

# Suggestions for process improvement – ccNSO Policy Work

## Version 2 - February 2023

### **This document**

This document was originally 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 was shared for discussion at the January 2023 meeting. The Triage committee reviewed it following the Council meeting and this updated version is submitted to the ccNSO Council for approval at its meeting in February 2023.

### **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 its 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, to use as basis for planning and to track progress. Regularly discuss planning with the working relevant 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 the Board has a mechanism).
- Board is provided with a 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 ICANN meetings.
  - For future, consider WG in person meetings to be used to introduce new topics and brainstorming, post-ICANN meeting online WG meetings could be used to refine outcomes and select options.
- In other words, 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' votes 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 simple, light retrospective session (self-analysis by the group of what worked well, what to do differently next time) or (where appropriate) 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