

# PDP 3.0 Improvement #17: Resource Reporting for PDP Working Group

## 1. PDP 3.0 Work Plan<sup>96</sup>:

### **#17. Resource reporting for PDP WGs:**

- Small Team Lead: Rafik Dammak
- Staff Lead: Berry Cobb

### **Proposed sign-off method:**

- Council review and non-objection to updated fact sheet and possible updates to charter template

### **Objective & Description (Per PDP 3.0 Final Report):**

- Allow for resource tracking and oversight, enhancing accountability.
- Require PDP WGs to provide regular resource reporting updates to allow for a better tracking of the use of resources and budget as well as giving leadership teams the responsibility for managing these resources.

### **Possible Implementation Steps (Per PDP 3.0 Final Report):**

- Staff should collect information regarding budget and resources to be allocated for PDP.
- Charter drafting team should identify the resources and needs during the chartering process
- GNSO Council to work with ICANN Staff to adapt fact sheets used for review teams and EPDP to monitor and report on progress as well as resources for PDP WGs.

### **Proposed Next Steps:**

- Review charter template to see if additional sections/guidance is to be provided to reflect this point
- See PDP 3.0 Improvement #11, #12 & #16<sup>97</sup> - Update GNSO Council Project list that incorporates Status/Condition of projects, including procedures for reporting and response to changes in Status/Condition

---

<sup>96</sup> <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QsZoBxrJc8rq4BcpfQBK-zvxchxleFRY/edit>

<sup>97</sup> See GNSO Project Work Product Catalog, Project Status and Condition Change Procedure & Flowchart, Project Change Request Form

- Review fact sheet and provide input, as appropriate
- Review prior efforts on resource and bandwidth analysis of current workload and pipeline.
- Review small team conclusions and proposed implementation of this improvement

## 2. GNSO Council Action Items List<sup>98</sup>:

### **Relevant Council Action Items from SPS2019:**

[items marked in red are possible responses to Action Items that remain on the GNSO Council AI list]

How to manage Council's 2019 workload: strategies to increase effectiveness

- Erika Mann to send note to Council upon the adoption of the new copyright law and the potential impact on GNSO policy work / DNS.
  - This action item is not relevant for PDP3.0, but it does speak to activity at the beginning of the pipeline; Legislative Tracker. The second-generation capacity management model was presented at SPS 2020 and does contain an enhanced forecasting view.
- Council to form a small team to work on the definitions in the Project Timing Document in relation to definitions of priority and level of effort.
  - This action item is marked complete; older capacity management examples were shared with the PDP3.0 team. At the 2020 SPS, and second-generation capacity management model was demonstrated. This new model does account for level of effort, but the concept of priority was further discussed at the SPS 2020.
- Staff to update Project Timing Document to try and incorporate suggestions from Councilors.
  - This action item is marked complete; older capacity management examples were shared with the PDP3.0 team. At the 2020 SPS, and second-generation capacity management model was demonstrated.

What does Council need/want to achieve in 2019, and how to do this?

- As part of PDP 3.0, Council to establish PDPs Chair(s)/ liaisons communication / reporting timelines and requirements to Council.
  - This action item is marked complete as PDP3.0 produced clearer role definition of Chairs and Liaisons. This role(s) will also act as the channel by which monthly project packages will be delivered to the GNSO Council.
- Council to consider how to better understand the specific resourcing needs of PDP WGs (e.g., SCBO to meet with PDP leadership in August of every year).
  - This action item was completed at SPS 2020.

Wrap up and close of session

- In order to better prioritize work, need to know capacity of Council, community, staff, Staff to get existing information from Berry Cobb about average commitment and Council to see if that can be utilized, leveraged, and/or updated.

---

<sup>98</sup> <https://community.icann.org/x/RgZlAg>

- This action item is marked complete; older capacity management examples were shared with the PDP3.0 team. At the SPS 2020, and second-generation capacity management model was demonstrated.

### 3. Possible Near-term Actions & Deliverable for SPS2020:

1. Better understand and determine scope of what is meant by resource tracking, reporting, and oversight as defined in SPS2019 including child action items as result of those deliberations.
2. Define “resource management” in the context of GNSO WGs (project triple constraints<sup>99</sup> – Scope, Cost, Time)
  - a. Staff resource – current best effort = % FTE allocation guesstimates
  - b. Community resource – current best effort is # of members times the duration of calls
  - c. Budget and financial resource – no current data
3. Define “capacity management” and decision structure required for the GNSO to understand available bandwidth and manage capacity
  - a. Expand on the pipeline concept from the Project List
    - i. Develop a prioritization criteria matrix that ranks urgency, priority and demand requirements
    - ii. Develop an enhanced forecast mechanism for planned work (within Council scope and external efforts such as Organizational and Mandated Reviews or Implementation of Policy etc. that place demand on GNSO resources)
    - iii. Develop a framework to understand % allocations of resources for in-flight projects
    - iv. Develop an after-action-review of closed projects for continuous improvement for comparing planned vs. actual
  - b. Develop an evaluation and decision framework to manage planned and unplanned projects. Determine what in-flight work is paused, parked, or cancelled should unplanned projects dictate higher priority and exceeds the available bandwidth across the resource pool.
4. Define “financial management<sup>100</sup>” in the context of GNSO WGs
  - a. Should time/resource/budget constraints be applied at chartering phase (ex. Model 1 = 12 months, Model 2 = 18 months w/ appropriate rationale; both maintain quarterly and annual checkpoints)
  - b. Should a guesstimate cost / sizing per project mechanism be developed?
  - c. What are the fiscal budget considerations and define inputs to the budgeting process based on forecast?
5. Define “Program and Portfolio Management<sup>101</sup>” as parents to Project Management in the context of GNSO projects.
6. Review GNSO Charter template for possible enhancements.

---

<sup>99</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/triple-constraint-erroneous-useless-value-8024>

<sup>100</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/powerful-project-financials-6339>

<sup>101</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/triple-constraint-erroneous-useless-value-8024>

## 4. Improvement 17 Proposal:

The following is a framework to address the issues identified under Improvement 17 of the PDP3.0 effort. It should be considered a starting point of continuous improvement in the tracking of resources related to policy development projects of the GNSO.

- Definitions and framing:
  - **Project Management** – is the application of processes, methods, skills, knowledge and experience to achieve specific project objectives according to the project acceptance criteria within agreed parameters. Project management has final deliverables that are constrained to a finite timescale and budget. A key factor that distinguishes project management from just 'management' is that it has this final deliverable and a finite timespan, unlike management which is an ongoing process<sup>102 103</sup>. A crucial element to project management is well defined scope. An improperly scoped project often leads to unforeseen/unplanned tasks and schedule delays. Scope is one of three constraints to any project with the other two being Cost and Time<sup>104</sup>.
  - **Portfolio/Program Management** – is the continuous process of selecting and managing the optimum set of project-oriented initiatives that deliver maximum value. It is a dynamic decision-making process, enabling leadership to reach consensus on the best use of resources to focus on projects that are achievable and strategically aligned with goals and objectives<sup>105 106</sup>. Program Management differs from Project Management in that they generally have a multiplicity of requirements, deliverables, stakeholders, departments, and interfacing organizations interacting with the work. Further, projects typically have narrowly defined scope and shaped by start and complete dates, whereas programs take on a broader view of policies, issues and operations<sup>107</sup>.
  - **People (Community) Resources** – representative community members required to deliberate and complete project tasks resulting in consensus policy outcomes; community resource availability for any new project should be reviewed and balanced against all other in-flight projects. Given the distributed and volunteer nature of community members, it will be challenging to estimate and determine actual consumption required to complete all tasks. Therefore, an estimation framework will be used, which is based on assumptions of time allocation to certain activities, combined with actual attendance of in-person or remote participation of policy development discussions. While not perfect, once a baseline is established and repeated for several projects, it can allow for a more consistent gauge of effort for future projects. These initial estimates are indicative of the continuous improvement approach for this improvement (e.g., precision in estimates will be gained, a more effective measurement mechanism may be established).

---

<sup>102</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/about/learn-about-pmi/what-is-project-management>

<sup>103</sup> <https://www.apm.org.uk/resources/what-is-project-management/>

<sup>104</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/triple-constraint-erroneous-useless-value-8024>

<sup>105</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/proven-project-portfolio-management-process-8503>

<sup>106</sup> <https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/understanding-difference-programs-versus-projects-6896>

<sup>107</sup> <https://www.workfront.com/blog/differences-between-program-management-and-project-management>

- **People (Staff) Resources** – staff (Policy + SO/AC Admin) assigned to a given project supporting the project through its full lifecycle. The tracking of this resource at the beginning stages of any project will be a percent allocation of an FTE. For example, one staff member is allocated at 2080 hours per year (40 hours per week times 52 weeks in a year. A one-half FTE (.5) equates to 1040 hours. Again, initial estimates are indicative of the continuous improvement approach for this improvement (e.g., precision in estimates will be gained, a more effective measurement mechanism may be established).
- **Financial Resources** – authorized budget allocated for particular purposes of a sponsored project, such as professional services. Only in exception circumstances will a GNSO working group be allocated a specific budget.
- Update Charter Template:
  - Remove reference to “Fact Sheet” and replace with work products where resource tracking is available elsewhere (refer to screen shots of legacy Fact Sheet). Rationale: The Fact Sheet was an attempt to consolidate different components of project management for summary publication to the community. The structure and content of the Fact Sheet is now duplicative to items contained in the work product catalog. Features of the Fact Sheet are being migrated to ICANN’s CRM (roster, attendance tracking, budget, milestones). The GNSO Council should not lock-in its use and reference to the “Fact Sheet” as to allow for innovation in the tracking of a project.
- Chartering process:
  - Effective resource tracking can only occur with a properly scoped project as noted in the project definitions. It is critical that during the chartering phase of a project that once the project scope is agreed upon that the effort be appropriately sized in terms of Time (project duration + expected delivery) and Cost (person/task hours + professional services). Note however, that a completed project plan will not usually occur until after a working group has performed a cursory review of the in-scope issues and confirmed its workplan. Therefore, the formal project plan should be returned back to the GNSO Council for final confirmation and formal initiation of the project Status, Condition, and Delivery Date. It should be noted that with more effective chartering, resource allocation may accordingly become more efficient.
- Oversight:
  - **Project Leadership team** – the working group leadership team is ultimately responsible for managing the project resources. Oversight of resources will occur in the monthly publication of the project package and issues or risks with project resources should be immediately communicated via the Status and Condition change procedure should additional resources or time be required.
  - **GNSO Council** – at the project level, the GNSO Council will be the primary audience of the monthly project package. After a project plan has been confirmed, the GNSO Council will provide oversight and ultimate authority on any project change requests, especially where additional resources are requested.
- Develop, review and evolve a macro resource consumption and forecasting tool. A second generation of this tool will be demonstrated at the 2020 GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session (see next page for concepts).

## 5. Example Charts for Resource Reporting:

# Resource Based Activity Estimates / Meeting

Regular WG Weekly Activities	Community Member Hours	Leadership Hours	Policy Staff Hours	SO/AC Admin Hours
Manage roster				0.50
Schedule meetings				0.50
Prepare remote participation				0.50
Manage call				1.50
Manage attendance				0.25
Post-meeting artifacts				1.00
Setting Agenda	0.00	0.25	0.50	
Preparing Documentation	0.00	1.00	2.00	
Reviewing Documentation	0.50	0.00	0.50	
Prepping for Meeting (incl. coordination calls)	0.00	1.00	1.00	
Participating in Meeting	1.50	1.50	1.50	
Sending Outcomes from Meetings	0.00	0.00	0.50	
Updating Documentation	0.50	0.50	0.50	
Reviewing and Responding to Email	1.00	1.00	0.25	
Ad Hoc Work	0.00	1.00	1.00	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>7.75</b>	<b>4.25</b>

Agressive WG Weekly Activities	Community Member Hours	Leadership Hours	Policy Staff Hours	SO/AC Admin Hours
Manage roster				0.25
Schedule meetings				0.25
Prepare remote participation				0.50
Manage call				2.00
Manage attendance				0.25
Post-meeting artifacts				0.75
Setting Agenda	0.00	0.25	0.50	
Preparing Documentation	0.00	1.50	3.00	
Reviewing Documentation	2.00	0.00	1.50	
Prepping for Meeting (incl. coordination calls)	0.00	1.00	2.50	
Participating in Meeting	2.00	2.00	2.00	
Sending Outcomes from Meetings	0.00	0.25	0.50	
Updating Documentation	0.50	0.50	0.50	
Reviewing and Responding to Email	1.00	1.00	0.25	
Ad Hoc Work	0.00	1.00	1.00	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.50</b>	<b>7.50</b>	<b>11.75</b>	<b>4.00</b>

GNSO Council Monthly Activities	Community Member Hours	Leadership Hours	Policy Staff Hours	SO/AC Admin Hours
Manage roster				0.50
Schedule meetings				1.50
Prepare remote participation				0.50
Manage call				2.00
Manage attendance				0.25
Post-meeting artifacts				2.50
Setting Agenda	0.00	1.00	0.25	
Preparing Documentation	0.00	1.00	2.00	
Reviewing Documentation	3.00	1.00	0.00	
Prepping for Meeting (incl. coordination calls)	1.00	3.00	2.00	
Participating in Meeting	2.00	2.00	2.00	
Sending Outcomes from Meetings	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Updating Documentation	0.00	0.50	0.50	
Reviewing and Responding to Email	0.50	1.00	1.00	
Action Items	0.50	3.00	3.00	2.00
Standing Committees	1.00	2.00	4.00	3.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>15.50</b>	<b>15.75</b>	<b>13.25</b>

