: Background

The most recent GNSO review was initiated in July 2014 by ICANN with the assistance of the GNSO Review Working Party, which was comprised of GNSO community members in accordance with ICANN's Bylaws. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) -- formerly the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC) -- of the ICANN Board is responsible for review and oversight of policies relating to ICANN's ongoing organizational review process, as mandated by ICANN's Bylaws. The ICANN Board appointed Westlake Governance as the independent examiner for the GNSO review.

Each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency appointed representatives to serve on the Working Party. The GNSO Review Working Party provided input on the review criteria, 360 assessment, and served as a conduit for input from GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies as well as the GNSO Council. The GNSO Review Working Party offered guidance to the independent examiner to ensure the draft report accurately reflected the GNSO structure, scope and dynamics.

The scope of the GNSO review was to assess the extent to which the improvements resulting from the 2008 review have been implemented and whether they successfully addressed the concerns that led to the review, and to consider whether the GNSO, as it is currently constituted, can respond to its changing environment. The independent examiner was not asked to assess various options and alternatives pertaining to the structure of the GNSO, but its inquiry into the effectiveness of GNSO operations led to structural considerations. The Draft Report was put out for [public comment](#) on 01 June 2105, and subsequently Westlake published its [Final Report](#) on 15 September 2015, with a [correction](#) to Recommendation 1 issued on 5 October 2015, with 36 recommendations. The recommendations were organized into the following themes:

1. Participation & Representation;
2. Continuous Development;
3. Transparency; and
4. Alignment with ICANN's future.

The GNSO Review Working Party reviewed the recommendations and conducted a [Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis](#), which it submitted to the GNSO Council on 28 February 2016. In its analysis document, the Working Party recommended to adopt all but three recommendations (21, 23, 32).

On 14 April 2016 the GNSO Council approved a [motion](#) to adopt the GNSO Review Recommendations Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis. In its adoption the GNSO Council amended the Feasibility and Prioritization Analysis to support the implementation of recommendation 21, to which the Working Party in turn agreed. On 21 July 2016 the GNSO Council adopted the [Charter](#) of the GNSO Review Working Group. This Working Group is tasked to develop an implementation plan for the [GNSO Review recommendations](#) which were recently [adopted](#) by the ICANN Board.

Per the GNSO Review Working Group Charter the GNSO Review Working Group is responsible for developing an implementation plan, containing a realistic timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome for the GNSO Review recommendations adopted by the ICANN Board (thirty-four (34) recommendations of the [Final Report](#) of the Independent Examiner (i.e. all recommendations excluding recommendations 23 and 32).

This implementation plan is to be submitted for approval to the GNSO Council, followed by consideration by the ICANN Board. Following the approval of the implementation plan, the Working Group is also expected to execute and oversee the implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations unless specified differently in the implementation plan.

The GNSO Review Working Group is also be responsible for considering any new requests^[1] by the GNSO Council concerning issues related to the GNSO Council processes and procedures and to Working Group guidelines that have been identified either by the GNSO Council, or a group chartered by the GNSO Council, as needing discussion. However, the first priority of the Working Group will be the development of an implementation plan and the subsequent implementation of the GNSO Review recommendations.

The GNSO Review Working Group is expected to deliver the implementation plan to the GNSO Council for consideration at the GNSO Council meeting at ICANN57 at the latest in order to meet the Board set objective of ‘an implementation plan, containing a realistic timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome, shall be submitted to the Board as soon as possible, but no later than six (6) months after the adoption of this resolution’^[2] i.e., December 2016.

ANNEX 2: GNSO Review Recommendation Charter

DOCUMENT PURPOSE: The GNSO Review Recommendation Charter recognizes the existence of a project and supports the decision to further refine the project solution. This charter signifies consensus on the vision, scope, authority and overall deliverables of the project.

PROJECT PURPOSE: The purpose of this project is to implement GNSO Review Recommendation(s) #XX.

Note – multiple projects may be needed to implement one recommendation. If this case, state this explicitly in the “project purpose” above. E.g. Three distinct projects will be completed in order to implement the full scope of this recommendation. This is first of the three with the other two being: XXXX and XXXXX. This note should be deleted from the final project charter.

RECOMMENDATION IDENTIFICATION

| RECOMMENDATION TEAM | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|------|
| Recommendation Name | Recommendation Number | Date |
| | | |
| Project Sponsor | Project Owner | |
| | | |
| Project Manager | Cross Functional Departments Involved | |
| | | |

| RECOMMENDATION BACKGROUND |
|--|
| Recommendation Background – historical information that relates to this project |
| |

| STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT | |
|--|--|
| Part One – Which ICANN Objective does this meet | |
| | |
| Alignment with Strategic Objectives | |
| Goal | |
| Portfolio | |
| Project/Recommendation | |

| SCOPE DESCRIPTION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRODUCT OR SERVICE THAT THE PROJECT IS TO OPERATIONALIZE |
|---|
| |

| |
|--|
| Scope Statement – What work needs to be completed during the project |
| Recommendation #XX, as directed by the Board (link to Board Resolution). Recommendation states: Summarize the spirit of the recommendation as interpreted by the team. Indicate why this approach was chosen. List the scope of the work to be completed during this project in order to implement this recommendation |
| Out of Scope – Implied project work that will not be part of the project |
| |
| Assumptions – What assumptions have been made regarding the implementation of the project |
| |
| Deliverables – What will be delivered at the end of the project |
| |

| |
|---|
| OPTION ANALYSIS - THE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS THAT WERE CONSIDERED |
| List all approaches considered and why they were not chosen |
| PROPOSED SOLUTION – “TO BE” SITUATION; THE SOLUTION TO THE BUSINESS NEED |
| List what it looks like when this project moves from implementation to operationalization List the triggers that will move this recommendation to operationalization |

| |
|--|
| KEY DEPENDENCIES – KEY DEPENDENCIES NEEDED TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES |
| |

| |
|---|
| RISK IDENTIFICATION – FACTORS THAT MAY HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE PROJECT |
| |

| |
|---|
| KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS – WHAT TO MEASURE BEFORE AND AFTER OPERATIONALIZATION |
| |

| |
|--|
| NECESSARY TO PROCEED |
| Next Phase Activities/Resources |
| |

| APPROVERS | | | |
|-----------|-------|-----------------|------|
| Name | Title | Approval Status | Date |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| REVIEWERS | | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|
| Name | Title | Date Sent |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| REVISION HISTORY | | | |
|------------------|---------|-------------|--------|
| Date | Version | Description | Author |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Attachments, as applicable:

- None