

**GNSO Review Working Party Meeting
18 November @ 15:00 – 16:30 UTC
Chat Transcript**

Nathalie Peregrine: Dear all, Welcome to the GNSO Review Working Party on the 18 November 2015

Oswaldo Novoa: Hello, am I too early?

Nathalie Peregrine: never too early Oswaldo :)

Nathalie Peregrine: *too

Oswaldo Novoa: Thank you

Oswaldo Novoa: I have some problem with my microphone, if I cannot get it to work I will dial in.

Chuck Gomes: Hi all.

Nathalie Peregrine: @Oswaldo, have you clicked on the telephone icon at the top of the AC room? If you follow instructions there, the icon should become a mic, and this will show your mic is activated

Nathalie Peregrine: alternatively, we can dial out to you

Oswaldo Novoa: @Nathalie, I think the problem is in the microphone cable, I am changing it

Rudi Vansnick: still a small group here

Marika Konings: It would first require identification of cost barriers...

Marika Konings: as participation happens at different levels (e.g. participation in a conference call requires only time - is that a cost barrier?)

Rudi Vansnick: +1 Marika

Amr Elsadr: @Marika: Good point.

Larisa Gurnick: It may be useful for the Working Party to rephrase this recommendation to make it more precise and useful, if you agree with the spirit of the recommendation.

Amr Elsadr: @Larissa: My instinct is that; to make this rec useful, quite a bit of work needs to go into it. A lot of questions that need to be raised and addressed.

Klaus Stoll: I agree with Amr, as it is the statement is in a way meaningless

Marika Konings: for the GNSO, most of the work is actually done in between physical meetings, something that many do not seem to realise as the focus is often on travel funding as a means to

participate. Agree with Rudi that enhancing that understanding may help clarify that participation in F2F meetings is not necessarily the end goal.

Amr Elsadr:For one thing, "cost barrier" needs to be defined. I don't recall a scope to what is considered cost barriers in the report.

Rudi Vansnick:"cost" not equal finances

Amr Elsadr:@Rudi: Emotional costs paid as a result of participation in ICANN? ;-)

Rudi Vansnick:;) @ Amr

Mary Wong:@Chuck, perhaps the WP can take a look at Westlake's analysis that led to this (and the other related recommendations) in the Final Report , to see if there is any explanation for this.

Marika Konings:The PDP Manual does have some guidance on translation, especially in relation to executive summaries

Rudi Vansnick:i mean translation

Mary Wong:e.g. all executive summaries of WG reports are translated on publication.

Mary Wong:This Rec 7 is grouped by Westlake with Rec 6 - which is that the GNSO record diversity statistics.

Mary Wong:The accompanying text seems to indicate that these two recs came out of Westlake's analysis that "Working Groups are dominated by English speakers from NA/EU."

Rudi Vansnick:@Amr : +1

Rudi Vansnick:agree with Chuck

Rudi Vansnick:let's have an ad-hoc group working out some proposals for implementation

Amr Elsadr:@Mary: Yes... this rec is under Theme 1: Participation and Representation, but still didn't strike me to be WG centric like other recommendations under the same theme.

Marika Konings:Good point Klaus

Mary Wong:There were comments WEstlake noted about the need for skilled WG chairs.

Klaus Stoll:this needs to be reworded

Mary Wong:Note that the rec specifies "WG leadership" as "part of the overall training" provided by ICANN.

Avri Doria:did you mena more harm than good? that is what i think.

Mary Wong: Please note that Westlake had this to say about pro facilitators: "The Westlake Review Team considers that the use of a professional facilitator/moderator, who is well briefed on the subject matter of the WG, is helpful in certain situations (for example, when policy issues are complex, where members of the WG are generally inexperienced and/or where WG members have interests that conflict)."

Mary Wong: This was based on community responses and the surveys.

Avri Doria: sometimes when a group breaks down, it might be useful to bring in someone to help a group find its balance.

Rudi Vansnick: @Avri : couldn't that be done by staff ?

Mary Wong: That is why this recommendation applies only "in certain situations".

Avri Doria: but as a general rule, group facilitation by those who do not know the subject matter often wasted a lot of time and patience.

Amr Elsadr: This was also in the Westlake report: The Westlake Review Team considers that an experienced independent chair is the preferred option because, as a full member of the WG, they will be seen to be working within the WG and have incentives to complete the process in a timely manner. An independent paid facilitator may have no such incentive – indeed they may benefit personally from prolonging the process.

Klaus Stoll: what are "certain situations"

Avri Doria: Rudi, sometimes, it might be. sometime you need a specialist in group dynamic who has no ties.

Klaus Stoll: I agree with that

Marika Konings: that's a very good point too Chuck - I think when reading this people assume it is someone external but it doesn't need to be

Mary Wong: @Amr, that may be why the final rec is phrased the way it is.

Rudi Vansnick: going back to rec 9 : perhaps specific training at this level too

Amr Elsadr: I'm fine with Orange.

Rudi Vansnick: Orange fine for me too

Oswaldo Novoa: orange is fine for me too

Amr Elsadr:Mix of orange/yellow then. :)

Charla Shambley:Thanks, Amr. I'll work on that :)

Klaus Stoll:That's another orange

Larisa Gurnick:Staff is looking into solutions, there is definitely work going on

Mary Wong:Question whether the WP wants to endorse a specific tool, as mentioned in this recommendation?

Klaus Stoll:No endorsement of a specific tool, I think this is about the general idea

Larisa Gurnick:@Mary - Westlake was using Loomio as an example of a tool that could be useful.

Chuck Gomes:I don't think it is our place to endorse a specific tool or tools but we could recommend tools to be evaluated just like Westlake did.

Rudi Vansnick:yellow status

Chuck Gomes:@ Rudi: What needs to be modified?

Amr Elsadr:@Jen: Yes. Thanks.

Avri Doria:and yet, we need to find a way to introduce new methods and systems. we could all do our work by sending sheaves of paper back and forth for traditional markup.

Avri Doria:but we should pick new systems based on needs and not pick new tools based on their coolness.

Rudi Vansnick:agree with Avri

Rudi Vansnick:define objectives and then look which solution will enable improvement

Mary Wong:The three are: RDS to replace WHOIS; the potential one on New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures; and another potential one on rights protection mechanisms. It's not a given that all will be done in the way Westlake describes, but the topic is under active discussion.

Avri Doria:it is really about appropriate serialization not chunking.

Rudi Vansnick:so the wording needs adoption

Amr Elsadr:@Chuck: yes to the next gen RDS PDP. It's basically set up in chunks (although called phases) with the GNSO council having a role along each "chunk".

Mary Wong: Besides chunking, there are other ideas such as parallel efforts, review of stages, etc.

Amr Elsadr: @Chuck: +1 again. I think the wording of the recommendation is fine the way it is. I believe it provides the GNSO the flexibility it needs.

Oswaldo Novoa: ok

Mary Wong: It sounds like what we are talking about is highlighting the need for each PDP to be conducted in a flexible way, and for different methods of accomplishing this to be explored.

Marika Konings: This was the announcement I was referring to:
<https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-11-17-en>

Amr Elsadr: That seems interesting Marika. Will have to check it out.

Amr Elsadr: Thnx.

Chuck Gomes: I would break this into two parts and code them differently.

Chuck Gomes: 21.a & 21.b

Rudi Vansnick: good idea @Chuck

Amr Elsadr: @Larissa: +1. Yes..., we need to go back to the report first before contacting Westlake.

Chuck Gomes: Let's defer 21

Klaus Stoll: I don't understand what it means

Avri Doria: I support going back to the report for clarification of what was said. I do not recommend going back to Westlake.

Rudi Vansnick: I think it comes from the ATRT2

Avri Doria: I do not mean to imply they mention the nomcom. I meant that much of what we do may already constitute a framework, and it just needs to be discussed in the form of a framework.

Rudi Vansnick: quick reading of report doesn't make it clearer

Amr Elsadr: didn't we go through this one in Dublin?

Marika Konings: Chuck is correct

Amr Elsadr: Isn't there already language in the OP that the council needs to be sure that reasonable efforts are made to recruit geographically diverse WG members?

Amr Elsadr: @jen: Right. :)

Marika Konings:The WG Manual does foresee that: 'The Chair should make it clear that participation on sub-teams is open to all and he/she should encourage representational balance to the degree possible. However, it should be understood that there will not always be volunteers from every interest group and that it is often acceptable to have a small sub-team that is not totally representational perform an initial role that will later be reviewed by a broader more representational group. In those cases where initially there is insufficient balance, the Chair should make a special outreach effort to those groups not represented. In all cases where the Chair believes that one set of interests or expertise is missing from a group, special efforts must be made to bring that interest or expertise into the group via invitation or other method and the situation must be documented in the final report, including a discussion of the efforts made to redress the balance. Additionally, the Chair should ensure that particular outreach eff

Amr Elsadr:@Marika: Isn't the role of the chair in the WG limited to sub-team membership? Not WG membership, right?

Marika Konings:@Amr, no, the chair is also responsible to assess at the start of every meeting as well as in general that there is sufficiently broad participation and engagement in the WG.

Klaus Stoll:I recoment that we do not approve this recommendation

Amr Elsadr:@Marika: OK, thanks. Got it.

Marika Konings:@Chuck - and that wasn't as a result of lack of reminders to participate ;-)

Amr Elsadr:@Chuck: Thanks. You said it better than I did. :)

Klaus Stoll:red

Rudi Vansnick:red

Chuck Gomes:I think I am leaning more toward yellow.

Oswaldo Novoa:I would prefer yellow

Amr Elsadr:Sounds good Jen. Thnx.

Amr Elsadr:Some might argue that the role of the board here is important from a "public interest" perspective. :)

Chuck Gomes:It is important for the Board to have a role here but they must look at the whole process.

Amr Elsadr:@Chuck: Yes..., fully agree.

Amr Elsadr:Within the next month sounds good. Get it done before the holidays.

Avri Doria:sounds good

Avri Doria:look forward to that survey

Amr Elsadr:@Larissa: +1

Avri Doria:agree

Chuck Gomes:Thanks to all. Very good call.

Rudi Vansnick:thanks Jen, very good session

Amr Elsadr:Thanks all. Bye.

Avri Doria:thanks, bye

Rudi Vansnick:bye

Oswaldo Novoa:Thank you and by to all