Suggestions for process improvement – ccNSO Policy Work
January 2023

This document

This document was prepared by ccNSO Secretariat staff following the workshop held in late 2022 to review recent PDP work and identify possible improvements that could be put in place for future policy work. It was viewed by Jordan Carter, Vice Chair of the ccNSO Council, and is shared for discussion.

Highlights from the workshop

- Clearer process/plan, sticking to time
- More prep of Board for how to consider this
- Consider different uses for in person and intersessional meetings
- Encourage meaningful participation versus spectating

The summarised results of the workshop itself are included in Annex 1.

Process improvements
Using the results of the workshop and related discussions please find included a more general approach to improve processes. Note some of these have been tried already.

Planning & Scheduling policy work
- Build project plan: ensure Triage and PDP leadership review plan regularly (whatever regular means - quarterly?). Plan is to help WG and Council in achieving goal and set expectations. Tool is to be used to engage in conversation about progress. Note planning: due to very nature of policy development it is NOT a project.

- Expectation that the Council and Working Group leadership notes any issues and logs them as well as changes (examples: discussion bindingness of review/ inclusion of review by the ccPDP4 group), so there is a clear record of changes to timeframes or approach.

- Break down policy work into a set of issues that need to be addressed, as basis for planning to track progress. Regularly discuss planning with working group.

More preparation of the ICANN Board for how to consider ccNSO PDP outcomes
Retirement policy adoption was a significant learning experience for the Board:
- Board has now developed an outline on how to engage with ccPDPs, starting with the Initial reporting.

- In future: ccNSO should request Board liaison (was originally done in various groups, but no formal method for liaison, currently Board has mechanism).

- Board is provided regular update on progress of all ccNSO PDPs.

Meeting formats and WG methods
- Consider different uses for in person and intersessional meetings
    - Pre-pandemic: 3 hour workshops during meetings? WG in person meeting used to introduce new topic and brainstorming, post meeting online meetings used to refine outcome and select options.

- Consider intensive development of proposals during ICANN meetings, and community engagement online in between ICANN meetings.

- Currently standard 60-90 minutes WG sessions: text focused by nature, however not necessary.

- Require stress testing of a proposed policy to understand and test handling of corner cases.

Participation
- Encourage meaningful participation versus spectating
    - Ensure closure of items, no re-litigation if not attending.
    - Use members vote and community consultations.
    - Respect availability.
    - Two-readings approach to all key matters.

- Use participation logs.

- Use various working methods and formats to engage attendees.

- Training of the leadership.

Self-Evaluation (PDP) WG and Committees
To date self-evaluation by working groups is not a standard practice, despite being a good practice.

Suggestion: introduce a 360 self-evaluation of working groups and committees, for example following every other year for committees and after one year and after completion of their work by working groups.

If agreed, the Council could ask the GRC to develop a framework for self-evaluation.

Annex 1

Go well

G1
- Collegiate discussion in the WG
- Once set up, could have been faster but not the main blocker - took time to set up
- Quite successful, ultimately
- Good documents
- Good community engagement, including with GAC
- No gaps identified requiring revisions
- Good staff support
- Harder to do in COVID

G2:
- Output was quality

G3:
- did complete it
- Workshops and webinars insightful
- Good working methods, but harder in pandemic
- Good leadership
- Times rotated
- Two readings approach
- Good staff support

G4:
- Didn't take too long for the actual policy development
- Good staff support

Themes
- good engagement
- Quality work
- Rotate times and two-readings process
- Good staff support
- Not too long for actual development

Different next time

G1
- different online meeting approaches
- Compared with project plan, took much longer
- Be clearer about different realms of community input
- Board approval process set up earlier as PDP getting ready

G2:
* consider reversing process, do the development at in person meetings and engagement intersessionally
- Lots of directions, need clustering
- Cleaner process

G3:
- Issue report delay to be avoided
- Shorter time to decide structure
- More consistent participation
- Make it easier to follow next time
- Don't write, let staff do this (one disagreement)

G4:
- Avoid delays including in deciding structure.
- More and earlier participation from Board itself
- Avoid duplicating public consultations

Themes
- Clearer process/plan, sticking to time
- More prep of Board for how to consider this
- Consider different uses for in person and intersessional meetings
- Encourage meaningful participation versus spectating