

# At-Large Workspace: Invitation to Provide Input for PDP 3.0 Implementation

Public Comment Close	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
22 November 2019	<a href="#">Invitation to Provide Input for PDP 3.0 Implementation</a>	<b>SUBMITTED</b> Extension request granted to <u>Wednesday, 27 November</u> .	<a href="#">Holly Raiche</a> <a href="#">Alan Greenberg</a> <a href="#">Justine Chew</a>	22 November 2019	26 November 2019			27 November 2019	GNSO Secretariat <a href="mailto:gnso-secs@icann.org">gnso-secs@icann.org</a>	AL-ALAC-ST-1119-03-01-EN

Hide the information below, please click [here](#) >>

**Email from GNSO on 24 October 2019 to Maureen Hilyard, ALAC Chair:**

On behalf of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council, we are writing to provide you with an update and seek you, ALAC, feedback on the proposed implementation documents for PDP 3.0, a GNSO Council initiative aimed to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of GNSO policy development processes. The [GNSO Council response](#) to the "Next Steps to Improve the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model" public comment contains background of the PDP 3.0 initiative and details of our implementation process.

As of today, the GNSO Council has received the implementation documents for ten (10) out of the fourteen (14) PDP 3.0 improvements. We expect to receive the proposed implementation for the remaining four (4) improvements sometime before the GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session in January 2020. You are welcome to check this [wiki page](#) for details and future updates.

As the GNSO Council is in the process of reviewing these proposed implementation documents, we invite your members to provide feedback and input for the [selected improvements](#) in the table attached. We believe these improvements may affect the participation of members in the wider ICANN community in GNSO PDP working groups, while the other improvements are internal to the procedure within the GNSO.

The GNSO Council appreciate comments from the ALAC and will take them into consideration when finalizing the proposed implementation. At-Large members are encouraged to send their comments to their ALAC Liaison to the GNSO for GNSO transmission to the GNSO Council. If possible, please forward your comments and input to the GNSO Council by **22 November 2019** so that we may fully consider them in our further deliberation.

**FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)**

*The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.*



AL-ALAC-ST-111...9-03-01-EN.pdf

# FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

*The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.*

*[Updated Draft as at 26.11.2019](#)*

*Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed implementation documents for PDP 3.0.*

*The ALAC appreciates proposed reforms to the PDP process that may make the process more effective and efficient in achieving outcomes. However, in striving for timely, inclusive, productive and broad-based participation in PDP 3.0, the ALAC wish to share some feedback with the GNSO Council.*

## **Selection of WG Model**

*The [proposed Improvement #2](#) suggests 3 models from which the GNSO Council (or the PDP Team Charter drafting team) would select, subject to rationale and arguments for their selection and presumably based on a pre-determined set of elements. The ALAC believes that membership and participation in a WG should be limited only in VERY specific situations. The current Open Model clearly was problematic in the Registration Directory Service (RDS) Review and perhaps would be in the EPDP on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, but it has served us well in many other PDPs, so any decision to depart from it under regular circumstances will lead us back to the Task Force model that was abandoned for good reasons after the first GNSO Organizational Review over ten years ago. Therefore we propose the default should be the Open Model and that the GNSO Council (or the PDP Team Charter drafting team) should always be called upon to explicitly address why their selection should not be the Open Model.*

*In the case of the Open Model and the Representative & Open Model where participation is open to anyone, we suggest that a process be put in place for a periodic reminder (or invitation) be issued to persons who had volunteered to be WG members but do not appear to be actively turning up for calls or contributing on mailing lists to renew their Statement of Participation (see: [proposed Improvement #1](#)) failing which, they could opt to become observers instead. We think this would assist in ensuring active engagement by WG participants.*

## **Encouraging Compromise and Cooperation**

*Regardless of the WG Model selected, we do need better ways to ensure compromise and cooperation among WG participants. This aspect does not appear to have been considered within the proposed implementation documents and we hope to see some developments on this in the near future.*

## **WG Leadership Selection**

*We are concerned about a lack of considered improvements to the selection of WG Leadership as such selection is critical to the success of a PDP. WG leader(s) MUST be able to do the job, and must be able to do it without bias or vested interest in the outcomes. That has been a major issue in previous successes and failures.*

## **Better Support to Facilitate Broad-based Participation**

*The GNSO Review of 2014 recognised the need for the GNSO WGs to more broadly reflect the ICANN community and made several recommendations to achieve those ends. Specifically, its first three recommendations - grouped together under the heading 'participation and representation' - recommended that the GNSO develop outreach strategies for new WG membership, a drive to recruit volunteers for new WGs and remove any cost barriers to participation in GNSO WGs.*

*While there are no specific cost barriers to direct participation in GNSO WG, indirectly, there are costs. Almost all ALAC and At-Large Community members are volunteers, and their participation in WG is generally not related to their employment. Therefore participation in WGs does represent a loss - either of time with family and friends or loss of holiday time since many such 'volunteers' use their holiday leave to attend ICANN meetings and/or WG meetings.*

*We also ask that the GNSO recognise and take into account the barriers others, including ALAC and At-Large community members face in participation in WGs. Those barriers include lack of technical knowledge on the issue, language barriers, geographical barriers (making the time of WG calls very difficult for 'the other half' of the globe), and the fact that ALAC and At-Large community members are volunteers; time taken to understand and participate in WGs is time away from paid employment and/or family.*

*Thus, the GNSO could help ensure more participation by members of the At-Large Community through steps such as:*

- *Providing webinars (to accommodate different time zones) to explain the issues to be considered*
- *Providing webinars in different languages*
- *In the webinars, either have a technical expert to explain in simple terms the issues to be addressed, or have a separate webinar specifically to provide background information on the issue to be considered.*

## **Request for Data Gathering**

*We are supportive of the [proposed Improvement #14](#) in its aims to not only clarify the criteria for data gathering at the charter drafting phase or during the working phase of a PDP, but also to optimise flexibility for the same as we recognise the value of possessing relevant data to aide the drawing of conclusions in a PDP.*

*In concluding, the ALAC would welcome the opportunity to work with the GNSO for reforms to the PDP that encourage and support broad-based participation which upholds ICANN's mission as a truly multi-stakeholder organisation.*

*Thank you for the opportunity to comment on PDP3 planning.*

*ALAC appreciates proposed reforms to the PDP process that may make the process more effective and efficient in achieving outcomes. The concerns ALAC have are that those reforms are not accompanied by reforms that will encourage and support ALAC or At-Large Community members both to join a WG and to continue with constructive membership in that WG.*

*The GNSO Review of 2014 recognised the need for the GNSO WGs to more broadly reflect the ICANN community and made several recommendations to achieve those ends. The final report of that Review suggests that the GNSO has implemented all of those recommendations. We strongly suggest that the GNSO Council revisit those proposed reforms to ensure their continued implementation.*

*We also ask that the GNSO recognise and take into account the barriers others, including ALAC and At-Large community members face in participation in WGs. Those barriers include lack of technical knowledge on the issue, language barriers, geographical barriers (making the time of WG calls very difficult for 'the other half' of the globe), and the fact that ALAC and At-Large community members are volunteers; time taken to understand and participate in WGs is time away from paid employment and/or family.*

*The GNSO could take steps to ensure more participation by members of the At-Large Community through steps such as:*

- providing webinars (to accommodate different time zones) to explain the issues to be considered*
- providing webinars in different languages*
- In the webinars, either have a technical expert to explain in simple terms the issues to be addressed, or have a separate webinar specifically to provide background information on the issue to be considered.*

*ALAC would welcome the opportunity to work with the GNSO to ensure that reforms to the PDP processes ensure that other ICANN members are encouraged and supported to constructively contribute to ensure that those processes reflect ICANN's mission as upholding a truly multistakeholder organisation.*

---

## **DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION**

*The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).*

### Speaking from context of ALAC participation in a ccwg under PDP 3.0

1 - ccwgs are becoming so complex now that there must be an expected level knowledge, expertise and competency, plus a firm commitment to stick with some of these long-standing PDPs. We had a disappointing drop out rate from our own group and had to relegate an appointed member to observer status and replace him with an active participant who was also a regular attendee from the outset. Sometimes people volunteer who have the knowledge but not the commitment (staying power)

2. The different levels of participants in a working group as an alternative WG model worked for us from the example of our own participation in a CCWG in #1. It means that everyone will be keen to join in at the start, however as the number of issues get drawn out, they tend to drop off until you have a core. Every now and again the WG needs to review the representation of constituency groups still the WG and if there is still a balance of representatives. I have been on Auction WG meetings where ALAC reps equalled all other participants at the meeting (not counting the Chair, VC and staff.).

3. The stratified membership of a WG does allow for people to step up to member status for participation. However it can be disruptive to have people joining in after a considerable time and has not completely read up with where the WG is at. I think the joining up criteria is very dependent on what background they have on the topic and if they actually will bring any new perspectives. It takes us back to the expectations of #1

4. suggest you distribute the playbook to other constituencies as well so that we all play the same game - we might get consensus better that way

5. I think that it is extremely important for the GNSO to have a Council liaison to support the WG leadership and to help keep the WG on track and achieving their goals and hopefully timeframes. More of an advisor to the group as Board liaisons have been in the Auction Proceeds WG.

6. Documentation about roles and responsibilities should be given to all WG leaders but more importantly they have to have the necessary skills and expertise to manage groups that have high level technical knowledge and a diverse range of views, and achieve consensus.

9. Perhaps there should be an Academy program for WG Chairs to learn not only chairmanship, but mediation and consensus building skills as well as conflict resolution for #15

11. The scope of a pdp should be limited and focused. Some PDPs have been so complex that there is no way they can be done in a reasonable timeframe. People get tired of the same old thing, especially if it is controversial and complex enough to easily get people tied up and frustrated because consensus can then seem impossible. Small bite-sized pieces as recommended could get the WG through a PDP much more effectively as well as efficiently. And you would keep your WG team together longer. But it requires a lot of work to ensure that the PDP is carved up into its specific objective components so that you work towards one goal at a time.

12. Notifying the Council if anything was changed would be the responsibility of the Council Liaison. This would enable the Council to make the next set of decisions about the WG.

13. An annual report by the WG Chair would enable the Council to assess performance and results of the WG Chair in relation to progress according to milestones set within its Charter.

14. Such flexibility must be made possible to prevent PDPs going on forever with no chance of consensus being achieved. If the situation gets to this level, then a rigorous review of the scope and clarity of the expectations of the original charter may be required

15. Conflict resolution mechanisms should be available to assist WG leaders to manage any possible conflicts that may challenge the progress of the WG. It would be handy to share these among other groups

16. As part of this issue I'd like to request that the updated information be in language that allows non-technical ICANN participants to really understand what is actually developing within the PDP. In At-Large we are impressing on communication as an important aspect of our role in ICANN to ensure that all participants understand policy and why it is important to them, and why they should care. If these updates were already provided so that the key issues can be clearly understood across the diverse set of end-users within the ICANN community, it would be very much appreciated.

17. Resource reporting - internal