ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Review Working Group call
Thursday, 30 November 2017 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review-30nov17-en.mp3 Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p6mwvy3nt8d/

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/a5BEB

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Phil). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Review Working Group call on the 30th of November, 2017.

On the call today we have Kris Seeburn, Jen Wolfe, Sara Bockey, Rafik Dammak and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. We received no apologies for today's call. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Mary Wong, Emily Barabas and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And I see that Marika Konings has just joined the call too.

I'd like to remind you all to please to remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes and to mute yourselves when not talking to avoid any background noise. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks so much and thanks, everybody, for taking the time for the call today. We appreciate your continued effort and support in completing the implementation plan of the GNSO Review. We do have a full agenda today and want to thank Julie and Emily who have worked very hard to prepare the

draft charters for us so we're going to work as hard as we can to move through quite a number of these today.

Just to briefly review the agenda, we're going to briefly ask for any updates to your statements of interest and then move on into a discussion of the revised charter of Recommendations 26-29, and then move on to a new discussion of charters for Recommendation 4, 34 and then 5, 9 and 17 if we're able to get there. And then we'll close out with looking at our schedule ahead as we approach the end of the year and into the next year.

So just briefly before we start, are there any updates to your statements of interest? Okay, seeing none, why don't we go ahead and move forward? Julie, if you could give us the update on the revised charter for Recommendations 26-29?

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Jen. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So we did discuss twice now these recommendations, 26-29, that all relate to stakeholder group and constituency membership and statements of interest. And two weeks ago we walked through these and we did have some comments that staff has then tried to address in this revised version. So rather than going through the whole charter I'll just point you all to the revisions.

So one of the questions was from Wolf-Ulrich as to whether or not the strategic alignment still seems to be correct. It did to us. That objective is promoting the – promote role clarity and establish mechanisms to increase trust in the ecosystem rooted in the public interest, also evolve policy development in government processes, structures and meetings to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient, effective and responsive.

It was our sense that having, you know, having more clarity and transparency in membership and statements of interest did still appear to fit into this objective of the strategic plan. But, you know, help – we're happy to look more at this if so desired by the working group.

I'm not seeing any questions so I'm going to move ahead then. So one of the issues that was raised is, you know, as you know, the European Union General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR, is going to be enforced beginning 25 May 2018. And that does relate to access to data and privacy issues. And so what we suggested as staff was that we put in some language indicating that the working group may need to revisit the implementation of these recommendations with respect to GDPR.

But I'll note that my colleague, Mary Wong from staff, is on this call and may be able to provide a brief update on what ICANN is looking at with respect to the statements of interest and GDPR. I don't – we don't have a lot of detail at this point but we can probably give a sense of where things are going. And, so Mary, I see you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks very much, Julie. And hi, everybody. This is Mary from staff. So as Julie mentioned, one thing that I've been working on internally is compliance with GDPR and also other data protection legislation from around the world of different processes of our supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The one thing in the GNSO practices that clearly may be impacted both by GDPR as well as the increasing number and scope of data protection legislation around the world, is of course the statements of interest. So that's one piece that we're working on as part of an overall look to see that all SO/AC procedures are compliant and GDPR is a big part of that.

But noting that the SOIs for the GNSO were a particular subject for the GNSO review, and of course there are specific recommendations that this Review Working Group is considering right now, what Julie thought would be helpful for me to let you know about is that while we do not at the moment have a specific proposal for any permanent changes to two things, one, how we ask for the statements of interest and, secondly, what goes into the content of the statement of interest.

On this second part I think that that seems to be what most of the implementation based on this recommendation, is concerned about. But hopefully within the next few months, if there is going to be any kind of change both to the process in terms of how we get the statements for each person who, say, joins a working group, or, you know, comes to the GNSO Council, and secondly, the content itself, obviously we'll get back to you and we're trying to do that as soon as possible.

But before I get to Wolf-Ulrich, I know you probably have a question, the one thing that we are implementing imminently, pretty much right away, is what we're calling some stop gap language. It's an interim solution and it doesn't touch the content piece. So the SOI as it is for example, the questions that it asks, the information that it requires and the language in the GNSO Operating Procedures, we're not touching any of that because those are more significant changes. The interim solution or the stop gap language will be the information that is displayed to a person signing up for a working group to say this is what a statement of interest is for, here's the information that we collect and here's where we're going to publish it.

So it builds on an understanding that is more implicit these days and it builds on how we currently collect and publish the statement of interest, but what it does do is that it is much more up front and much clearer about the purpose, the need for consent and what is actually collected and published. So hopefully that's clear and I will go to Wolf-Ulrich if that's okay Jen and Julie?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Mary. Well my – it is clear, well, that there is some impact of the GDPR on the SOIs or some interrelation between them, let me say, in this way. The only question for me is here, you know, as we have a – the review is going on, plan scheduled until the end of next year, and by May of next year, so the GDPR – the rules are going to get in set here.

So the question for me is, is it really – can we or when can we expect whether our working team here has to take an eye again on the implementation which we're just doing here for this recommendation, or not? You know, I would like just to know is there a case, you know, that our group has to be – has to do something or is it enough, you know, just to mention that there is an interrelation that's, you know, there are others, let me say, in the context of the GDPR working on the – on the SOI impact?

And that would be enough, you know, rather than, you know, to oblige the group to come back to that point. So this is my question here.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. I'll endeavor to answer your question. So if we look at – if we look at the substance of these recommendations, so just to kind of look back at what it is we're being tasked with implementing, you know, 26 talks about the requirement that stakeholder groups and constituencies and members of working groups complete – I'm sorry – Executive Committee members complete an SOI. And so we did look at that and we found that that recommendation is consistent with what is already required and that while the term "Executive Committee" is not specifically called out in Chapter 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures it's implicit. It is meant to be included.

And so, you know, so the sense was that, you know, at least as a staff recommendation that Recommendation 26 was implemented already. We found with 27 that there is already a centralized publicly available list of members and individual participants. And 28 that the key clauses are already taken to be mandatory based on the language in Section 1.2, Membership of Chapter 6.

And then for 29 that while it wasn't currently feasible to include the total number of years, the sense was that – that upon the next change of the statement of interest form, it could – the form itself could require the entry of a start date so that the number of years could be calculated and that form is not

part of the Operating Procedures and so that could be taken as implemented as well.

So as to your question, will these have to be revisited? Staff had put in some just some language that suggested that these could – they might need to be revisited, although it's not clear that these recommendations, as already implemented, would need to change in any way. What may change is, you know, say the content of, you know, of the form, you know, what questions are asked, maybe that changes.

We don't know, I think, at this point and so I think it might be hard to say. But these recommendations themselves may or may not change. I'm sorry, that's so vague. But I see that Mary Wong has her hand up so maybe she can rescue me from my vagueness.

Mary Wong: Hi, this is Mary. Not at all, Julie. I don't think that was vague, at least not to me. And I'll try and keep this brief to get back to Wolf-Ulrich and so that this group can have a fuller discussion. Based on what you just said, Julie, that is why, you know, I was careful to emphasize two things. One is we are just talking about something that's a stop gap to a more permanent solution on the internal side. And therefore secondly, what we're going to do is not at the moment touch either what goes into the statement of interest you know, what's used in there, and secondly, not, you know, really recommend language for the GNSO Operating Procedures.

And hopefully by your next call you'll be able to see the language that I'm talking about which like I said, focuses on something that we show to the prospective, you know, working group member that says, you know, this is what we collect, this is where we're going to publish it and here's how you update your SOI, etcetera, etcetera.

But what this group might want to look at is generally I guess what is or is not within scope for your discussion but even if something is not within scope but

this group after discussion believes that the specific recommendation whether it's, you know, 26 or one of the others, the spirit is there but the way it's implemented or the specific implementation format that you've been talking about may be affected by GDPR, which is what Wolf-Ulrich is saying and what this new language that Julie's put in this document, does.

Then it may be worth thinking about not just ways in which within the scope of your charter you can address the implementation issue, but it may also be a broader concern to flag for example, for the GNSO Council whether that be changes to the Operating Procedures or even indeed how an SOI is collected and displayed.

So hopefully, you know, that makes sense in terms of the discussions for this group. And I'm happy like I said, to share the language for the interim solution and we can all try and work together to figure out what specifically about this implementation discussion may need to change, and secondly, maybe more broader issues that in working through this, this group can maybe bring back to the Council and others. I hope that's helpful. Thanks, Julie and everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much, Mary. This is Julie Hedlund. And I see Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Yes, well thanks very much both to Mary and Julie. I think it's not, you know, not problematic, it's just a question whether, well, to once, you know, when we are clear about – or when, I mean, the community and staff is more clear about the impact of the GDPR, so with regard to SOIs, that we may just pick up again, you know, this recommendation and look at it. So that means so my suggestion would be here, you know, leave it as it is but, you know, put it aside, well, and take it again, you know, after, let me say, next year, just have a quick look to it, this group, because we are still working next year on other things.

So and just then think, you know, with the knowledge we will then have whether there is something which needs us, well, to look more into details. Nothing more, I think, but that would be my suggestion here. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And so I think what I'm hearing is that – we're hearing as staff is that this would be a good one to put on hold, as you say, given that we will still be working as a group on the recommendations and implementation as of next – actually this extends through to September of next year.

And also, I'll note that on the larger issue that Mary raised as far as sort of flagging possible impacts – GDPR and other impacts on the SOIs, I'm just going to remind this working group that it does have a secondary role or another role I should say, not necessarily secondary, and that is that it is the group that addresses changes to procedures, changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures whether those arise you know, through this group and the work it does or whether they're brought to the group from outside.

And so even if that issue is not in scope for this particular implementation of these recommendations, it certainly is in scope for this working group. So, Jen, I think we're taking the action that we'd be putting this on hold I think at the moment and pending updates also from ICANN on the stop gap, and we can track that status on the status page on the wiki. So if there aren't any further discussions perhaps, Jen, we should go to the next recommendation?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, I think that makes sense. Let's go ahead and keep moving forward.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. Okay, again, this is Julie Hedlund from staff. This recommendation – Recommendation 4, relates to nonfinancial community recognition. And it reads that, "The GNSO Council introduce nonfinancial rewards and recognition for volunteers." We felt that this fell under the strategic plan and promoting ICANN's role and multistakeholder approach, specifically encouraging the community role in implementation, one way to

encourage the community role is to have rewards and recognition for volunteers.

The scope is for staff to provide an overview of existing nonfinancial rewards and recognition for volunteers and then the GNSO Review Working Group to assess the overview in determine what steps, if any, are to be taken or whether the existing nonfinancial rewards are sufficient to implement the recommendation.

We found that this – of scope is clear, that there are – and also the assumption is that there are existing nonfinancial rewards and recognition for volunteers. And a deliverable might be suggestions for additional nonfinancial rewards and recognition.

So to go to the – an option analysis, no further options were necessary to be considered. For the solution so at the time that the GNSO review – okay, Emily is saying is the document not displaying for anybody else? I'm seeing the document, are others not seeing the document?

Jennifer Wolfe: I don't see it yet, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, how odd, and then some people are seeing it. And Marika, Nathalie, I'm wondering if others need to go out and come back in? Yes, Nathalie is saying please log out and back in quickly, that should fix it. In any case, even if you can't see it I'll go ahead and speak through it, so if you don't see it at least you'll know what we have here.

So at the – at the time that the review is taking place, I think that there were not – the programs that we currently have that are nonfinancial reward and recognition programs either were just starting up or really did not exist at that time and because it's only been a couple of years since these programs have been in place. So there are two key programs.

The first is the ICANN Community Recognition Program. So this program recognizes community leaders for their service and contributions to the mission of ICANN. And the process is that at the ICANN Annual General Meetings beginning in 2015, that is the last meeting of the year each year, ICANN recognizes and thanks those community volunteers who are completing their terms of service after providing a significant volunteer commitment.

So for example, on the 2nd of November, 2017 at ICANN 60, the program, as stated in the ICANN – the meeting schedule said – notes that, "Community-driven work is at the core of ICANN's mission. Countless hours are spent in working groups across our supporting organizations, advisory committees and other groups including the Nominating Committee. Together these community groups develop and refine policies that ensure the security, stability and resiliency of the global Internet. The ICANN Organization is proud to help facilitate this work. As ICANN 60 comes to an end, it is important to acknowledge the vibrant role and critical impact of our community. During the community recognition program, we will recognize 49 community leaders who have concluded a term of service since ICANN 57 or will complete a term of service at ICANN 60."

So that is the community recognition program. And that is the most – the current iteration of it that happened at ICANN 60. And I'll see – I'll note that Mary Wong said, "The community recognition program spans all officers who are stepping down from SO/AC SG and constituency leadership." And actually we can pull that into this description as well to make that more clear.

The other program is the ICANN Multistakeholder Ethos Awards. And so that is – was launched in 2014 at ICANN 50 in London. The Multistakeholder Ethos Awards recognizes ICANN participants who have deeply invested in consensus-based solutions acknowledging the importance of ICANN's multistakeholder model of Internet governance and contributed in a

substantive way to the higher interests of ICANN's organization and its community.

And the process is that in December of each year a call for nominations is announced. The ideal recipients will have served in roles in multiple ICANN working groups or committees and collaborated with more than one supporting organization and/or advisory committee in a significant capability. Candidates for the award will demonstrate at least five years of participation in the ICANN community. Candidates will be evaluated by a panel of community members appointed by the chairs of each supporting organizations and advisory committees using a merit-based point system evaluated against three criteria.

Demonstrated ability to work across community lines with both familiar and unfamiliar ICANN stakeholders with the aim of consensus building and collaboration that substantiate ICANN's multistakeholder model, facilitator of dialogue and open discussion in a fair and collegial manner through the spirit of collaboration is shown, through empathy and demonstrating a sincere desire t engage with people from other backgrounds, cultures and interests, and demonstrated additional devotional factors exhibiting – exhibited by time spent supporting ICANN's multistakeholder model and its overall effectiveness through volunteer service via working groups or committees.

The awards are announced at the Policy Forum, which is held in June or July of each year for two recipient – I should say two or more, I don't think that there's a limit, but generally it's been two. And the most recent example was – and I'm sorry, that should say ICANN 59 in July of 2017.

So and Mary Wong notes – Wolf-Ulrich asks, "What about working group volunteers?" And, yes, I think that the recognition can also be – actually I think that they do have to be people – to Wolf-Ulrich's question, just looking back at the community recognition program, so generally it is for members who are stepping down from a term of service.

So that would be somebody who had been a chair, say who would be stepping down from that role or say for example, a member of an advisory committee, you know, stepping down from that group. And so – and Mary Wong says she can answer Wolf-Ulrich so – and I see first though, Wolf-Ulrich, you have your hand up and perhaps you'd like to elaborate on your question then we can go to Mary.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Julie, can you hear me? Sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, we can hear you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, it's Wolf-Ulrich. Thanks. Well, the question was because, you know, why I raised the question, you know, in the GNSO so we rely mainly on the work of working groups, that's the model we have. You know, the decisions are to be taken in the end by others, by the Council and by some constituencies, maybe also taking some input. But, you know, the main – the real work is to be done within the working group and that's why I'm asking this question.

Well, I was also a lucky guy to being one of the 49 the last time it was a great picture and all that, but and I wouldn't like to enlarge, you know, this – to multiply these number of people because, you know, the more people you have to be awarded the less valuable the prize itself seems to be. And so those – is this, you know, this relation between these both approaches or it's a little bit complicated.

So I would like really to have discussion – discuss this question how we can cover more working group participants and those, you know, are really people doing the work also working group leaders maybe also but all participants in the working groups, well, who are doing that work how that could be covered in the future. But, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Julie. And thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. So Wolf-Ulrich actually what you just said exactly hits the nail on the head. So hopefully it's good news that what we are working on internally is to evolve the community recognition program, do a couple of things, one, to acknowledge the working group volunteers and by that obviously a bulk of that is the GNSO working groups and PDPs, but there are also work parties and groups in other SOs and ACs, and it's the same thing.

If we only have one spot in a year where we do community recognition, which is currently how it's done, and as you said, you know, there's 49 people and the vision of, you know, 300 people going on stage during the ICANN Public Forum is probably not the best way to recognize people.

So we are trying to work on a program that's somewhat more evolved and that may take place throughout the year. For the GNSO I think there's already a couple of things that I don't know is already – is on this document. So for example, when a working group is closed, the Council does pass a resolution to thank the group for their work. So there are other nonfinancial rewards and recognition but what we hope to do is to have something that's a little more consistent and that's more I guess prominent because of what you said, that the bulk of the work is done by these volunteers.

So the extent that within the charter of this Review Working Group, that there are certain ideas coming up, your implementation discussion, I think those will be very, very helpful. And so hopefully that answers your question, but at the moment that one award ceremony at the end of the AGM does not include working group volunteers but between now and the next AGM we hope to come up with some ways maybe not all at once but throughout the year to make sure that that recognition is there as well. Thanks, everybody.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much, Mary. Wolf-Ulrich, did that answer your question?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie and Mary. Yes it answers, so and we should make reference in the recommendation or in the determination of the recommendation of that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. Yes, staff is going to add not only the reference to the fact – and thank you, Mary, for the reminder that there is recognition within the GNSO to thank volunteers and working groups when the finish their work. But also thank you, Mary, for letting us know that there are internal efforts underway to seek other ways to provide recognition throughout the year for other groups of volunteers. And we'll also make reference to that as well here.

And so we'll come back with these revisions that we could perhaps touch on briefly on the next call and then determine whether or not with this new information that, you know, whether or not this recommendation is considered to be implemented assuming that there will be some additional ways or ongoing efforts to continue to provide recognition.

So, Jen, not seeing any other hands up, we can go ahead to the next recommendation if you like.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, let's keep moving. I think we've got about 25 more minutes before the top of the hour.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thank you. So Recommendation 34 – and this is Julie Hedlund again from staff – is on the rotation of PDP working group meeting start times. We felt this fell under the strategic alignment relating to the clarity and establishing mechanisms to increase trust within the ecosystem. I won't read through all this in the interest of time but hopefully you can all see this on your screen.

Recommendation 34 says that PDP working groups rotate the start time of their meetings in order not to disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world. The scope was that the working group could develop the definition of effectiveness or take into consideration criteria, participation time standardization and regional neutrality. Staff to review the working groups where rotations are used and provide indication of effectiveness. Staff to provide this review to the working group for its consideration. And then working group would determine whether this recommendation has been implemented or further work needs to be undertaken to meet the intent.

So staff did do an analysis and found that for each of the GNSO PDP working groups the leadership team currently conducts an ongoing assessment of meeting times to ensure that the meeting schedule supports and promotes participation from all regions while not unduly burdening other members who want to participate. This is a continuous joint effort between staff and working group chairs to assess the composition of the working group and time zones of its members, attendance, records for meeting and feedback from working group members at regular intervals regarding this schedule.

Based on this analysis, three PDP working groups have implemented a system of meeting time rotation. These are the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, which rotates meetings for both the full group and sub team calls; the Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace Whois PDP Working Group; and the Review of all Rights Mechanism – Rights Protection Mechanisms RPMs in all gTLDs PDP Working Group.

The working groups have continuously sought to improve making adjustments where appropriate to the schedule based on member feedback and analysis of participation data. Staff notes that every working group is unique and each has different member needs and composition. Staff believes that the leadership team and support staff for each working group are best

positioned to assess the most appropriate meeting schedule for the group and assess the effectiveness of this rotation based on principles discussed above.

As the review is ongoing staff recommends that the GNSO working group consider this recommendation to be implemented. And so staff suggestion for working group determination could be that the GNSO working group – Review Working Group has reviewed the current procedures for the rotation of meeting times and has determined that they address the recommendation that PDP working groups rotate the start time of their meetings in order to not disadvantage people who wish to participate from anywhere in the world, thus the working group determines that this recommendation is implemented.

So I'll go ahead and stop there and open things up for discussion. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. My question is just because I'd like to know exactly from the recommendation and the original one, is this recommendation just focused on effectiveness with regards to these points like timing of meetings, regional diversity and these things or are there other points also – I'm not sure about that so I didn't check some of the recommendations whether, for example, well leadership was – these kinds of questions. I also ask with the recommendation. So that's just for clarification.

And the other thing is I have – would follow, you know, your suggestion if it's just focused on this point. So I would follow your suggestion as you're doing and adding, you know, the suggestion that as you are doing already, you know, a kind of periodically reminder or review of participation in working teams in order, well, to fresh up, you know, the – and to remind people, you know, about these things. So that would be included as well, that's my suggestion. Thanks very much.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. So, yes, first of all the recommendation itself seems to be very limited in scope, really speaking only to the rotation of the start times of meetings, you know, to, you know, getting to the point of you know, making it easier for people in other parts of – in various parts of the world to participate. Some of the language in the scope statement, the language that we put in the scope statement came from language that the GNSO Review Working Party used and specifically this definition of effectiveness, you know, and the criteria, participation and time standardization and so on.

So while there is no – there is no definition of effectiveness, I think what staff found and I know Emily actually did the research for this and wrote it up and she may have some comments as well, but that there is really, you know, as part of what the working groups do is they're doing an assessment of the effectiveness of the meeting schedule, is it working? You know, are – we look – the working groups look at attendance and the attendance records are kept. If it's found that there's a rotated time that, you know, consistently gets very few attendees, the times are revisited, there may be Doodles or other methods for, you know, adjusting the times for groups. It's a continuous process.

And to your second point, I think it would be helpful for staff to put in here the fact that, you know, that there is an ongoing assessment within working groups. I think we talk about how, you know, these – I do make adjustments where appropriate but that there is also within working groups periodically the staff and leadership will assess whether or not attendance is, you know, steady at the various times and needs to be adjusted and so reminders that, you know, that the representatives and members on the working group are the appropriate ones from each organization.

And here, for example, within this particular working group, we have sent a notice to working group members and we'll send a reminder asking the stakeholder groups and constituencies to confirm their primary and alternate

members to this group because we have noted that we've had limited participation. We have asked whether or not timing needs to be adjusted. It seems that this time still works for most people, but it may be that between the membership and representation on the working group and the timing of meetings there could be ongoing adjustments.

So I think we'll add some additional text to the recommendation to speak to your point that there may need to be ongoing reminders and adjustments to timings of meetings but also to membership of working groups as well. And I see Marika has said, "From a personal experience on the RDS Working Group, the out of bounds rotation definitely gets a lot less attendance than the quote unquote normal working group meetings but the leadership is committed to keeping this rotation to accommodate participation from the Asia Pacific time zone regardless of lesser attendance."

And Kris says, "I've noticed that, Marika. I'm on the RDS." And Mary Wong, "Plus 1 to Marika's observation also from the RPM Working Group." And Emily has her hand up. Please go ahead, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks, Julie. This is Emily Barabas from staff. I just wanted to kind of emphasize one point in here that we might also want to fill in with a little more depth which is about how working group leadership teams kind of look at what effectiveness is and how that might be different for different working groups. So obviously one of the goals is to accommodate members who are in different time zones but then a second goal is to encourage participation for people who might not already be participating from those time zones.

So essentially if you don't rotate then more people from the regions where the rotation doesn't exist won't join in the future and that's' something that's been discussed a lot in the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group essentially what Marika and Mary are saying that, you know, rotation even if it loses attendance from other time zones is still something that's important to encourage participation from Asia Pacific.

So, you know, I think for some working groups the core set of attendees is based in the US and really won't show up at Asia Pacific time zones where in other cases people might be more willing to be flexible. So, you know, again I'm just emphasizing the fact that that evaluation is a bit of a balancing act and I think it's something that the leadership teams are best positioned to do rather than having a hard and fast definition of what success looks like for all working groups in terms of rotation. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. And just taking a couple of notes here. This is Julie Hedlund again. Thank you, Emily, that was quite helpful. Are there any – any further questions or discussions on this item? And staff takes the action to add a few more notes and points to the charter and we'll send around a revised version. And I see a couple people are typing but maybe, Jen, I'll take this opportunity to go to the next charter.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, yes, let's keep going.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So this is the charter for Recommendations 5, 9 and 17. Oh here we have Mary Wong saying "As Emily is saying, we do have or get grumbling from either American or European based folks on rotations that are APAC friendly, but that is simply a function of the fact that currently working group membership is dominated by volunteers from those regions. That may change in the future." Great point, Mary. Thank you very much.

So these are three recommendations that are related as they all address aspects of the working group self assessments. I won't read out the strategic alignment objective. We've seen this before. But let me get directly to the recommendations.

Recommendation 5 is that during each working group self assessment, new members be asked how their input has been solicited and considered. Recommendation 9 that a formal working group leadership assessment

program be developed as part of the overall training and development program. Recommendation 17, that the practice of working group self evaluation be incorporated into the PDP and that these evaluations should be published and used as a basis for continual process improvement in the PDP.

So Recommendations 5 and 9, scope statement that staff will provide the GNSO Review Working Group with a proposed modification, the working group Self Assessment Survey to include new questions on how working group member input has been solicited and considered and; a new assessment survey for working group leadership.

And based on the proposed modifications the Review Working Group would determine if provisions are necessary to the Working Group Guidelines. If there are changes, just as a reminder, to the GNSO Operating Procedures including Working Group Guidelines, and the PDP those do need to go out for public comment and approval by the GNSO Council.

The Recommendation 17, the working group would review current procedures of self evaluation in the PDP Working Group Guidelines and will work with staff on possible modifications which will be published for public comment noting here that if there are changes to the Operating Procedures they could go for public comment. If there are changes to the survey itself, and the questions in the survey, those are not – the survey itself is referenced in the Operating Procedures but the survey is separate from the Operating Procedures and doesn't require public comment to be modified.

So it may not be that an amendment to the Operating Procedures are required, the working group can decide that. So just moving down to the solution so the – for Recommendation 5, staff notes that the working group self assessment currently includes the question, "How long have you been involved – actively involved with ICANN?" This provides information about whether the respondent is new to ICANN or a more experienced member of the community.

Section 4 of the working group self assessment asks respondents to rate on a scale of 1-7 their personal level of engagement in helping the working group accomplish its mission, personal level of fulfillment and willingness to serve in future groups. There is also a text box for respondents to provide comments. Staff recommends adding a second free text field to this page with the question, "How was your input solicited and considered by the working group?" While all respondents will be prompted to answer this question, those analyzing the results will be able to filter and view responses only from newcomers if they choose to do so.

On Recommendation 7, staff notes that Section 2 of the working group self assessment asks respondents to rate on a scale of 1-7 effectiveness of participation climate, behavior norms, decision making methodology and session meeting planning. Section 3 requests input on the same scale regarding effectiveness of the primary mission and quality of outputs, deliverables. Section 2 and 3 also has free text fields for comments. Staff suggests adding an additional question for Section 2 and 3.

For Section 2, "How did performance of the working group leadership chair, cochairs, vice chairs, impact effectiveness with respect to norms, operations, logistics and decision making? Please provide examples." For Section 3, "How did performance of the working group leadership, chair, cochairs, vice chairs, impact effectiveness with respect to products and outputs? Please provide examples."

And then finally for Recommendation 17, discussion of the working group self assessment is currently included in Section 7.0 of the Working Group Guidelines. Use of this assessment is standard practice in PDPs and other working groups in the GNSO. In the self assessment questionnaire, members are asked a series of questions about the team's input processes, e.g. norms, decision making, logistics, and outputs as well as other relevant dimensions and participation experiences. Processes regarding the self assessment

questionnaire included in working group charters under Section 6.2.4.4, closure and working group self assessment.

Working group self assessment results are posted on the working group wiki and are available to be reviewed by the GNSO Council, staff and community members and acted upon if results of the survey warrant follow up action. Thus per staff, this recommendation would appear to be implemented.

Staff notes that if the above suggested changes are made to the self assessment survey then no changes would need to be made to the Working Group Guidelines themselves. Staff – and there would not be a requirement for public comment. So the suggestion from staff – "Is this survey anonymous?" that's a very good question, Wolf-Ulrich. I don't have – I did not load up the survey template. Emily, do you recall if it asks for – if the survey asks for a name? Kris says, "I do not think it's anonymous."

Emily says, "She believes it is. One moment," she'll confirm. So while Emily is looking at that, so a staff suggestion was that the working group has reviewed the suggested changes to the working group self assessment questionnaire addressing Recommendation 5, 7 and 17 and once these changes are made this – these recommendations would deem to be implemented.

So I'll now open it up for discussion recognizing that we only have seven minutes left so we may need to carry over to the next meeting. Please go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Julie. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well the question I am asking whether it's anonymous or not, well, if the type of questions you are adding here could well in a case where you have a leadership which people are not – do not like also but there might be, you know, some critical arguments, well to be brought up. So and if it's not anonymous so the people – you know how people are, you know, and you don't like really to offer, you know, just hostile arguments, so if it's not anonymous. So that's why I'm asking this question.

And so on the other hand it may help so if – in the one sense I understand that some questions are rated in a form from 1-7 or 1-10, but other questions they could not be rated because the type of question and then therefore it might be helpful even, well, to have a set of examples as answers, for example, five answers which cover, you know, this kind of rating also, maybe that helps. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So and just some things from the chat, yes, the name is required. And that's to make sure that the person responding is a working group member in fact, so and is a member of that particular working group. But the information is kept confidential, summary information is published but not attributed. So it is a good point but it seems that there does need to be some accountability as far as making sure that the actual working group members of that group who are taking the survey.

And, you know, I guess one thing we might consider we can look at the language again of the survey to see if it addresses this, the issue of confidentiality and ensuring that people who are answering the survey that the information is not for attribution and that it will be kept confidential because as you note, someone might be concerned about, you know, putting critical information in about, say, someone in a leadership position, they may be reluctant to do that, you know, if their name is included.

We'll take the action to take a look at the language again of the survey to see if it's clear as far as attribution and confidentiality. And also as to your note, we can take a look too to see whether or not it's clear how people should respond in a case where there are sort of rating levels or whether or not there needs to be examples as Wolf-Ulrich has mentioned. So we'll take a look at those things and perhaps we can just revisit this briefly at the next meeting to decide whether or not we can deem it to be implemented.

And I see we have three minutes left, and perhaps, Jen, I'll just – if you like I can go over the meeting schedule…

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: …and reminder on participation.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, absolutely. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so the meeting schedule, we did ask for the timing whether or not we wanted to settle on 1200 UTC or 1300. There was some biased to 1300 UTC so we have settled on that. We will have one more meeting in December, that will be on the 14th. We will not meet on the 28th of December as the ICANN offices are closed that week. And of course many people are out for the holidays.

So we will then go ahead and start up again in January. And I think what we've got on the schedule is starting up that first week in January on the 4th. Does that – yes, because also we'll note the – when we look at January we'll note the conflicts currently. If we meet on the 4th and the 18th, that puts a meeting on the 1st of February and we know that there are meetings – intercessional meetings that clash. And so the working group could decide whether or not to postpone to the following week.

Staff notes that we would not meet the week prior to that so that the week of the 22-25 because the policy development workshop happens that week and we generally don't try to schedule when the policy staff are typically not available during that time. So perhaps the working group would like to revisit the timing of that February 1 meeting as we get a little bit – as we get into January.

And then just finally again the reminder of stakeholder groups and constituencies to confirm their primary and alternate members; staff will send that reminder out again. And I have the top of the hour.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, thanks, Julie. And thanks to everybody for joining the call, for your active participation. We got through all the items on the agenda so that's great to keep things moving forward. And we'll talk again in December before we take a break for the holidays. So thanks to everybody and we'll talk in two weeks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks, all. Thank you very much. Good-bye.

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining today's call. Operator, you may now stop the recordings. This adjourns the call. Thank you.

END