

#13. Review of Working Group Leadership



Darcy Southwell
23 July 2019

Background/Intro for #13

Objective from PDP 3.0 Report:

- ⦿ Allow for regular review of PDP leadership team to be able to identify early on potential issues
- ⦿ Despite running possibly for multiple years, there is currently no system in place that allows for the regular review of the functioning of PDP WG leadership teams. The Council could run an anonymous survey amongst the PDP WG to obtain feedback on the WG Chair(s) on a regular basis to facilitate its role as a manager of the PDP. Similarly, there is no process in place that allows a WG to challenge and/or replace its leadership team.

Options and Considerations

Some options identified to date are listed below. Note, these options do not seem to be mutually exclusive and could in fact form a more complete package. Options include.

- ⦿ Appointing PDP Leadership for 12-Month Periods
- ⦿ Anonymous Survey
- ⦿ WG Challenge to Replace Leadership

Consider: Whatever solution is decided for #13, it must tie closely to the expectations of #6 (expectations of PDP leaders) and #11 (enforcement of deadlines and bite size pieces)

Appointing PDP Leadership for 12-Month Periods.

- ⦿ Consider: From Improvement #11 – If PDPs are broken into bite-sized pieces, perhaps even executed in phases, there may be natural inflection points in which to appoint new leadership or reappoint existing leadership. With this approach, the transitions could be aligned on the structure and timeline of the project and may be less disruptive than a strict 12-month cycle.

Options

- ⦿ Leaders serve 12-month term with deliberate reappointment. What criteria must be affirmed for reappointment? How will we collect it?
 - Pros: Puts leaders on notice that leadership positions are not guaranteed.
 - Cons: Does Council have bandwidth to engage in these annual reviews for multiple PDPs? If Council is slow to review or deliberately delays a review, it sends a poor message to leaders. Some may assume Council isn't concerned with their performance. Others may assume it was just a threat. #13 must tie closely to the expectations of #6 and #11

Appointing PDP Leadership for 12-Month Periods, cont.

Options, cont:

- ⦿ Leaders do not have term limit, but performance is reviewed annually (and that's written into the charter). If during the annual review Council is not satisfied that the leader(s) are performing satisfactorily to the [GNSO Working Group Expectations for Leaders \[docs.google.com\]](#) and the PDP's charter, the leader(s) will be removed.
 - Pros: Gives Council more flexibility as to when to take action and how. If a leader is found to be struggling but improves with Council and/or Liaison advice/support, then he/she can continue and become an effective leader.
 - Cons: Assumption that leadership position won't be challenged.

Anonymous Survey

- While there was opposition to leadership surveys at the SPS, it might be worth revisiting, now that there is more detail available from PDP 3.0 work.
- Some factors to consider in a potential survey include:
 - Purpose. One idea is this: “Understand member perception of Working Group leaderships performance against what is expected of them in the [GNSO Working Group Expectations for Leaders \[docs.google.com\]](#) and the PDP’s charter.”
 - Frequency. 12 months? 18 months? Something else (e.g., milestone)?
 - Questions. Base survey questions on key criteria from Improvements #6 and #11 that will factor into identifying successful or unsuccessful leadership. Those criteria could be presented as statements, such as “Working Group documents represent the diversity of Working Group views” or “The Chair [or Working Group leadership] usually assumes a neutral role regarding substantive matters discussed by the Working Group.” Limit number of questions to 10 or so. The longer the survey, the less likely folks will be willing to complete it. We’ll end up getting responses from the outliers.

Anonymous Survey, cont.

- ⦿ Some factors to consider in a potential survey include, cont.:
 - Rating Scale. Suggest responses be presented as a model of something like “Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.”
 - Anonymity. If we want honest answers, I think we have to keep this survey anonymous. Should not assume we’re looking for bad behavior but rather we’re utilizing survey results to reinforce the aspects specifically asked in the survey in relation to the (monthly) reporting the Council receives and the formal expectations.

WG Challenge to Replace Leadership

Note: Replacement of leadership is more of a potential outcome from the review of PDP leadership, rather than an option to consider for performing the review.

Question:

- ⦿ Is there more we want to consider beyond what Flip is leading in #9 and #15?
- ⦿ As managers of the PDP, it seems that the Council should be utilizing WG review and PDP monthly reporting to evaluate leadership performance.
- ⦿ Does Council need further procedures to allow it to remove any PDP leaders?