**Transcription ICANN Singapore**
**GNSO PDP Improvements Update to the Council meeting**
**Saturday 07 February 2015**
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(David):       Okay so the next item on our agenda is the GNSO PDP improvement

               discussion and Marika is going to lead us through that.


Marika Konings:   Yes thank you (David). So this is Marika, I'm just going to kick it off and then

               share that with my colleagues over here. So some of you may remember we

               developed a list of proposed improvements which are inter-streamlined and

               enhance some of the steps of the GNSO PDP.


               Not only focusing on the process itself but also on, you know, those people

               that participate in the process and how to facilitate the participation. And so

               we were tasked to, you know, start exploring and implementing some of

               these next steps on those items.


               Several of which are being done in a kind of pilot format. And the agreement

               was that we would come back at every ICANN meeting to give you a status

               update on where things stand to allow you as well for an opportunity to

               provide further input or share ideas. So that we can take those on board as

               move forward on those.


               So this is a reminder I mean some of them I'll run through pretty quickly

               where, you know, there hasn't really been a change since the last meeting,

               this is one of those, you know, to include the proposed charter as part of the

               preliminary issue report because you're heard, you know, the idea is also

               that, you know, the next PDP that's likely on the doc's on the EWG we would

               also include a proposed charter as part of the preliminary issue report.

And, you know, we did take the feedback to heart from the last meeting that, you know, we would need to ensure then as we publish a preliminary issue report for public comment we would, you know, flag separately that there I also a charter that we would like input on and further feedback.

I still believe it's too early at this stage to draw conclusions on whether that is successful or not but we hope that after a couple of iterations of this we may be able to provide as well a kind of trend what impact does it have on the timing of a PDP and is it something we actually want to formalize in the PDP manual as, you know, the proposed approach for dealing with a charter.

Then the next one, intensity of PDP working group meetings. I think as several of you know and have probably actively participated in the pilot we're running throughout this fiscal year on facilitated face-to-face PDP working group meetings.

So we had a first pilot meeting in Los Angeles with the proxy and privacy services, accreditation issues working group and the feedback we got from that meeting that it was very positively received. We ask everyone to provide an evaluation so we're keeping track of that but at least, you know, the feedback there was overall positive.

And we haven't been able yet to really assess, you know, what impact it had on the overall timeline. And again that is probably where, you know, we probably need to have a couple of meetings or a couple of pilot meetings to properly assess that because, you know, privacy proxy is maybe as well more difficult than maybe a typical PDP.

So that of course has an impact as well on the overall timeline. But again I said overall feedback was positive on the impact and the ability for the group to meet face-to-face and work through some of the issues and we're having a second pilot meeting here in Singapore.

So on next Friday the INGO curative rights PDP working group is meeting. And then we probably need to think about or discuss which working group should be meeting at the next meeting in - where are we meeting in the next meeting? Buenos Aires.

So I think from a staff side we'll do some thinking on which group we believe from our perspective may be at a, you know, good moment during that meeting to meet face-to-face and probably come back to you during the wrap up with a suggestion and get your feedback on whether you also agree that that's the right one to move forward.

And one point to note there as well I think we will plan on asking for an extension for this pilot program under the special community budget request because I think we do have a sense that we may want to extend this for a bit longer to see indeed if, you know, what the impact is and how that's working.

And also noting that the deadline for that is later in February so we do want to make sure to get that in even if we should decide or if the council should decide that you don't want to continue. So it's easier to take something off the table than add it later on.

And then I just wanted to send it over to Mary to speak about the increase of volunteer pool and the improving of online tools and training.

Mary Wong: Hi everybody this is Mary Wong from staff. So the slide is pretty self-explanatory and, you know, this is one of the PDP improvements recommendations as Marika said that the council has pretty much highlighted as requiring some work.

And this is the one that we have started working on and it's important because it does align with some of the ATRT2 recommendations as some folks will know. We are working on a couple of things, some very specific things and some that are more intended to be integrated into a larger mentoring/training/information/education program for GNSO participants.

And what I wanted to emphasize here is that what we're working on at both levels would apply in different ways to absolute newcomers to the GNSO processes all together as all of us have been once upon a time, as well as those who might be called veterans.

Either because you've been continuously participating or maybe you participated, dropped off for a while and are coming back or may need some sort of refresher on some of the rules, processes and so on.

So one of the specific things we've been working on as part of this overall project is to develop certain modular tools and training programs under the current ICANN learn program, which I think most people know about.

That is not a GNSO initiative, it is a broad cross cutting ICANN program and initiative but looking at the GNSO and what it is that we need that's been identified by the community and the council, we did start thinking about some modules again both for newcomers and for veterans.

And if I go to the next slide, actually I don't know that it's actually on the next slide. No the one before that. And so this is really part of the overall onboarding program as well.

So where the specifics were on ICANN learn modules and I'm looking at Lars to see if he's ready whether he wants to talk about it. I guess he's not ready, Lars. Do you want to talk about ICANN learn?

Lars Hoffman:     Yes on the previous slide.

Mary Wong:       Yes (unintelligible).

Lars Hoffman:     This is Lars Hoffman from staff. So we developed - you've probably been battered with this over the past few weeks. We've got two quick Web sites that we - even closer and that on a Saturday afternoon.

So we developed two Web pages that kind of have, which should have councilors and GNSO members and newcomers to find a way around on the Web site.

We didn't create any new content for this per se we just tried to order it in a way that it's all based in one location. So we did this here quick links Web site, the shortcut hyperlink on the top there that you can see.

And I strongly encourage you obviously to bookmark that. And we did something else for the ICANN meetings too, this is for the current ICANN 52 with links to all the relevant sections on the Web site and that will be updated for the next meeting in terms of what - but the hyperlink you can see there on the top as well (unintelligible) ICANN meeting will remain the same.

And then we developed or in the process of developing what Mary just alluded to earlier the ICANN learn GNSO modules. So we dubbed this internal working name as GNSO learn but as Mary said it's a wider ICANN effort that we're trying to hook onto.

There's a couple of courses that we've already constructed and it should be concluded hopefully those online courses by Buenos Aires ICANN 53. What we're trying to do here also is to collaborate with the folks from the GSE from the global stakeholder engagement.

So those are hopefully the people that will help us to reach the audience to bring in the (unintelligible) newcomers and help combat and extend anyway the fatigue of volunteers.

And you can see on the fourth point here it's important that we don't want to do this, you know, as an isolated staff effort and we definitely want to re-launch and engage the PDP improvements committee so we're sure that whatever assets we're trying to get underway we've got the support and the input from the community in this.

And even if you're not part of that committee if you have any suggestions or ideas or you come across, you know, the Web site or you have an idea for courses that, you know, that might be helpful to others please get in touch at any point. Mary did I forget anything?

Mary Wong: No I think that's it but I think that was the important point that obviously we're trying to do all these things as part of the effort that the GNSO and the councilors asked us to do.

And obviously we have our own views perhaps on what might be a good module to launch first, second and third. And as Lars said hopefully we'll have some content to show the council and the community soon.

And certainly by BA we want some of this up and running but it's very, very helpful, it would be very, very helpful to us if you will give us ideas on content as well as on what sort of tools.

And as Marika was mentioning earlier we're trying to, you know, change a little bit about the newcomer Webinars in terms of timing and so forth. So ideas, suggestions, feedback, what's working, what's not working, what your community might need, which may be a little bit different from another stakeholder group that would be something that we would look forward to very much, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika and I think as Lars already mentioned some of you may recall we did form a small committee I think a couple of meetings back. But I think in the meantime all the council members that actually signed up for that effort have left the council in the meantime.

So I think we'll probably just reach out again and see who is interested in joining that and working with staff on that. And one thing I did want to mention and was on the previous slide is that at the last meeting we discussed, you know, that it would be helpful of having a kind of standardized list of, you know, uniform definitions for some of the terms, you know.

One is a drafting team, one is a working group, members, observers so actually we haven't forgotten about that. We are working on that and hope to be able to share something shortly with the council and see whether that is something that meets your expectations in that regard.

And again it's an effort to make it very clear for people when, you know, you talk about a working group people know what the expectations are or what the objectives are similar for, you know, drafting team we now have discussion groups.

And that may also help in standardizing, you know, some of the projects that we initiate and by basically looking at that list and, you know, what are some of the standards, approaches or terms that we're using and make sure that we follow that model.

So then just moving along this is one where we haven't really done anything further. We've spoke about it in the past, you know, would it be helpful if we would require working group representatives from each stakeholder group constituency and/or SOAC in ensuring, you know, broad participation and engagement.

I haven't really seen overwhelming feedback for that one so maybe at this stage and again I think many groups have a system in place where they do assign someone to working groups that is responsible for updating their respective groups.

So maybe this is something that is already being taking care of at least in that regard. Just to note, you know, we're still working with the meeting list observer option and I think at least from our perspective it seems to be working well.
It's a way as well for people just to follow conversations who don't necessarily want to be recognized as a member. And also, you know, hopefully lowers

the barrier for those that just want to observe for a while before they feel comfortable joining us as a full member.

So again if you have any further suggestions where you think this is something that should be further explored or with the small improvements and changes we've made we're actually I think getting close to what we were looking for with that recommendation, let us know.

PDP working group repertoire again it's not something we really have explored any further. The idea behind this was that instead of kind of, you know, collective drafting we could also investigate whether there would be a way of, you know, streamlining or speeding up some of the work by appointing a repertoire who would basically hold the pen and provide a first draft to the group and work from that.

We haven't really done any further work on that. We are looking at tools to facilitate document collaboration, which is also something that other community groups have asked for. So we expect that, you know, further information will be shared on that shortly.

So to be looking at how to, you know, avoid different versions of documents going around or people making comments on different versions, which would really help streamline at least the process from a document management perspective.

Professional moderation and facilitation and involvement of experts. As mentioned, you know, we're running the pilot program that also includes professional facilitation. So based I think on the assessment of that program we'll see if that's something we want to explore further.

The first one we had on the PPSIA we actually had our facilitator fall ill so we didn't really get to explore there but I think in this one Mary has been working closely with a professional facilitator and seeing does it make a difference. To

note on the first one we actually had a community facilitator in the form of (Thomas).

So I think what we eventually will be exploring is, you know, what are the differences between a professional facilitator that may be really good at facilitating the meeting but does not necessarily have, you know, the content knowledge or expertise versus, you know, maybe someone from the community that has received facilitation training and is skilled in the content.

You know, versus normal working group chair that may not have neither or may have both as well. So again I think at the end of the pilot we may have some further data that we can share on that and some recommendations that they may be able to share.

The organization of workshops and discussion at the outset I think there are several initiatives that I think are a demonstration of, you know, trying to do that more intensely.

I think the launch of the, you know, discussion group is one example where it was a clear and conscious decision from the council that before immediately going into a PDP it would actually be good to actually map the issue, understand them in detail and then be able to, you know, go well informed into the PDP.

And I think similarly the day of the (RPM's) preliminary issue report to allow for additional data gathering I think was another one where it was clear that, you know, that information is really helpful and needed at the outset instead of halfway through the process.

Beta data on metrics I think you'll be hearing later this afternoon about the efforts of that working group and, you know, we try as much as we can to gather any data that may help inform these efforts I think as we've discussed earlier today as well.

There is also recommendation in relation to exploring the flexibility in relation to the public comment forum duration and as you are hopefully all aware there were some improvements that were implemented in January of this year.

And one of those is that now the standard duration of a public comment forum is I believe 40 days. I think the flexibility that exists is that it can be shortened if there is approval from two ICANN global leaders to do so.

So I think this is one where, you know, the council may want to review whether those improvements, you know, meet what you were setting out to do here and whether any further action or feedback is needed in relation to that specific recommendation.

So the next steps, I need feedback or input you have today or later throughout the week or, you know, at any point, you know, please feel free to share. As I said this is really in an effort to help facilitate and streamline PDP related efforts.

We'll adapt and modify as necessary and as we receive feedback and we're planning to provide the next update in Buenos Aires.

(David):      Do we have any questions about that, about any of this? And obviously we're all familiar with a lot of this but of course there's always, it's always great to see the work that's been done since the previous meeting, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:   Chuck Gomes from VeriSign, just a quick question on the training modules. Any of them anticipated with regard to leadership training? In other words chairing, co-chairing and so forth working groups?

Mary Wong:    That's a great question Chuck. At the moment no because we're really starting from scratch so we're taking the material from the newcomer Webinars and trying to figure out how the two could work together.

Chuck Gomes:    Okay.

Mary Wong:      But we are very aware that that is something that's of growing concern. So one question I think for the council and the community maybe is there something that's appropriate for us to generate internally, is there something that the ICANN academy committee or whatever that's called should be tackling. Is it broader than the GNSO in other words?

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks.

(David):        Do we have any more questions? Yes Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi:   So I just want to say thank you to the staff because I, you know, with being on working groups over I don't know how many years, I've seen a continual just more helpfulness, more availability and really getting in there and keeping us organized when sometimes it's hard.

There are times I don't stay on track with all the issues and it's like staff pulls it up and says, we made a decision on this such and such a date and this is the decision.

So I really think that it's evolving how staff works on PDP's and I appreciate that.

(David):        Thank you, if no one else has a question I've got one. Do we have - just of all the different areas where we have put some improvements are we contemplating any improvements to the public comment process in terms of tools and just that strikes me as one of the more antiquated bits of our current...

Marika Konings:  Yes so this is Marika, so as I just mentioned some updates have been made in January already and I think that also changed, you know, the format of how it's displayed, how people can access information.

I think there are further conversations around, you know, should further change be made but I may just want to reflect because of course that relates to, you know, ICANN public comment in general.

What is worth noting and I think Chuck was speaking about it earlier today what for example has been done in the policy limitation working group of trying to see are there other ways in which we can, you know, make it easier for people to on the one hand submit comments but also make it easier for working groups then to review comments.

So in that context we've developed a survey and I think based on the success or lack thereof we may see if that is something we want to explore as well for other efforts and similarly for that effort we also provided a template that we also use in working groups to review those comments.

That will also help, you know, both on the one hand those that are providing input to hopefully, you know, provide it and at the same time for the working group to then review and analyze it.

So I think from that perspective I think we, you know, there's a lot of flexibility in the GNSO context in how we deal with comments or other ways or obtaining but I think on the broader, you know, the general ICANN public comment forum I think that's a broader conversation with I think (David) and Rob who are now responsible for that as a forum.

And of course that's also, you know, coming from ATRT recommendations and, you know, the board has expressed views on that as well. So that is, you know, if there are specific views on that that would need to be taken up at a higher level.

(David):    Thank you, Tim at the mike.

Tim McGinnis:   Tim McGinnis (dot pharmacy) registry but speaking in my personal capacity. I've never understood why the GNSO has to reinvent the wheel charter of PDP for every single issue.

And I'm wondering if you ever thought about piloting PDP a working group charter that works for multiple issues. I know it's sort of heretical but, you know, it really works really well in the IETF and the (RAR) world.

They've got one PDP and all the issues just get run through that and it's easy peasy and you don't spend a lot of time and effort and volunteer burnout on rewriting a charter and the conflict that that entails.

(David):   Marika if you'd like to answer that.

Marika Konings:   Yes this is Marika just to respond because I think that is, you know, kind of what happens because we, you know, most of this charter is standard language and I think a lot of work has gone into that template.

So the only place where actually work gets done is around, you know, the scope and the objectives, which is of course hard because you do want to map out, you know, what is the working group actually tasked to do.

And I'm not really sure if you can standardize that as you do need to focus on, you know, what are the specific questions that the group is working on? But it may of interest to look at how the IETF model looks to see if that is something that can be replicated but I think at least on the (unintelligible).

But I think at least there I think we have made, you know, or gained time with having a need to template that I think most of the sections are standard language and also having that included as part of the preliminary issue report.

So there's not necessarily a drafting team needed unless, you know, the council decides that they're not happy with the preliminary, the charter that

staff has prepared based on the issue report they can still decide to form a drafting team.

But I think at least for the last one or two PDP's I think they were, you know, quite content with the charter that was provided or made some small changes and it didn't really take up a whole lot of time, so.

(David): Okay, do we have any other questions on this topic on the improvements of the PDP process? There being no other questions I'll just thank Marika for the presentation and of course all the staff for the - like this is one of the, it really is one of the great - this meeting to see that things actually get - every single meeting thing have got better, which is terrific.

And actually quite reasonably fast for the, you know, GNSO pace anyway so thank you again and we'll end that session.