ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 10 November 2021 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. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/eQKlCg

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

JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday the 10th of November 2021. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room.

We have no apologies for today's call. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing none, all documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted to the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Julie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening wherever you are. Thanks for joining this meeting. We have an agenda, and it was shared yesterday by Marika. Hopefully you had a chance to read it. Any comments, changes to the agenda? Seeing none, I take silence as a yes.

The first thing is what happened with the work that we did about the statements of interest taskforce assignment. There was some news in the GNSO e-mail list by our chair, Philippe. Maybe Marika, you can give us an update about this status.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure. Thanks, Olga. As you may recall, the group finished tis work well before ICANN 72 and Olga sent a message to the Council list basically asking everyone to review the assignment form for the taskforce that would be set up to review the statements of interest procedures and form. No responses were received and no objections were received before ICANN 72.

Following ICANN 72, Philippe sent kind of a last call basically indicating that no comments, no objections have been received. So based on that assumption, I will now go ahead and basically set up the taskforce so it can commence its work. The next step

would be to launch the call for volunteers to have every stakeholder group and constituency confirm their members and commence the discussions on that topic.

OLGA CAVALLI: Marika, how is this call for participants and the formation of the taskforce done? Who starts that, the GNSO or do we have some role in that?

MARIKA KONINGS: Normally, it's staff who will draft the call for volunteers. Maybe in this case, as it's the committee that provides oversight to the group, we can share the draft with the committee to see if you have any input or concerns. And if not, we would go ahead and send that out to the different stakeholder groups and constituencies. I think that's something we can share with this group for review probably in the next couple of days.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Any comments about that, reactions? Okay, so that's already done. Very good. Number two in the agenda, working group self-assessment. You remember we've shared a survey among the members of this working group and we have received some responses that were very interesting. We've already reviewed them. But staff has prepared a very good and detailed document that I would like to review with you now with help of Marika and staff. And that will lead us to define our new next steps about what we should do. Can we share the document? It was distributed with the agenda yesterday.

So the document has initial thoughts. Can we just take a look at the whole document as a first step? Initial thoughts on improvements, and then there is a second part that is ... Just scroll it a little bit to see the three parts of it, if you can.

MARIKA KONINGS: Would you like me to [inaudible]?

OLGA CAVALLI: No, I just wanted to give a brief overview. It has initial thoughts on improvement and enhancement that can be introduced. Then we can review the next step, then there's a question about if a more periodic survey should be introduced. That's another part of the document. And then the last part, if an assessment of the performance of the working group leaders should be done.

So these are the three parts. I think it's a very good idea of dividing it into these three parts, and I wanted to just stress the fact that these are the three parts of the document. And now we can go step by step. So if you can help me with that, Marika, running through the document and reviewing the text.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure. Thanks, Olga. Basically, what we tried to do here, as Olga explained, is based on the responses that we received to the survey as well as a discussion that we had on our last call before ICANN 72 and some of the input that was received from those that were in attendance. We tried to come up with some preliminary responses to some of the main questions the group will need to

ask itself to basically see if everyone kind of agrees on the direction that the current thinking seems to go in.

So as Olga noted, we've broken it down into three different segments here, and the idea behind this conversation and this document is that during today's calls, and if there's input after the meeting, we're able to kind of agree on what the group views as the direction to take on the working group's self-assessment, because if we have at a high level the direction, we'll be able to basically take the next step and dive into the details of how some of the changes may need to look, and as well, what it would take to actually implement those. Because as you know, the working group self-assessment is currently part of the GNSO operating procedures and there's a specific template that is being used, so changes to that would need to go through a number of steps based on the recommendations of this group.

So basically, on the initial thoughts for improvements and enhancements, there were some suggestions that were made in the survey as well as the conversation that the group had. And again, very important reminder that the survey is intended to assist the Council as the manager of the PDP with a kind of early warning mechanism that would allow for course corrections if deemed necessary.

The issue has been that currently, the survey is done at the end of a working group's life cycle, by which time it's too late to provide any course corrections. And it also can just serve as kind of a check-in point to make sure things are on track or if there's something that the group might need or that the Council could provide to facilitate its work.

Some of you noted as well that of course, any additional survey needs to be fit for purpose, introducing a very lengthy survey that's very burdensome is not likely going to be helpful or might not get the responses that we're looking for. So a balance will need to be found between getting the information that is key versus making sure that it's easy enough for working group members to fill out their response and be able to participate in that kind of conversation. It was also noted that if there's indeed periodic surveys, they need to be easy to complete, provide the right balance there.

There was also a suggestion that there should be sufficient flexibility to allow for additional follow-up. A survey itself may not give all the information that is needed, there might be a need in certain circumstances to have follow-up conversations or reach out directly to some of those that responded. So there should be sufficient flexibility in this process to allow for that.

So this specific item, the next step would be to confirm that this is indeed what the group believes should be factored in, and of course, asked for another opportunity for any further improvements or enhancements that we may have missed here or that members may have thought of after we had the last conversation.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Any reactions from colleauges? Because we have new members in the call—we have today Thomas, Juan Manuel, welcome, Philippe, Desiree. We were reviewing a document that was shared with the agenda yesterday, and it's a

recollection of your comments in the survey that was distributed some weeks ago. So what we're doing now is reviewing some outcomes that staff has kindly prepared for us. And maybe you can react to what Marika is currently explaining from the document. Sorry, Marika, for interrupting, just wanted to say hello to the new participants.

MARIKA KONINGS: No problem. I see that Philippe has his hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Philippe, welcome.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Olga. Hi Marika. It's just a thought with the idea of keeping the ball rolling and make people think about the ideas. On the need to have intermediary halfway surveys, it just occurred to me that it would obviously depend on the nature of the work of the PDP, and maybe people might want to think about how this can be associated with the charter or the elements of the charter or whether built in the charter. I don't know. But given that dependency, just a thought for people to consider moving forward. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Philippe. This is an interesting question, and I was thinking about it yesterday if all this should be included in the charter so people could be prepared to know that these surveys

could or should be done as the work of the PDP is being developed. I have the impression that it should, but I don't know your reactions, what you think about it. Just food for thought, and maybe we can share thoughts later on in the work of our committee. Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Thank you. Sorry for joining late and also for this question now, but is it necessary that the work of the CCOICI would end up being a PDP? I just wonder whether that's too early to mention, PDP as part of the working group and the period of also what we need to do is what we just mentioned halfway through to do the survey.

OLGA CAVALLI: Marika, maybe you can ...

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: To hear maybe some explanation to that.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure, I can try to answer that. Basically, the CCOICI is not a PDP. It's not looking at policy issues or questions. But of course, it is closely related as it's focusing on the process and some of the requirements that are currently in place for a working group. So there is a direct link with PDPs, but as this does not concern contractual obligations for contracted parties, there would not be a need to go through a PDP even if the group recommends certain

changes to the working group self-assessment. It would require probably changes to the GNSO operating procedures so there are some steps involved, such as public comment for example, but indeed, it's kind of a separate track compared to a PDP.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Thank you, Marika.

OLGA CAVALLI: Is that okay, Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Well, yes, I think that explains that it may not become a PDP in the end necessarily. But yeah, we don't want to necessarily change the operating procedures.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Thank you, Desiree. So should we go through the second part, which is the periodicity, should a more periodic survey be introduced? What impact does it have on the existing end-of-life survey? Marika, can you conduct us through that topic?

MARIKA KONINGS: Of course. And as Philippe noted, [inaudible] great introduction to this part of the conversation, because one of the questions was in

the survey as well, and as we discussed on the last call, whether a more periodic survey should be introduced and what impact would that have on the existing end-of-life survey, basically the existing working group self-assessment survey.

Based on the responses we got, it seems that the group is in agreement that a more periodic survey should be introduced and that such a periodic survey should be tied to milestones achieved. For example, publication of the initial report. But there should also be the ability to run this on a timed basis. For example, upon publication of the initial report or after six months after the first meeting, whichever occurs first, to avoid that you may have a group for example that takes a very long time to get to initial report but you're not finding out what the issues are because you're waiting until the initial report is published before you conduct the periodic assessment.

And indeed, we made a note here, I think similar to Philippe's thinking, that one potential approach that could be considered is at the time of chartering, some thought goes into the expected periodicity and for example, having a default that's based on milestones reached, but with the ability to modify this as deemed appropriate for the specific effort.

So for example, if it's a PDP that has a number of different phases or where the expectation is that delivery of initial report could take one or two years, maybe then the character specifically foresees that periodic assessment is carried out earlier.

I think a related question might be, how could it potentially be adjusted if indeed the Council at some point or for example the

liaison indicates that it would be good to do a survey to assess what is going on in the group or something that the Council could be doing. And of course, if it's part of the charter, it could require a potential charter change. But again, it's a way of documenting what the expectations are so that both on the council side as well as the working group side, it's clear what can be expected and what timeframe and assessment is expected to be carried out.

We discussed this as well during the last call and is also something we'll speak a bit more about during the next agenda item. The idea would be also to have the group conduct a test run of the existing working group self-assessment survey so that you're able to see what is currently [inaudible] at the end of a working group's lifecycle and to consider what changes would need to be made both to the end of life survey but also what might be relevant questions for the periodic survey. That would need to be carried over.

So as said, we'll talk more about that next, but we hope that looking concretely at what is currently being asked will give everyone a better idea of whether or not that is helpful information for the Council. As is currently structured, would it be too much to ask if already periodic surveys are carried out? And one thing to consider as well, is it something where maybe there's a minimum set of questions that Council leadership or the liaison or whoever would be responsible for kicking off the survey would be able to say we need to ask certain questions because we know certain things might be specifically relevant to this effort.

So similarly as for the previous question, hopefully to confirm with the group the preliminary responses, does it indeed align with the

views that have been expressed to date? And what would be the preferred periodicity and who or how would this be confirmed? Is it something that's set in stone and the same for every working group, or is there kind of a baseline that is confirmed in the charter but could be modified if charter drafting team or the Council thinks it should be different?

And the next step would be to do the test run of the existing working group self-assessment and provide observations and suggestions for changes as well as considering what are the questions that should be asked in the periodic survey. Again, a question there might be, are those set of standard questions that would always be asked with the ability to add to it, or is it just a one-size-fits-all that is used for that purpose? I'll pause here again.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Do we have reactions about these questions that we have included in this document? I have some ideas, but I don't want to [inaudible]. Any comments, reactions? Are we okay with these questions?

My initial thoughts—maybe I'll break the ice—I think it could be good that it is included in the charter, at the same time some general structure of this survey, and then it should be adjusted in relation with each working group. That is my initial thought. But based on the experience I have from other working groups. Sebastien, your hand is up. Go ahead.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I ran through the survey you shared in the agenda right before this call. My first question was the introduction of the survey asked for your name and where you're from, etc., which is all valid information, but I was wondering if we should have room for anonymous response.

The second question, whilst I couldn't find any question that was redundant or useless or anything like that, my gut feeling was that the survey was a tad long. So if you're going through a survey with several pages—I can't remember how many there were, six or seven—and I don't know if it's because the technology only allows so many questions per page or where we're limited, but I think there should be some kind of a warning—I guess people will start getting used to filling these surveys if it becomes a recurring theme. But some kind of an idea of how many pages are ahead of you would be fantastic.

The last one is a point that I had made already, but indeed, I think there needs to be room in the survey for a working group-specific item, and particularly if we are relying on third parties, on external sources, something else, that we may also want as a group to rate and give feedback to the community as to the usefulness of that external source.

That's all I have. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Sebastien. About the anonymity issue, I thought about it, it's an important decision, the freedom that those responding could have if they don't have their name and affiliation

displayed, or the value of having the information attached to a name and affiliation. That's something important to decide.

Emily, your hand is up. Welcome.

EMILY BARABAS: Hey Olga. Thanks. Thanks, Sebastien, for the points there. I just wanted to clarify the first item about anonymity and how it's been administered in the past. So this is not a comment on what it should be going forward but just an explanation of how it's been run previously.

The survey does ask for names and affiliations. The name is only used by the staff member administering the survey to confirm that the person is in fact affiliated with the working group in the role that they specified. So if they say "My name is Emily Barabas and I'm a member of this group," we just make sure that that is actually the case and that there aren't multiple responses from a member. That's the only way that it's used and that's not published anywhere publicly.

Previously, the responses have been aggregated and published, and the affiliations of those who responded, but not the names. And there were a few cases in the last two that we did for SubPro and RPMs where some of the narrative responses made it somewhat clear who the person was who weas responding, and in those specific cases, we reached out to the people and confirmed that they were okay with those narrative responses being published even though they could be potentially tracked back to the person who submitted them.

But again, there's potentially room for improvement across the board, and if the survey is not making it sufficiently clear that by providing your name, that name will be confidential. That's also a problem because that might discourage people who are concerned about their identity being disclosed. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Emily. This is an important issue, because whichever the information that we share saying that the names will not be published or we will ask for authorization first, the reaction of someone putting name and affiliation before may have an impact on the responses. Desiree, you're next. Welcome.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Thank you, Olga. My question is a follow-up on what Sebastien and Emily just said. I would also support some form of anonymity. And not knowing how many members of the working group there will be and when it's a huge amount to process in a survey, I don't know if we have an idea in order to identify whether we get duplicates or not.

But certainly, I'm not sure who the members are going to be, whether you can tell it just by asking affiliation rather than a name. So if there is any way of providing anonymity, I would support that.

I also understand there is a need for flexibility to send multiple surveys and to follow up, but I would then think that we should clearly identify why the follow-up survey is different from the previous one, whether it refers to the initial period publication or second so that people don't really get this tiredness of filling in

way too many surveys. But yes, some flexibility should be built in so that the working group could resend, do survey again. That's all I had.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Desiree. There is a question Sebastien had about how to know how many pages the survey has. There are some tools that show the percentage that has been responded. I don't know if this tool allows that. Maybe Marika or staff can give us some background about this tool, because there are some surveys that show the progress in the lower parts, Google docs or something like that. Maybe we can add that.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi Olga, I can respond to that. A couple of different tools have been used to administer the survey in the past. For quite a long time, one tool was being used and then we transitioned to another tool that's more standardized by use in the organization.

The one we're using now, there's not currently an option to have a progress bar, and we're actually thinking about that as well and thinking there's a lot of text in the survey, it would be helpful to have such an indication. We did include a little bit of text in the introduction this time around, listing the number of questions and the number of sections and about how long we think it would take to complete, but there's a lot of text in the intro. So if the group says absolutely essential that we have a visual indicator or something like that, it's to some extent up to this group to develop

those requirements and then for us to take away and see what we can do with that. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think that some indication of the progress in the survey could be useful, or perhaps informing that it would take about five or ten minutes. At least for me when I make a survey, it's useful. If not, sometimes I'm discouraged to fill it because I don't know how much time it would take. So if we can investigate that a little bit, and perhaps make it shorter if possible, or more direct, easygoing.

Thank you for that. Any other reactions about the next steps, questions? And thank you very much for those who responded. Marika saying it's okay. Go ahead, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: Just to note that the survey at the moment is very long because of course, it's the survey that's carried out and it was really intended to try to capture all aspects of the working group's lifecycle and the steps they've gone through. So I think at least my expectation is if we move to a more periodic assessment, the end survey really focuses more on what are the questions that are relevant at the end of a group's life and probably are more forward looking to a certain degree, because of course, the input that's received from the working group at that stage won't make any difference to the working group because they have completed their work, but it's more for the Council to kind of think about what are some of the things we may need to think about for the next working group that we constitute because we got feedback that XYZ could be done

better, so let's take that into account and see if we can make that improvement for the next round.

So if we move to a more periodic survey, my expectation is that the focus of the end of life survey might change and as a result, could be shortened and be more focused on those specific aspects, and some of the other things that are maybe asked about now, because if I remember well, I think there's a section for example about, was the information that you received when the working group started helpful to you? I'm kind of suspecting that by the time—some of our groups last years, they don't even remember what they were given at the start. It seems that it's better to ask that at another point in the lifecycle of a working group.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika, for the clarification. Any other comments, reactions? Okay. Thank you for that. Now we can go through the last part of the document, which is about ... [If you could show it to me. I don't remember.]

MARIKA KONINGS: So the last part is about including questions about the performance of the leaders.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, including the performance of the leaders in the working group self-assessment. So this is an important issue because it may be important for those leaders who think that are performing well and

happy to be evaluated. I'm always happy to be evaluated, and I think that's an important issue. But some people may be discouraged of being a volunteer for leadership positions if they have to be evaluated. So that's something that is an important thing to have in mind. So please, Marika, if you can lead us through the text.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. Based on the feedback that we've received so far, it seems that most agree that there should be questions included that ask about the performance of the working group leadership. But I think those that commented also made clear that the question should not be a way to apply pressure or exert influence on leadership.

This also, I think, goes a bit to the previous conversation about the discretion around the way input is collected and shared, and that is important to find a balance between transparency and confidentiality, because indeed, on the one hand, you want to make sure someone that's providing feedback is actually a member of the working group, but indeed if they don't feel comfortable having some of that information publicly shared, there might need to be an ability to do that as well because of course, it can sometimes be sensitive if there are concerns that someone wants to express.

It was suggested that maybe certain detailed responses are only visible to some and not publicly posted. For example, it could be Council leadership that's kind of tasked with doing a first review of all the responses but only making a high-level summary that's

shared publicly, or someone's already suggested as well, maybe it's permission-based where someone can choose if it's something they feel comfortable sharing publicly, and if not, of course, it would need to be made very clear in the survey who would have access to the information that is provided.

We'll also ask you to review the template that was developed through PDP 3.0 to see if that's a helpful starting point. I think several of you indicated and have looked at that, that it probably does serve as a good basis and maybe there's not a whole lot that needs to be added to that.

We flagged here as well—and it's a bit similar to the issue or the question we previously raised in the context of these types of questions, would it be helpful or desirable to have a base survey that would have a minimum set of questions and depending on how things are going or perceived to be going, there's an option to add additional questions by the Council or Council leadership if deemed appropriate. Maybe this could be the result of a conversation that leadership, staff have potentially with the liaison as someone who's closely involved in the deliberations and indicate that it might be helpful to ask more questions, because there might be something [inaudible] or if everything is going pretty smooth and no issues, maybe with a minimum set of questions, it's efficient to kind of do that check-in.

Again, it's about finding that balance between being able to ask the right questions and not overload the group with a very lengthy survey where maybe a number of questions are not felt as being relevant to the group.

I think one or two commenters also noted, is there a potential role here for the ombudsman? We put in here language from the webpage, the ICANN ombudsman's job is to make sure that ICANN community members are treated fairly, acting as an impartial mediator, the ombudsman helps resolve disputes on issues involving the ICANN Board, staff or supporting organizations.

So obviously, if there are issues that get escalated to the ombudsman, the ombudsman already has a role. We did not here as well that GNSO working group guidelines already include rules of engagement as well as an appeals process. Of course, that doesn't prevent anyone from involving the ombudsman if they would want to—but I think the group may need to ask the question, is there a specific role that is foreseen or could be foreseen for the ombudsman in the context of working group self-assessment?

So the next steps that we identified here is first confirming with the group that this is indeed some of the preliminary responses that you all can find yourselves in, to review the PDP 3.0 template to see if the questions that were developed as part of that effort should be incorporated into the periodic survey, part or all of the different questions, or are there other questions that should be considered? And then indeed, this question around the role of the ombudsman in this process, of course the existing role the ombudsman already has and of course is not changed by anything that is considered here.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Now that I saw the comments about the ombudsman, I mentioned it last time and indeed, it sounds a bit like an extreme escalation path, particularly as you said, as a ready path to the ombudsman baked into a lot of the things that we do.

The main concern here was probably not so much having to escalate that far but just the HR aspect of evaluating somebody for their credibility and credentials in the community, but also [often back home too.] A silly example, but you go in some kind of a corporate training, it's not a make or break in your life but coming back from a corporate training not having received the diploma of the training looks bad, and you want to avoid it.

So here, the same thing, it might also have an impact on people's lives outside ICANN. So just a thought as you were saying it, I'm sure that for example, the NomCom has some guides and rules as to how to treat—there's a lot of HR issues related to NomCom, obviously, a lot of people that go through their hands that are not part of the community, but there's also a fair amount that are within the community, and that may for one reason or another not be chosen, good, bad or indifferent, there might be a reason. And obviously, those don't transpire. So something of that degree. Maybe not—again, we're not on the warpath, and maybe the ombudsman is a bit overkill. But something that sort of describes that. Thank you.

EN

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. That's a very important thing to have in mind. Thank you for that, and [inaudible]. Okay, any other reactions, comments to this evaluation of the leaders and what may happen if it's included or not? Any other reactions?

Okay, seeing no hands or comments in the chat. Kristian says it's important to be included. I do agree that evaluations are important, as I said before. So we may give some time to our colleauges in the group, some new members like Desiree or others who are starting to participate perhaps more actively. Maybe we can give another week to review this document. I think it could be a good idea. It has been shared by Marika, but we can reiterate after this call, again, the document.

We have some more issues in the agenda. We have the test survey and how to get some feedback. Marika, maybe you can conduct us through this part of the agenda.

MARIKA KONINGS: It's actually Emily that will take you through that. And Emily, do you want me to share the survey while you talk about it?

OLGA CAVALLI: Emily. I knew that before. Sorry. I was confused.

EMILY BARABAS: Sure. That'd be great. Thanks. So we're going to do a quick run through of what it would look like for you to take a working group self-assessment as it's currently designed. This is basically

identical to what the SubPro and RPMs members saw, but this is a dummy survey so you're all welcome to go through this in your own time. You can add text or click around, submit. It doesn't matter, it's just for you to get a sense of what the current tool is so that you can provide feedback about ways that it could be improved. Or if you feel like it should be scrapped entirely, that's also something we'd like to hear.

The first page is just an intro page, it provides some context about how the tool is used, about the confidentiality of information and about how the tool is organized, how long it is, how long it should take to complete and so forth.

The first section of the tool is basic information. As Sebastien noted, it does ask for name, e-mail address, affiliation and so forth. The name and e-mail address is confidential and only used by staff to verify the identities of the participants. And of course, there are ways to distribute surveys using special tools where you can essentially give people unique links so that they wouldn't need to provide this information and would be completely anonymous, but this particular tool does not provide that option. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you back up to the first page, there's two links here on top. I use Chrome on a Mac. I don't think that I'm that exceptional. But neither of them work. I'm sure that they're probably written in the tool, but there's some kind of a problem in passing those on. And I had seen similar behavior in the previous survey that we filled in.

EMILY BARABAS: Good feedback and important to know. We need to look into that, and it may be an issue with the tool itself, in which case we can ask for that information to pass on to their customer service department as well. But yeah, obviously, I can see how you would find that discouraging, if things like links aren't working and active. So really helpful. Thank you.

Okay, so again, this is just asking for basic information, the role of the individual in the working group and a little bit of context for the following sections. Next page, these following sections are organized topically. The first one is what is referred to here as inputs, so things like the charter and mission of the working group, the expertise of members, the representativeness of the working group and so forth.

The question asks for people to rate on a scale of one to seven how they respond to these questions and then provides a box for narrative answers, one per page. You can see that at the bottom there.

The next one, organized similarly but focused on processes. It asks about the participation climate, the behavioral norms of working group members, decision making methodology and so forth. And again, there is a narrative box at the end for comments on anything related to that full topic.

The next is about products and outputs, so looking at the effectiveness of things like the quality of the working group's

outputs and deliverables and the overall mission of the working group. And again, an opportunity for comments.

Section five is about what's called your personal dimension, things like how engaged the respondent felt like they were in the working group, the level of fulfillment that they experienced, and willingness to serve in future working groups. Again, these are numerical scores with an opportunity for comments.

And I can say one of the things we noted when going through some of these responses and maybe something to think about as you all are commenting on this survey is, how can these responses be actioned or how can we modify them so that they can be actionable? Either if the questions are delivered midway through the working group or at the end of the working group, I think things like personal satisfaction are really helpful to hear about but standalone numerical scores around that without a lot of narrative context also are somewhat challenging I think to evaluate. So I think that's something that I think is really helpful to get feedback on, is how do we look at these questions and think about how they can be framed in a way that they're easy to answer but also actionable in a way that the leadership of the PDP, Council and staff can assist in making improvements where appropriate.

And then the final section is just about some follow-ups, so things like how did the individual learn about the working group, how long have they been involved in ICANN, and then there were a couple of questions at the very end that we added specifically for these last two working group surveys, the ones that occurred this year, and those were sort of an anticipation of this group or another

group kind of taking a fresh look at how this tool is being used. So that is about, are there ways to improve the tool, are there ways to improve the process of evaluating and so forth? So we did get some narrative responses on that, and then there's a space for just general feedback about the experience, the self-assessment or anything else not covered in the questionnaire.

So that's the structure of what's been done previously, and we'd love for you all to take a spin through the survey, think about it a bit and provide your input and feedback on opportunities for improvement or ways that it can be revamped. Marika, please.

MARIKA KONINGS: As Emily said, now the work is on you to run through it. And what we've done to try to facilitate input on this and make it actionable for further conversations and consideration is to ask everyone basically to run through the test survey and then answer these questions or look at the survey from these perspectives.

The first question should be, what needs to be kept in, assuming that there will still be an end-of-life survey? You can either describe it in a general way, the category of questions, or if you want to specifically call out the questions that you think should remain as part of an end-of life survey, what should be changed in this end-of-life survey assuming that there's going to be a periodic survey as well, so are there adjustments that need to be made? And are there things that can be removed and are no longer relevant? Is there anything missing that currently is not asked about?

I think Emily already noted as well, maybe there's some improvements the group wants to look at, making responses more actionable. Is there a way certain questions should be asked? Again, it's trying to find a balance between ... People seem to be more inclined to fill out a survey if they're multiple-choice boxes versus having to write an essay. So again, how to balance that while at the same time, of course, survey responses might be more insightful and more helpful if you're trying to decide what might need to change as a result of those.

And then the last question here is as well, which questions that are currently in the end-of-life survey should be moved or duplicated to the periodic survey? So again, those questions are tied together and we don't expect either that this will immediately give us perfect responses for what the future will look like, but we hope by going through this exercise and getting input from everyone, we'll be able to kind of start distilling what people expect to see in the periodic survey, what changes you expect to see in the end-of-life survey. And we've left as well a box for other comments. For example, indeed, we've of course taken note of that, but comments like indeed it would be helpful to see how far along you are in the survey. Is there more information needed with regards to the privacy aspects compared to what is currently covered? The links should be working. Anything of that nature, of course, feel free to fill that in as well.

So that's what we hope the group will be able to do next, because again, we think this will provide helpful insights into the next steps because eventually, of course, we need to get to kind of a set of recommendations. This is what a periodic survey should look like,

this is show it should be run and when it should be run, this is where that needs to be captured, and here are the changes that we expect to see to the end-of-life survey. That's of course where we're trying to get to, and we're hoping that by going through this exercise, we'll get there.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Thank you very much. This table is very good, and I encourage you all to put your inputs in it. You will share it as a Google doc or something like that?

MARIKA KONINGS: It's a Google doc, so after this call, we'll send out a note to the group with a link to the survey as well as a link to the Google doc. I think a question for the group is what is a reasonable timeframe for you to complete this exercise. Is it reasonable to ask everyone to do that ahead of next week's meeting? Is more time needed? I can see some shaking heads already, so it would be good to get your input because of course, again, it's very important that we get everyone to participate in this exercise because it'll form the basis of the end recommendations of this group.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think we may try to have some input for the next meeting. Is it okay to have the next meeting next week at the same time? That's a question for all of you. Thomas says that he can make it in a week if necessary, two weeks would be better. We can try some input and review it next week and then we can give another week.

EN

Marika, could we also create a Google doc for the previous document? Because some of the members of this group could have some input, so maybe they can include them as comments or a redline. That could be also very useful. And that could be some homework for next week. Is that okay, having a call next week? I see some inputs in this table and some comments. Kristian says he will be driving at this time next week, but if he gets a call out, he can participate verbally, but he won't be able to see. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, we can definitely put up the other document as a Google doc. And it just occurred to me I think I'll add to this table as well the link to the PDP 3.0 working group chair questions, because we may want to use—and maybe we do a separate table for that, but maybe it's also good to already ask everyone's input on those questions and how they should be factored in, and maybe that's not homework for next week but for those that want to work ahead, can already start on that too.

OLGA CAVALLI: Sebastien, the floor is yours.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If we have a call next week at the same time, it's right before an SPS session. Just to make sure that people know that for me, it's going to be two SPS sessions [inaudible]. It's going to be a GNSO-heavy day. That's all. Otherwise, I can do it.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. You're right. At 14:00 UTC and this is 13:00 UTC. I don't know. Do we want to have a call in two weeks? It's up to us. I usually tend not to leave a lot of time because then the momentum becomes lost, but I would suggest, let's have a call at 13:00 UTC, maybe we can have a quicker call and have some time between the two calls. And see how the inputs have been evolving.

Sebastien, yeah, I agree, I'm also a teacher. When you don't have this periodicity, the momentum is lost. So my proposal is that of course, it's up to the group. Philippe says sort of challenging here, don't want to stay in the way.

Okay, I would propose to try to have the call and have some review of the feedback, and then perhaps the more complete review of all the feedback could be done in two weeks. That would be my proposal, but it's up to you. And we are at the hour, so we have to close the call. Any comments, reactions?

Okay, so let's schedule it. We can always cancel it. Let's schedule it for the next week, and [inaudible] people cannot participate or a lot of apologies, then we can see what to do and in two weeks, we should be able to review in more detail all the feedback received. So please take a look at the documents that will be distributed by staff in the list and give your feedback. It's very important for our next steps. Any other last comments?

I see none. Thank you very much for your active participation, and have a nice rest of the week. Ciao. Bye. Thank you, staff, for your great work, as usual.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Olga. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]