Transcription ICANN London
Update on GNSO PDP Improvements
Saturday 21 June 2014

Volker Griemann: Okay first on our agenda is the GNSO PDP improvements. Before I start to delve into too much detail and costing us all too much time I would just like to ask Marika to take over and present the topic and the slides that you have obviously prepared.

Marika Konings: Yes thank you Volker and the slides are coming up. Just basically starting off with another reminder and, you know, we had identified based on our discussions I think between staff and the council and the broader GNSO community ten areas of possible improvement aimed at streamlining and enhancing the GNSO policy development process.

And as part of the process a number of next steps were identified. And for several those I think we had done some work as a pilot project approaches to experiment and try them out and then come back and see how those were going.

For two specific items we did form a small committee to help staff in those areas. And it was also agreed -- next slide Lars -- to provide an update at the ICANN meetings on where things were and allow the council for questions and comments and possible corrections to the course that we were taking.

On the next slide so we've got an update. I've listed all of these items you identified and then briefly mentioned some of the things we have been doing or planning to doing and also highlight in blue some of the items were - I think we're specifically looking for council input or feedback.

And of course all the issues are open for discussion but those are some of the specific questions or issues we identified.

So first of all we had to include the proposed chart as part of the preliminary issue report identified as one of the possible areas where we could streamline the PDP.

Because in that past we would use the drafting teams so basically after the initiation of a PDP a drafting team would be formed that would work on the charter and that typically would, you know, take a couple of months before that would come back to the council.

So one of the suggestions was made, you know, how about if we would experiment with actually including a proposed charter as part of the preliminary issue report based on the content of the issue report obviously put it over public comments, encourage also input on that and then with the final issue report produce a final version that is then submitted to the GNSO council for its consideration so obviously leaving open the option of, you know, discarding the charter, forming a drafting team or, you know, forming a drafting team and using the draft, the proposed charter as a basis for discussion.

So at the first opportunity we actually had to use that process for the recent curative rights PDP. So we did include charter there. And that was up for consideration at the last meeting. It was deferred and it's being considered here. So again this is a bit of a first test case. And then we'll see on Wednesday indeed whether that was something that did receive broad support.

Someone -and we did already receive and I think it was particularly Avri pointed that out and will definitely take that with us as we hopefully do this for other efforts is that we make sure that when we publish a preliminary issue report that we specifically call out but there is a charter that people are also encouraged to review and post it as well as a separate document and

similarly when we submit the final issue report to the council that we also submit the charter as a separate document making it easier for people to review and comment on.

Next slide, so that intensity of PDP Working Group meetings was one we briefly touched upon earlier today. And we did some calculations. And, you know, in general it takes between 32 to 64 hours, you know, spread over a year or two, a year and a half for a working group to produce its final report.

This typically takes the form of a weekly or biweekly calls and, you know, certain cases one hour, two hours -- different variations but that's the -- about the range.

And at the time we also discussed the increasing ICANN intensity may not always be desirable or feasible and I think it's actually taking into account the current workload.

I don't think I would see a lot of enthusiasm if we would suggest increasing the current working group meetings that we're having. It's already hard to actually to get their working groups on a weekly schedule so let alone as suggested increasing that.

However we did discuss also the option of exploring what would be the impact of actually having face to face time for working groups.

Would that make a difference? Would that help them too, you know, work through difficult issues? Would that actually, you know, speed up the process?

And thinking through that and we actually developed a proposal for our pilot project to allow for facilitated face to face PDP working group meetings which also aligned with one of the other items where we spoke about, you know, seeing if facilitation would help and come to a conclusion on moving working groups forward.

And this is also one of the specific items that was identified by the ATRT2 as a needing further exploration.

So this was actually approved by the ICANN board as part of the special community request. So we're now able to implement a pilot project that foresees the PDP working group face to face meeting with facilitation during the next ICANN meeting for fiscal year '15. That means the next three meetings.

And in order to implement that and just to be clear, you know, we submitted the proposal outlining an approach for that and we've also identified a working group that from our perspective would be very suitable to have the meeting in that timeframe as a Proxy Privacy Services Working Group.

Because they seem to be, you know, attracted hopefully deliver an initial report by January would work and very well in their schedule.

But just to make clear as well the funding that is foreseen for that meeting is basically just a traditional hotel night meeting room facilitation. It doesn't foresee any additional travel funding.

So the idea is that stakeholder groups and constituencies would identify members of their groups that are either already traveling to the meeting at their own expense or already as funded as meeting participants.

And again, you know, the idea is that this is a pilot that after that the year period we review and evaluate did it have an impact, you know, was it from the perspective of working group members effective, efficient? Did it help their conversations to me face to face to have a professional facilitator?

In the proposal we've also outlined some ideas on how we may use the facilitation part as a kind of training opportunity for possibly a member of the community as well so be kind of a tandem team.

We have a professional facilitator who's skilled in facilitation but maybe a community member that's more well-versed in, you know, knowing the different community members, the sensitive issues, the topics. And the person can work closely together.

And hopefully that will benefit that person and as well as they may take on, you know, and share our responsibilities and in other efforts.

So the question we're really asking here we shared the proposal with the council list, you know, if you have any comments or suggestions please let us know.

Seeing that the meeting in LA is coming up pretty quickly if there are any concerns with moving ahead as suggested as well with the working group we've identified as a suitable candidate for that it would be helpful I think if we could get some feedback on that ASAP.

The proposal is also that then at the next meeting we would basically review or already have some feedback on what happens in LA and also identify who will be the next group that will be eligible or suitable for that effort.

It could be the case that it's the same group that would continue on the same basis or maybe a different effort as I think again basically looking at the status of where our working group is and, you know, how it's viewed it may help in their process of coming to either initial report or final report.

Next slide, to increase the pool of PDP working group volunteers we already discussed that quite extensively earlier today.

I just want to mention again that we have started I think in January with the concept of monthly open house new Common Group Working Group Webinars which are cohosted by council members.

And I want to thank especially James and Avri and Thomas who have agreed to serve as cohost for these sessions.

The idea is really to have a kind of open house. You know, anyone interested can just show up and, you know, ask any questions that they may have about, you know, what is involved in participating in a PDP working group.

We have, you know, a basic set of slides available that we can on what is a PDP, how does it work, you know, what are the working group guidelines, you know, what can you expect and what are some of the basic things, you know, how do you use Adobe Connect, what is a wiki -- those kinds of things.

And so far I think we have that, you know, a handful of people showing up for each of these calls which I think is a pretty good turnout because it does allow for very open and frank discussion and people asking questions.

And the feedback we've received so far is it's pretty positive. So I think from that perspective we're quite happy with that.

And clearly from a staff perspective we're also increasing our conversations with colleagues from the GSE Team, the Global Stakeholder Engagement team in ICANN to ensure coordination and synergy between our two departments.

As you know GSE is mainly focuses well on outreach and engagement. But from our perspective they're the ones that are rallying up new volunteers.

And but we need to find a way how to catch those people and make sure that we, you know, have make sure that they have a soft landing if they're interested in joining GNSO activities.

So we're having further conversation on how we can, you know, facilitate and enhance our collaboration there.

And also aligned with that is another proposal that we circulated to council for the development of a PDP working group member on boarding program.

As you note I think a lot of materials and, you know, videos and presentations that we have available on the GNSO Web site that are, you know, spread out over different parts. And but we don't even really have a kind of, you know, welcome program when people join the GNSO or join an effort.

So what we're trying to do here is if we can come up with a kind of, you know, on-boarding program that caters to different levels of newcomers where it's easy for them to find information.

And as you'll see there's a quite detailed proposal as what kind of information we think we should be providing or developing for that.

I think eventually as well we'll look at as well, you know, any information stakeholder groups and constituencies may have that may, you know, feed into there that will be helpful.

And we'll definitely be reaching out to all of you because I think we're, you know, we're looking at ways that we can engage everyone in explaining certain things.

And the feedback we've received from some of these efforts is that it's often better or easier to hear from people that are actually doing it than maybe hearing it from staff. So we're hoping to make this again a collaborative effort.

So if you have any feedback or input on the proposed outline for that program please let us know. I think we took some notes as well from the earlier sessions on some of the comments but again feedback very much appreciated.

Next slide, so another item we identified was requiring working group representatives from each stakeholder group and constituency as well as liaisons possibly from SOs and ACs.

I think this is an item the basically need some further discussion maybe also in light of a comment (James) earlier made is the working group model still the right one?

And we're also going to look at some data so we can actually have, you know, some further information, you know, what has been the makeup of recent working groups, are there indeed certain groups that are really absent and if so how we can make sure too that they are informed and engaged.

And we've already spoken about the GAC GNSO Consultation Group which is also exploring mechanisms for early engagement of the GAC.

And then something that we want to implement following London is also partly inspired by this notion that we do see a lot of people signing up for working groups as members but we don't actually see them, you know, turning up on calls.

So one of the questions is, is it, you know, are these members only interested in maybe receiving emails because we know some people don't like to go back to the mailing list archives but they do want to stay up to date so that they can't, you know, keep a close eye.

So one of the things we want to implement now that we have a new mailing list system in place is to allow for an option for people to sign up as an observer.

And basically what that will mean they would just get the mail - the emails in their inbox like it's a listen-mode only. They cannot post. They won't get the call information. They're not considered a working group member but they have the ability to just receive the email communications.

And if any point they would want to become a working group member, you know, they can let the secretary know, complete a statement of interest, and join the working group as a formal member.

But we hope that will give us some insight as well into, you know, the people signing up to working groups. Are some of those members just interested in, you know, getting the emails in their inbox instead of actually being an active working group participant.

So I think we're anxious to see what the outcome may be of that and, you know, report back accordingly.

So the next call for volunteers will specifically call that out as one of the new options and we just want to see what, you know, what response that may get.

Next one improved online tools and training. I think it links back as well to what we spoke about before, the on boarding program and something we've started as a trial with the data protection and no data metrics for policymaking working group before is having a calendar invite attached to meeting requests.

And one of the things to maybe make it easier for people to remember that there is a meeting and, you know, if you can't make it to show up and if they can't to actually send apologies to the secretariat.

There is an option to actually and attach I think it's a CVS file so people can click it and it automatically goes into their calendar.

That's one of the things we'll be implementing across all working groups after London. And again will track to see if that actually has an impact on attendance and participation as well as notification from working group members if they cannot participate as a result of that to see if maybe that's a successful tool or not.

Next slide. We spoke about that extensively this morning and this is one we'll, you know, do some further work on and some thinking.

I think we've got some good suggestions earlier at this morning about this topic. And there really seems to be some interest in further exploring this. So, you know, it will be high on our list and provide some further detail around and come back to you on that one.

The next one the professional motivation facilitation and involvement of experts. I think we briefly already touched upon the item of involvement of experts and have taken notice some of the suggestions that were made for example by (Gabriella) of providing materials that, you know, explain how contributions to working group may make a difference and especially explaining that in such a way that outside and people may think that it's a good thing or a nice thing to participate in this effort.

So we have the pilot that we're looking at for LA and following that on having professional facilitation involvement in managing working group meetings as well as, you know, training working group participants.

The community facilitation training that was piloted in Buenos Aires will continue. And I've been told there will be a next session and most likely prior to the LA meeting.

So again there will be opportunities for community members to participate in that. And I understand that the first pilot was quite well-received by those that participated in it.

And I think based on the review of the pilot, you know, will explore further options and recommendations. Indeed does professional facilitation does that really work or are we actually more looking having community members trained and skilled in facilitation skills?

Next item, organize workshops and discussions at the outset. I think at this stage is something we just can only further encourage and promote this issue emerge for from policy considerations.

And we haven't really seen anything bubbling up where I think there was a sense that, you know, the workshop or discussion should have been held at the outset before further action was taken.

So it's something I think we just need to remind people of that they have that option at their availability.

The next slide better data and metrics. You've heard already this morning why the data metrics for policymaking working groups so they are actively looking at that issue.

There will be an update from compliance on Wednesday. It was one of the outstanding items coming from I think that uniformity of reporting effort.

But they will provide an update on what they've done in improving their systems and how hopefully they'll be able to provide as well for the improved data and access to that data to policymaking efforts.

And then also from the staff side we're doing undertaking some efforts to have more information and data available to help inform these discussions and as well as, you know, show hopefully progress in some of these items to the GNSO as we move forward.

And the last item was explore flexibility in relation to public comment forum duration. As you may have seen a blog post was posted just before this meeting that some of - some improvements to the public comment forum are coming and will be implemented following London.

If you have any questions on that I'll point to Rob Hoggarth who's sitting on the other side of the room.

But I think this is one of the areas where, you know, the council may just want to review what improvements are being made and suggested and see and determine whether any further action is needed and how that aligns with the council's need and suggestions in this relation especially of course from a policymaking perspective.

So last slide what are the next steps? First take away the review or the input we receive from you today and, you know, we'll close it of course with some hopefully questions and comments.

So any feedback you have on either, you know, any of the items represented today any other suggestions you may have, you know, beyond what we've proposed in moving forward in some of these items.

And with a specific input on the two papers we circulated on the PDP face to face working group meetings as well as the on boarding program would be very much appreciated.

And I think then basically, you know, we'll continue with implementing these ideas and suggestions and next steps identify them.

We'll have the next update in Los Angeles. And that was it for my part.

Volker Griemann: Thank you Marika. I think we have a very clear picture of how things are moving ahead.

Are there any questions? And I see (Peter)'s hand up first so I'll start with you.

(Peter): I have in fact one question and one note. The question is when it comes to the open house newcomer Webinars what is the percentage of participation?

And have you any ideas of - have you seen any increase of the rate of activity for new members that have - after they have participated? That's a question.

And the note is more of a personal note. I really support the idea of heaven the possibility of observers to participate in the working groups because that mean that the list of real participants will be the people that have considered that they have time to act actively in the working group.

And I presume that also people that are more of general interest can get these general information by signing up as an observer which probably will also increase the numbers of replies once the suggestions are outside there so that's good.

Volker Griemann: Thank you (Peter). John?

Marika Konings: Do you want me to respond first or...

Volker Griemann: Of course I'm sorry. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: And just to respond on the second point, you know, we've also taken note indeed of some of the suggestions you specifically made on the call for volunteers outline what is required if you sign up for working groups.

And to make clear that if you sign up, you know, it may be for a one or two your period or weekly calls and make clear that indeed there is this other option two, you know, monitor conversation and participate in another way.

On the participation of the newcomer sessions I think we've seen, you know, four to five people on each of these to a large extent ALAC participants.

I think they seem to be very interested in how to engage. But I think it's too early to really see if that has or has already made a difference in the actual output of working groups.

But that may be something where we, you know, we do want to track that and maybe have a more rigorous follow-up as well with some of these members to say what was your experience, how did you like it, are there things we can do?

But I think we will try as well to build that altogether in the kind of package for the PDP Working Group on boarding program where this is one of the features offered.

And I think with that we do want to have some kind of, you know, measurement of was it useful for people, you know, what particularly did enable them to participate more actively and equip them to, you know, be a volunteer and participate proactively?

(Peter):   But if it's not too difficult for you we'll need to think to have, you know, certain time limits a follow-up on the results.

Volker Griemann: Okay. Conscious of the time we're already have made up some time but if there is any others then I would like to take the notes and then first John then Brett, anybody else? (David)?

John Berard: Excuse me John Berard from the Business Constituency. I think (Peter) is right that the emergence of an observer group is a good thing but only because it suggests that there's been an emergence of registered members which would then allow for observers.

And if you knit together what we discussed earlier today as can be found in the charter for the Internet Governance Cross Community Working Group the preliminary insight that I offered regarding the Cross Community Working Groups squared I think that there is an interest, a growing interest in having constituencies and stakeholder groups within the GNSO and groups more broadly in - within the community to actively designate or actively decide not to participate in working groups.

That can be very helpful both to the process and speed at which a working group conducts its business but also in terms of extending the recruiting of new working group members.

If a constituency or a stakeholder group wants to participate they're going to have to help us find people to do that. So I think that's good on a number of points.

Volker Griemann: Thank you John. Brett?

Brett Fausett: Interesting that so many comments about the observer status of which I think we all agree is a great idea.

Just one suggestion you may want to think about. If you make observers read-only without the ability to post I think you'll find that a lot of people won't select it because there are a lot of people who want to follow it and maybe there's a 2% or 3% chance that they'll find something as their issue that's going to come up that they want to post about.

If you make it read only post I bet people don't pick it even though they're - they should because they're unlikely to post.

Just maybe give them a safety valve in case they do want to switch their membership or they have something really important that they feel like they need to say.

Volker Griemann: I have Avri but I have you after (David).

(David): On the observer issue well one thing one comment is the only really reason why someone should have to be in nonspeaking observer mode is if they are willing to file an SOI or something like that. I don't know why being not very active member of a group is a big problem.

But the other thing I want to say on the observer issue -- and I'm afraid this is going to come across a little bit petulant but I know that I'm in that mode of not sort of signed up to a working group but not actively participating in meetings for at least two working groups at the moment.

And the process goes pretty much like I'm interested in the topic and I'd like to join this working group.

And about a couple of weeks later after the obligatory doodle poll I decide that adding a 3:00 or 4:00 AM regular meeting is not going to happen.

And that if there's a meeting that I - if there's a group that I can only participate in by 3:00 or 4:00 AM meetings I need to be very, very motivated.

And if we have working groups that only meet at the same time every time that's going to happen to somebody.

It just so happens that because of times that I mean it's usually me. But, you know, having working groups only meet at the one specific time is always going to be a problem for someone so yes.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. If I can just respond, I mean we're by no way saying that if you are, you know, not going to show up you can only be an observer. It's just an option we're going to provide because I think as well for us to assess, you know, if there are people that sign up as a working group member and, you know, they don't have any intention to participate, they just want to get the emails.

And we don't know, maybe we have no one signing up as observers because maybe most people are as you describe listening and do want to intervene or, you know, may not be able to attend calls but do want to stay on top and be able to participate if or when they can.

So I think it's really just an option where we're providing and maybe if over time we see that really no one selects that option well we've seen that indeed everyone that signs up does so consciously and is interested and willing to engage, you know, where needed. So...

(David): And it is - because I know they tried to do it. It is very difficult to remain sort of engaged with the working group where you can make none of the meetings.

So, you know, you can sort of have a few comments on email threads but most working groups if they have regular meetings will tend to not do a lot of work in there as much.

It tends to be harder, much harder to follow the email threads and so on but it's - it is a real problem.

Volker Griemann: Okay. I've been just informed that we only have a limited time for the SSAC so I would ask that everybody be concise.

I will not remove anybody from the list so Avri?

Avri Doria: Okay yes. I tend to be against the silent observer role. I only see a purpose for the observer role when there's bounded membership.

So in these groups that we put together with two to six people yes I see a purpose for observer role. But other than that I really just think we need to accept the fact that not everybody participates at the same level and deal with it that way. Thanks.

Volker Griemann: Thanks Avri. Next is Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I guess one of the - my observations is I have gone back and looked at the participation rate on some of the working groups. And I do think there is a big need for a category of listen-only or follow only. But I think there also has to be an easy way to switch that to active.

The other comment I was just going to make is I would urge us I think a lot of people want to listen or watch because that's in their breed so to speak if they're a government or they're from a business association or from a business and there are multiple people -- I can't speak for anyone else -- but there are multiple people who are following an issue.

But having the ability to switch easily I think is important. I just want to make one other point. And that is that we have up till now perhaps not really fully appreciated how important the transcripts are.

I just want to reinforce that again that the documentation and the transcripts that are being provided that go with the wikis, et cetera, continue to build the ability for somebody to come in at a later date.

And I think obviously that may help us with the observer category for people then to want to switch. Thanks.

Volker Griemann: Thank you Marilyn. Marika wanted to respond to Avri. And so last person in the queue I have James.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. To respond to Avri's point I think part of the reason as well as it would be easy to make it a real assessment of who's there to do work.

I think partly when we form working groups and we see the list of volunteers we normally make an assessment like okay we have a good basis to start the work.

But indeed if you for example see that, you know, 25 people have signed up as an observer and there are five people that want to be active working group members will then we maybe need to do a little bit more outreach because with five people we may not have enough people to actually do have a lifting.

So I think that's part of the thinking behind it as well that we have some more.

But again I completely agree with that the switching should be very easy if people do want to get involved.

There's nothing preventing, you know, there's no intention if someone hasn't shown up for five meetings we'll switch them to observer status. That's definitely not what we're talking about here.

It's really to provide an additional option for those people that are really only interested in just getting the emails.

And again if we see that no one's using it we'll just get rid of it again.

Volker Griemann: Thank you Marika. And (James).

(James): Thanks. So just a couple of, you know, off-the-cuff observations. I think that at first it was you mentioned you had some interesting statistics about the number of work hours involved in completing new PDPs.

And one thought would be using face to face or workshop to condense that even into a week with the goal of starting exactly starting on Monday and then having an initial report on Wednesday or Friday or something like that.

I mean that might be one potential that is that something that's I mean that's a pretty (unintelligible)...

Marika Konings: Well I think what we're looking at now is one day face to face meeting. But I think again if the feedback from that is that really helped and it works very well indeed why not consider it (unintelligible)?

(James): Right. I mean if you're bringing everyone together in the first place why not make the outcome an initial report even if it takes two days, three days, five days?

The second bit is -- and this is going to just I'm sure not go over well but I'll just put it out there anyway -- where - let's speak wild there. What about compensating volunteers?

Now obviously it would have to be a symbolic amount just too, you know, acknowledge the time that these people and their company's sacrifice.

It would be subject to loss if people weren't carrying their weight or attending the meetings. And certainly it would be limited to a certain number of participants or something like that.

But I think if you ran a cost benefit analysis for hiring more staff or more outside experts versus, you know, incentivizing participation like that I think that, you know, I think that that might actually have some merit.

So, you know, I would put that in the mix as well although I imagine that it would stir up a lot of controversy. Thanks.

Volker Griemann: Okay Marika...

Marika Konings: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...and then definitely yes as some people say above my pay grade to decide that. But one brief comment...

(James): But they wouldn't be volunteers anymore so...

Marika Konings: Right, exactly. I just overheard as well on the observer part it's not only indeed allowing working group members that are now working group members to, you know, downgrade as such but listen mode but it may be away as well to make the threshold easier for people that want to get

engaged but don't feel comfortable yet to become a working group member to first observe. So I think it probably works both ways.

So again this is an experiment. We'll, you know, we'll look at what we get back and report back accordingly and then we can all provide whether it's a good thing or a bad thing or modified version is needed.

Volker Griemann: Okay thank you Marika. I think we have a lot of potential here. And I just look forward to when the first pilot has been conducted.

And I think we can evaluate the results of this better when we have seen some of the projects in action, some of the ideas and action. And that will give us enough material to work off on in the future.

Maybe even have new ideas and move on on this.