EN

ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 20 October 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/SQNyCg

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. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call on Wednesday the 20th of October 2021. Today's call is being recorded and attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. Please be sure to update your statements of interest. If help is needed, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it over to Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

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.

OLGA CAVALLI:	Hello. Good morning from Buenos Aires, Argentina. Good afternoon, good evening, wherever you are. First, my apologies for not attending the call last week. I had some important family issues to attend. Apologies for that, but I'm back in work this week.
	We have new things to review about working group assessments, so let's give it one minute more and see if other colleagues join, and then in like two more minutes, we start the call. Thank you for being with us this morning for me, maybe afternoon for you, or midday. Most of you are in Europe.
JULIE HEDLUND:	Olga, since we are recording, this is now ... it's quiet.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Let's start. I think we can start. If someone else joins, it's recorded anyway. Or we stop the recording or we keep on going. So let's move ahead in respect of those who are—respectful of the time, I think we have to start and it will be recorded for the others.
	We have the agenda on the screen. Everyone can see that. I can imagine we have also sent it by e-mail. Should you say something, or should I start with the agenda? Do we have other usual mentions at the beginning of the call? Sorry, [I'm a little bit distracted.]
	Okay, any status update of our people in the call? So we have more colleauges. Philippe, welcome. Marika, Sebastien. Welcome. Any news about statements of interest? I see no hands,

no comments. We have now to start with the assignment number three, which is the working group self-assessment review.

We have some slides that we have prepared. Can you show them to me so I can—

JULIE HEDLUND: Olga, to start though, agenda item two is the update on the SOI taskforce assignment. I don't think we have slides associated with that. But I'm happy to provide that update if you like.

OLGA CAVALLI: Oh, yes. Please go ahead. Sorry.

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes, so as you may all recall, Olga sent a message to the GNSO Council the 1st of October on the SOI taskforce assignment asking if there were any comments or concerns. We've received no comments or concerns from the councilors. So to proceed, leadership is going to add as an Any Other Business item to the GNSO Council meeting agenda for the annual general meeting the item on the SOI taskforce assignment, and just noting that the CCOICI, the committee will then go ahead and proceed with this assignment and collect volunteers for the taskforce. So that'll move ahead and that'll be part of the agenda then for the next Council meeting.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Julie. Sorry, I was confused with the update of statements of interest that we usually ask at the beginning of a call. Sorry for that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Also SOI.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for that update, and we will talk about that in the next Council call. So going back to the agenda, can you show that to me, please? Thank you so much. So now we have to start with our new assignment, which is about the working group self-assessment. So we are done with the statements of interest one.

This new task that we have to work with is considering how working group self-assessment can be improved and possibly enhanced with periodic assessment as well as exit interview with interested parties to identify at an early stage potential issues as future improvements to be considered.

One thing important about working groups in the GNSO sphere is that the GNSO does work and provide information for the policy. So the role of the working groups. This, in my opinion, is very important. Philippe, you have your hand up. Welcome.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Olga. Just to put some additional context to what Julie just said, I guess it's fair to say that under normal circumstances, we would have proceeded without going back to Council and

asking for feedback, but mindful of this remote working methods and COVID situation, we don't want to add extra red tape, obviously. But hence the AOB to Council.

The feedback we've received has been somewhat limited or there's been concerns over the overly complex procedure that we have. So I think it's fair to say that we'll double check. That's really the spirit of this AOB item whereas normally, I guess even beyond the pilot, the spirit of all this would be to go ahead and start with the taskforce moving forward. Just a bit of background on what we just said. Apologies for [inaudible].

OLGA CAVALLI: No, I totally agree, Philippe. The dynamic of the meetings. It happens to me with my teaching at the university, it's the same. You have to sometimes reiterate or review some things because the dynamic is different. It shouldn't be, but it is different in this virtual mode, and so I totally agree that it's okay that we included. And also, I asked staff yesterday if that was the idea, because I think if it was not, I would not have proposed that, to have it in the AOB or someplace in the agenda. And thank you very much for that. My English is very slow today, so sorry for that.

So as I was saying, the role of working groups in the GNSO, I find it really very important and I have participated in several of them. "So is mine." Okay. Second language. So in my humble opinion, this self-assessment is very important because of the very important role of working groups. So this self-assessment could be combined with the working group chair assessment outlined in PDP 3.0 improvement number 13, and the Council committee

considered the findings of the most recent working group self-assessments to determine if there are other improvements that GNSO Council should consider. So now we will review some other self-assessment that are in place. Next slide, please.

Emily, maybe you can help with this and the next documents that we have in place, because you're an expert in that.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks. Hi everyone. I wouldn't say I'm an expert, but I am joining you for this particular assignment because I was helping with administering some of the previous working group self-assessments and assisting with some of the PDP 3.0 work on this topic. So I have a little bit of background with it and so happy to support with Marika and Julie on this particular assignment.

So I think most people on this call are pretty familiar, but just for those catching up with recordings or in case anyone forgot, a bit of background first. The working group assessment has been around since 2014. It was developed by an Org consultant with consultation from the community and was incorporated into the working group guidelines, so has basically remained unchanged since that time because it's a part of the working group guidelines.

The purpose of the working group self-assessment was primarily to gather input from members on their experience at the end of the process once it had completed. For some projects like SubPro and RPMs, we're talking about five years elapsing and then an assessment being done at the end of that five-year period.

There hasn't been any sort of formal evaluation and no substantive changes to the survey since 2014. And as I mentioned, the most recent times that we've deployed it were for SubPro and RPMs earlier this year.

We included two things in those two recent surveys in anticipation that this work might be completed to evaluate the working group self-assessment. The first element was a question in the tool that asked members of the working groups to reflect on the working group self-assessment itself, whether it's helpful, whether it makes sense, if there's any suggestions for improvements.

And then the second element that was introduced to supplement the survey tool was to have the leadership teams of each working group complete the survey themselves and then use that to reflect with Council leadership on their own experiences with the working group. So it was just a mini pilot to see how that worked and if that was helpful as an additional step.

As Olga said, there are a few questions at hand here. One is, should there be an addition or instead, some sort of periodic assessment that happens at regular intervals? Would these exit interviews that were piloted this year be useful on a more regular basis as a regular part of the process? And to what extent should PDP leadership evaluation be part of the self-assessment? Currently, there's not much there that focuses on leadership.

And then the final piece of this was that one of the elements of PDP 3.0 that were identified as a possible improvement for the GNSO was a sort of tool to help evaluate the leadership of a PDP periodically and some Council members worked together to

develop a draft survey that could be deployed to working group members. It's not been used yet, it's still part of the PDP 3.0 package to be considered further, but during Council's strategic plan session discussions, some councilors said we need to do some further thinking about this, we don't want to chill participation among community members serving in leadership roles, we don't want this to be used for folks to make personal attacks or kill morale if there's an opportunity to do that. So that's something that this group can think about some more.

And just a few observations from the staff side based on what we've seen in administering these surveys in the past. The working group self-assessment provides input at the end of the process, which is useful in some ways for future projects, future PDPs and so forth, but to the extent that there's input that could have been useful for the group itself, it's too late to use that. And also, each working group is a bit unique, so sometimes the lessons learned would have been applicable within the working group but might not be easily applicable to future groups. So something to think about.

The way the format of the survey is currently designed, it's not always clear if the input can be actioned in some way. It's certainly interesting to see what people have done in terms of rating their experiences, but it's not always clear how that can translate into future improvements.

We've seen response rates that are quite low. Maybe that's the length of the survey, the complexity of the survey. It may also be just that after a very long PDP process, people are just tired and

they don't have the energy to sit down and fill out a survey. So those are all possibilities.

And then in the question where we ask members to provide feedback about the tool itself from SubPro and RPMs, and also within the exit interviews with the leadership teams, we saw some support for some sort of regularly occurring checkpoint. Some folks said, hey, that could be a survey, others said maybe there's a more informal way to do it, like a focus group or informal outreach or something like that. So there wasn't one clear direction on that. But the idea of regularly occurring checkpoints to evaluate seems like a good idea to some, but that those should be scoped properly, meaning keep it lightweight, keep it fairly easy to respond to and not be a distraction for members, and that it should be used strategically.

So I think those are the main things from the staff side. Here is the text on the slide of the working group guidelines text that refers to the working group self-assessment. And this was the background reading for this particular assignment. The first element is the working group guidelines as excerpted on the previous slide.

The sample version of the working group self-assessment that's kept on the Wiki. Currently, the format is slightly different because we switched to a different survey tool, but the questions and the substance are the same. And then the final item was the outputs of the PDP 3.0 work on the draft tool for periodic assessment of working group leadership.

Olga, would you like me to walk through the poll results?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, please. And then we'll review the answers. Yes, please go ahead. Thank you very much.

EMILY BARABAS: No problem. And Marika, if you want to hop in at any time, I see that you are—okay. I think I'm going to carry on, and y'all just interrupt if you'd like to hop in.

Okay, so we designed a survey tool to give everyone a bit of an opportunity to organize their thoughts on this particular assignment. There were four responses with substantive responses included. I think one person entered their name but maybe didn't have a chance to fill out the other fields, so we've just included the ones with the questions answered.

Question number two was about asking all the members to record their initial thoughts about potential improvements and enhancements, and just touching on a couple of highlights. One of the responses suggested allowing feedback on leadership as part of the working group self-assessment. Another—I'm not sure if the person who responded with number two is here. I wasn't exactly sure how that linked specifically to this assignment, but would love to hear more. Raise your hand if you do want to speak to that.

The third response was a suggestion that general revision is a good idea, but without specific inputs. And then the fourth response was pretty detailed, noting that it's important for the input to be timely and workable, so shortened specific surveys could be good. It should be self-contained, easy to be done

quickly, encourage quieter voices to be able to provide input as well, like through multiple choice, and keeping it short. So that's a pretty clear emphasis on short, sweet, periodic and simple and easy to engage in.

Does anyone want to comment on their responses? Or if anyone didn't have a chance to respond and wants to provide input on this particular question, this is a great moment.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think that's an interesting thing to have in mind, is this self-assessment at the end of the activities, the closure of the working group or in the middle. There are other questions that we have included that we will review in a moment, that, should this be done periodically? And I think that's a big change. As Emily said before, sometimes the working groups take quite a long time to finish their work. And once the assessment is done, it's at the end and that's too late if there were changes that should have been made during the process. So I think that's something important to have in mind, and if we want to get some of these ideas into the final recommendations.

My comment was a revision of the self-assessment should be done, but that's [on number three, not going to ...] I didn't want to fill it out, chairing this, I didn't want to, but I wanted to go through it and respond. So that's my comment. Sebastien, go ahead. Welcome.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Comment number four I believe was mine, the long one. I have to say that—and this is not a criticism, I think it's a learning experience for all of us, I have to say that in terms of survey, this one particularly had pitfalls that almost inspired my responses for all the other surveys. So it wasn't so much on the existing surveys or the surveys that—I have never been surveyed, I've never been part of any group at the end of the group going through it, so I can't speak to it that much.

Some of the problems are due to the tools and some are due to the way the survey was designed, and I think that even a simple survey like that could be helped a lot. So first of all, engaging people with multiple-choice questions before blank pages always gets first toes in the water. It's a lot easier to get into the material than by giving a big question like this one, typically. This one I didn't answer until I had completed most of the rest of the survey, had taken mental notes and went back up to answer it, because I had nothing to say about it when we first initiated.

The second one is I think this question had it, had a helpful link in the question that was clickable, and then there was another two questions later, or there was a block with a multiple-choice question later with a link that wasn't clickable. It's all right, I can type, so I retyped the whole whatever, 100 letters of the link making sure that every single one was in its right place for it to work. But that's the sort of thing that is very discouraging for somebody answering a survey.

Of course, if you're in the middle of the subject, you don't really need to go back to those links, but we're talking about surveys

that could be years, months later or these sorts of things. Having a reminder [inaudible]

OLGA CAVALLI: I cannot hear you anymore.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Did my mic go off?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Sorry.

OLGA CAVALLI: It's okay now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And so it is very much about designing the survey, testing the survey in order to make sure that whatever the benchmark is, but if we say this should take no longer than ten minutes to fill, five minutes to fill, and have the [heart of it,] it's done that quickly and doesn't take an hour. Again, people's attention span, people's lives are like that nowadays. They don't have that much time to go and answer these things.

And then I think it is always a possibility, if there is something underlying that needs more digging than a survey, there's always a possibility of organizing an interview behind it and go and scratch under that surface, which no survey is going to be comprehensive enough to fine details. So the survey should allow for an alert to be raised, but again, shouldn't be so comprehensive that it raises every single issue. Because again, we're wasting everybody's time, I think. So these were just some quick thoughts.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Sebastien. About this questionnaire that was prepared just for us, but I do agree that having a survey that is useful and easy going, it's always important. But this was intended to be a tool only for us, for kicking off—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I understand. I only use it as an example because as [I was using the tool, I was like,] okay, let's not do this again. It was no criticism of the tool itself. I'm sure that we can find ways to make it work the way we want it.

OLGA CAVALLI: Of course. And thank you for your comments. Marika, go ahead. Welcome.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. Hi everyone. First, some reactions to what Sebastien said. On the survey itself, we indeed set this up and

definitely welcome feedback that we get on how to make it more useful, but actually still learning, this tool in particular as well, and we have ourselves as well found some limitations in the way it's set up and what you can do with it.

Noting that as well, I know that we shared the template for the working group self-assessment, but maybe it's also worth running kind of a dummy survey for the group so you can actually see what the working group self-assessment looks like in practice and how it works, how many questions people need to answer.

One of the suggestions or one of the things the group will need to think about as well, because the working group self-assessment is quite long, quite some thought went into it, what kind of questions do we want to ask the group at the end of its process. But of course, if there is agreement or support for having a more interim kind of surveys that will be done on a periodic basis, of course, it doesn't need to be the same kind of model. Oh hi. I see we have new participants in the group.

It can be different, it can be much shorter, much easier. It can as well be custom made. It might not always be the same thing that we run. So that might be something to at least—so you can see in practice what it's like.

I also wanted to mention the idea of kind of doesn't necessarily only need to be a survey. And I think it's something we did experiment with in the context of the recent PDPs that finished. I think there was a kind of exit interview that was done with the working group chairs or at least I think that's something that we contemplated, that as an other mechanism to obtain input.

So I don't think the group needs to limit itself to only this survey. It's really about working group self-assessment. And of course, it can be done in different ways. So if there are other tools or mechanisms that should be considered—and again, that might be used on an optional basis, not every group is the same—that's definitely, I don't think, precluded from discussions and conversations.

What I actually had raised my hand for is also to emphasize the reason why this was also considered in the context of the PDP 3.0 conversation is thinking about what tools or information does the Council need to perform its role as manager of the PDP. I think we focus a lot now on how could this also help working groups, because of course, at the end of the day, it's about helping a working group do its job, what tools can we provide a group to do its job better. But this is also potentially a mechanism that could flag or indicate to the Council at an early stage if there are issues.

So I think as part of the PDP 3.0 conversation, there's also considered having a more periodic tool available to the Council would allow for identifying issues early on that either can be course corrected or intervention might be necessary. But again, the idea is that by being able to course correct or identify issues early on, a more heavy handed intervention or breakdown potentially of a group may not happen or may not be necessary.

So I think that's also something to keep in mind, thinking about what will be helpful both from the perspective of making sure the groups have what they need but also helping the Council in doing its job as manager of the PDP.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. And thank you for the feedback about how to structure these questionnaires and the surveys. Can we go to the next one? So this is about the periodic survey. I think it's useful. So my answer was yes. And we have no noes. So somehow there's this idea that having a periodic review is okay. And the other, I don't know if we have more comments about the other.

Any comments from you about having this periodic review? Not at the end of the working group, lifecycle, or at different periods, half a year, yearly. I see we have younger members of the working group, which is good. We have new blood in the GNSO.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: He keeps on raising his hand but [not to speak directly.]

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay, good. Let him speak. Maybe he has good ideas.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: There's something itchy. I think I might have been the other, and [it was only—not against] periodic, but against this idea of having it every year or every six months. I think it's more interesting on milestones. So way before a primary or a final report, obviously, but on some milestone of the work or something like that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Sebastien. Philippe, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Olga. It's just a common sense comment, really, very much along the lines of what Sebastien and Marika just said. Surveys are just a way to collect data. And we need a backend for this. We need calls. We need a way to consolidate the results and make sure that we make up something with that data, if you see what I mean. And that indeed could be calls with the PDP chairs and learnings. I'm sorry, that's a dumb comment and very common sense, but there we go. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Common sense is never dumb. It's common sense. Which is not usually very frequent unfortunately. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, on this point of when to do it—and we actually chatted a bit about this between staff as well on this, because indeed, on the one hand, you don't want to overload a working group with surveys and giving them the feeling that they're surveying all the time without actually getting their work done. But at the same time, you don't want them to go on for too long either without having that opportunity for input.

So milestones might be a way to go, or having some kind of setup that says when a milestone is reached but no later than one year

into its work, or something like that, because some groups do take a long time before it may get to a certain work product, or introduce some kind of flexibility or introduce it in the charter or give the Council that mandate, or maybe the Council liaison, give some guidance around when it would normally happen, but then basically confirm that in some way to, again, not tie the hands of running the survey just for the sake of running a survey but doing it when it makes sense, but at the same time, not forgetting about it or leaving it for too long before you run it, basically.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Can we move to the next one, please? So this, if you responded yes to question three, with what regularity do you think the survey should be carried out? Every six months, upon achieving a milestone—which was discussed a minute ago—such as publication of an initial report or draft report, every year, and other.

My comment was every six months, because I'm a very structured person, I'm an engineer. So maybe thinking about this milestone thing, it could be also advisable every like initial report or final report, that could be also a good idea. Any comments from you? I see something in the chat. Let me check.

Okay. Emily says focus groups. Can you comment about that, Emily? How do you envision that?

EMILY BARABAS: Sure, Olga. I was just thinking if we're potentially going to make surveys simpler, more straightforward and really easy to respond

to, I think someone in their comments mentioned that there could potentially be a question that's like, can we contact you further to talk about some of your input and your ideas? I believe that was in response to the last question. And I could certainly imagine a case where if Council leadership or the liaison or some combination wanted more information, wanted more input, wanted more qualitative input about potential improvements, that could be a discussion with a small group of interested members to troubleshoot an issue or provide feedback.

Of course, we'd have to be careful. This is obviously—that's not about collecting representative data of the opinions of the entire working group, it's really about getting more in-depth insight into particular perspectives or issues. But that qualitative information could potentially be useful to council leadership in troubleshooting or just understanding how things are going, as long as it's kept balanced and neutral.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Emily. Thank you very much. Any other comments about this periodic quality? Okay, let's go to the next one. Thank you. If you responded "other" to the previous question, please specify, based on planned milestones in the lead up to reports and at the time of reports. That's interesting. Surveys should be included in the planning each time the group crosses key gates. What is a key gate? Sorry, my English is limited.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that was me again. Sorry.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's okay. I'm asking—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: But a key gate is a milestone, it's just the same thing. I don't know, some of the—if you have a piece of work that is separated in four questions, before you go to the initial report, every time you've closed one of the questions—and sometimes they're not handled chronologically. That could be a key gate.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Thank you for the clarification, and I didn't have that in mind. Thank you. Let's go to the next one. If you responded that there should be a periodic survey, should the working group self-assessment at the end of a working group's lifecycle remain in place? Yes, in its current form, and nobody answered no. We have one other having yes but it should be modified, and, I have not formed an opinion yet.

Periodic survey, should the working group self-assessment at the end of a working group's lifecycle remain in place? Okay. Any comments to this question? I see none, so let's go to the next one, please. If you responded "other" to the previous question, please specify. The curent4 form can serve as a template to be reviewed at the time of planning to ensure work-specific items can be captured. Okay. Comments? Emily.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi. I had a question, maybe as a follow-up to this. I think one of the things we've seen with the working group self-assessment is that it's remained the same in part because it was developed as part or has been approved as part of the working group guidelines and so then it becomes a static part of our work.

And I sort of imagine this question getting at the idea that the surveys could potentially be more dynamic, so maybe specific questions that are responsive to particulars of a working group. And I'm curious if people have thoughts about that. I would imagine that there's some benefit to standardization, but also potentially some benefits to being a little bit flexible about the way that you approach these, and that might also inform how we kind of enshrine it in the documents of the GNSO. So I don't know if people have thoughts about that. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Emily. Sebastien, your hand is up. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks. First of all, a quick start. Don't put "other" category for a Frenchman in a questionnaire because we'll take "other" all the time. We don't fit in boxes. Teehee.

So this again was me. I was just thinking—and it couldn't be enshrined also. I was just thinking for example you have a working group, standard procedures to work, and then suddenly, one [question] invites external parties, invites an arbiter, invites training in this and whatever. And then you start getting into evaluation of

that, maybe. Something that ICANN would have paid for and want to know for the future. It's in that sense.

Obviously, it's not about the content, the question. We're not surveying on policy, but on the way of doing, and that's in that sense that I meant it.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Can we go to the next one? Should an assessment of the performance of working group leadership be part of the working group self-assessment? That's an interesting one. Yes, three. "I have not formed an opinion," nobody. One no, and one other. Okay.

Yeah, working group leadership plays a very important role because usually, they're the ones that push for the work, they ask for the responses, ask for participation, and in general, most of the participants in the working group apart from some members, it's usually the leader or the group of leadership that is the one pushing the work to move ahead. So this assessment, I said yes, because the leadership has a relevant role. That's my opinion. I don't know if you have comments or thoughts about that. Let's see. [We have three responses—we have four, and three responses said yes] somehow, and three of us, [we agree in that.] Philippe, go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Olga. Just for the record, really, it's the usual caveat on having performance assessments on the leadership. That

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. Totally agree, it shouldn't be a pressure. But at a point—this is my opinion, the role of the leadership of a working group is really relevant. Somehow—and also to say good things about the work, the leadership. We think that it could be pressure or could prevent people from participating because they will be evaluated, but if you do really a good leadership, if you're a good leader and a good chair of a working group, that also can be recognized in a survey. And that is somehow important. Sebastien, your hand is up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, I'm going to have to step out in a second, but I wanted to intervene first. I tend to agree with you, Olga, you step up to a role—not all comments are going to be negative, and you step up to a role, I think, it's fair to be evaluated.

I think there is almost an HR question here in the sense that we're not employees, but it's a bit the same. There needs to be some level of discretion in the way the information is collected and digested. So where the rest is public information, here we're talking about somebody, somebody's credibility, somebody's professionalism, somebody—with the good and the bad.

So I don't know if I went in too much details there, but I think that these types of questions then, first of all, shouldn't be just for public release as they are, should be open for comments but then

these comments are visible to a number of chosen few. And I was thinking either through the ombudsman or through other means like that, somebody impartial who's able to digest and filter and remove the purely personal and whatever. Just the same way you would do in HR. It's not information that is being trusted with everybody in the company.

OLGA CAVALLI: I totally agree. And I always want to be evaluated. I'm okay. I don't like it when I'm not evaluated, because I want to also have feedback to learn from my own mistakes and I also want to be recognized if the work was done, I want that feedback from my students, my fellows working. So that's my personal opinion. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks. Yeah, it's something that we've also been thinking about, how to balance indeed being open and honest and kind of having that maybe only visible or viewable to some. And maybe a combination is possible. I know at least from producing reports that there is a waiver for example, maybe you produce for public viewing kind of high-level responses to multiple-choice questions where people can say yes, no, this is going well, this is going bad, but you leave the comments indeed separately and maybe it's something that's for example reviewed by the liaison first for kind of a check, is there something in there that's not acceptable to be shared with either a wider group or publicly?

Again, I think the question needs to be a bit who the tool is used for, who's the end audience here. If it's the Council, of course, there are also ways in sharing it but not sharing it on a public mailing list, or indeed not sharing it but having a conversation and relaying some of the feedback that is received. So I think there are various ways in which it could be done, but I think it's very good for the group to have a conversation around that and kind of indeed indicate what this could or should look like.

And I'm looking to Emily because I think for the working group self-assessment, I think there, all the responses including the comments are shared and publicly posted, I think for everyone to see. And I hope she can confirm. So again, we do have a practice there and at least I think based on experience there, I don't think there's ever been anything, because of course, staff does review that before it gets published. And of course, if we would see something there that's very objectionable, we would definitely flag that. And I don't think, at least from my knowledge, that that has ever happened.

But I think we do agree that there might be instances where in the heat of the conversation or if a group is really at a point where tension is very high, there could be instances where the survey is used for other means than giving an objective assessment on how things stand and there needs to be a way then to mitigate against that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. I think Emily commented in the chat, but maybe you can tell us about that, Emily. Go ahead.

EMILY BARABAS: Sure. I think that that's something we came across this last round with the working group self-assessment. I can't actually speak to how it was done in the past, although I know that historically, all of the narrative responses have been published on the Wiki and also on the mailing lists, but not the names of the people who responded.

So one of the things that we did encounter this last time around is we noticed that there were specific comments that came from certain contributors and they could reasonably potentially be tracked back to the person who wrote them, just based on the way that they crafted the response. So in those cases, we contacted the people and just reminded them that this was going to be public and confirmed with them that they were comfortable with that.

But I think that that's something we do want to look strategically at in the future, both for any periodic assessments but also any assessment at the end because obviously, you want the feedback to be honest, you want it to be constructive. To the extent that it's appropriate, transparency is something that we've tended to strive for in the GNSO, but at the same time, as Marika said, if some of this feedback is really intended to be specifically for the Council as an example, maybe certain elements are public and others are kept more closely to those who really need them. So I do think that that's a really helpful set of feedback to get from this group, and perhaps a proposal could be developed for that. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you very much, Emily. Any other comments about this number nine question? I see none. Let's move to the next one please. If you responded "other" to the previous question, please specify. Constructive criticism should be accepted as any part of leadership role. I agree, and I think we already went through that a moment ago.
	If you answered yes to question number nine, please have a look at the draft survey that was developed as part of the PDP 3.0 deliberations—and that's the link there. Could this serve as a starting point? If yes, what further questions should be added, if any? If no, how should the CCOICI go about creating such a survey?
	Yes, and that answers my question two. Collective survey approach will be the best approach. This will prevent the denigration of individual volunteers. We should seem to be encouraging everyone who comes forward to volunteer.
	As an example, the helpful link above is neither clickable nor selectable. Okay, Sebastien already talked about that. The survey model in reference looks good to me. It certainly ticks all the boxes in my top comment.
	Should we review that, or we all have reviewed it before? I copy pasted the link to my web browser and this is how I reviewed it. I see no reactions, let's go to the next one because we're running out of time.
	If you answered yes to question nine, how can a potential chilling effect be avoided, meaning that volunteers may not step forward

for leadership roles out of concerns of being criticized in the survey? To be discussed, role for the ombudsman? Confidential feedback to Council leadership? This was mentioned a moment ago. I think it's worth to have that in mind. I think that a good assessment for the leadership is important also for the leader. The leadership of the GNSO should evaluate before a working group is launched the interest of the Council members. There are ways to moderate personal or virulent attacks without killing feedback. We have a professional facilitator and an ombudsman to ensure comments remain above Board. Worst case scenario, we are always a Zoom call away from each other. This is not social media, we don't need to limit our interactions for fear of trolls.

Okay, I agree. In general, my experience is that it's very difficult that people really get very nasty and angry in surveys. It's not common. But it may happen. Any comments, reactions to this number 12 question?

Okay, seeing none and considering the time, let's move ahead. Are there any other aspects of issues that the CCOICI should consider or take into account as it deliberates on this topic? Periodic retreat for working group members will be key to helping group members in reflecting and learning from present and previous activities. That's a good idea. And I think this is the last one. Yes.

Okay, we have like five minutes. Any other comments? What I would like to do now—yes, Flip, your hand is up. Welcome.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you, Olga. Hi everybody. I just wanted to share a reflection that I had. I've worked with a couple of people actually—I think Julie Hedlund was one of the team members, and we worked on the GNSO operating procedures, 3.7, maybe you recall. I think there were some interesting sections there that could be taken into account. And for actually staff, the liaison, to avoid some views regarding how people have been behaving, handled, how leadership was doing, that they actually result into some sort of a conflict.

I think it's an important role for staff to try to detect what's going on and take into account what observations people make so that we can or they can better steer how evaluations that people spontaneously tend to make can be guided. I hope I'm clear enough. It's a very complex set of rules, but I would suggest you have a look at GNSO operating procedures and go to section 3.7 of the GNSO working group guidelines, and you will see what I mean, I think, I hope.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Flip. Very good comment, and we will have that in mind. [inaudible]. I'm not taking notes today. Marika, your hand is up.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. And to Flip's point, I think it is something that we shared at the outset with the group all the relevant sections, and maybe we need to do a better job as well in pointing people to kind of the roles and responsibilities as well as conflict mitigation

and resolution that exists. But I did take note as well of your point that there might be observations that working group members make throughout deliberations or feedback that we get from leadership, and of course, I think we do try to take that into account and share that as well with the Council as and when appropriate.

I actually put my hand up—I know we're running out of time here, and I think we already mentioned at the start of the meeting, I think from our perspective, we would like to take the feedback that you've all shared and kind of start drafting a potential response to these questions from the committee's viewpoint. I do note that we have quite a few people missing and actually, I think all of you that are on the call did participate in the survey, so that was really helpful to get some insight, but of course, those that are not here and did not participate, we have not heard their views.

So I think the idea would be to kind of summarize a bit that the responses or kind of direction that we seem to get from your feedback to the survey and share that with the rest of the group and kind of confirm, is that the direction that you want to take it in? And I think then we need to have a more detailed conversation on some of the questions that already came up. It seems that there is support for having a periodic assessment. So what does that look like? Do we settle it on a fixed timeframe? Is it flexible? Who decides?

I think based on that, we can probably identify a number of more detailed questions that the committee will need to answer which then will help us decide or draft recommendations, whether these

are in the form of changes to the operating procedures, to the survey, or other type.

I think one thing that we probably will do is set up kind of a test dummy survey on the working group self-assessment as it currently stands. So I think we also need to have a conversation around if, how should that be modified and if, how should a periodic assessment look like.

It is possible, of course, to kind of copy paste some of the same questions so you could potentially also see what is the evolution of working group responses, have you been able to correct certain things over time or not? But again, we have time I think to do that, I just want us to give it a high-level—at least our thinking of how to move this conversation forward and making sure that that aligns with your views on how to continue this conversation.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Question about next meeting. We have ICANN meeting next week, right?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, correct. Next week, there's no meeting scheduled. As Philippe noted, there will be an AOB item so that's also an opportunity to mention that this group is working and has already started on its next assignment in addition to the one it delivered.

So I think the question to the group is, do you want to have a meeting immediately in the week after ICANN 72? We do have a practice of kind of taking that week off for most working group

efforts. So I don't know how those on the call feel about that, just scheduling the next meeting basically the second week after ICANN 72 and reconvene.

Of course, we can try to undertake some work in the meantime and share that with everyone so everyone has an opportunity to review that and get prepared, or do people feel very motivated and want to immediately start after ICANN 72? I think that's the question.

OLGA CAVALLI: I'm in your hands. If it's usual to take the week after the ICANN meeting, I think we could have that idea for the next meeting of our group. Would that be a good idea? When would that be, Marika? Let me check my agenda.

MARIKA KONINGS: I think that's the 10th of—

OLGA CAVALLI: 10th of November, right? Would that be okay? In the meantime, we will try to reach out to those group members that haven't responded. November 10 would be the next meeting if we take— yeah. I was reading the chat. Is that okay? Are we okay with November 10th, or we want to have it a week before?

I see no reactions, so I will take silence as a yes. Okay, thank you for thumbs up. Thank you very much. Thank you for your time. Thank you for your patience with me last week. We will review all

the comments and we will prepare new information and share it with the whole group, and hopefully others join with their comments and ideas. And I wish you a good rest of the week. See you in our several meetings of the GNSO [in the next days.] Bye. Have a nice day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]