

COMPILATION OF SURVEY RESPONSES FROM F2F PDP WG CHAIRS

Working Groups that have participated in this pilot project so far: 3

- *PPSAI (twice – Oct 2014 & Oct 2015)*
- *IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights – March 2015)*

Working Group chairs that filled in the survey: 5 (all)

Q1: Do you think having a facilitated, face to face meeting of a PDP Working Group at a critical stage in its deliberations is helpful in bringing the group toward consensus? (Noting that what is "critical" can vary from one case to the next, and may need to be determined by either the GNSO Council or the Working Group itself.)

Yes – community facilitator: 1

Yes – either professional or community facilitator: 2

Yes – though facilitation may not always be necessary: 4

No: 0

Q2: When, in relation to an ICANN Public Meeting, should such face to face WG meetings take place?

- Prior to start of meeting: 2
- Immediately following the end: 1
- Set aside half or full day during the meeting: 1
- Only during Meeting B: 0
- Completely separate from ICANN meeting: 0

COMMENTS:

- ICANN needs to provide funding for all extra nights' stay needed.
- Set aside half or full day, as ICANN meetings are already too long.
- This (immediately following the end) is likely the best way, in combination with an agenda/questionnaire that is sent out to the participants prior to the ICANN meeting.
- Depends on the reason for the F2F.

Q3: If a professional facilitator is to be used, how can we ensure that he/she is sufficiently knowledgeable about the background, work and processes of the WG?

- Briefings from staff and WG chair(s) and access to the wiki. Also extract materials from the wiki that are specifically relevant to the issues that the F2F is to address.
- Provide curated background info and have the co-chairs of the WG brief him/her?

- Unsure, as we never had a professional facilitator. But I imagine it would be they have to read a report, attend a few calls and have a separate call with Chair(s).
- First of all, a professional facilitator must be one that has some general knowledge about the topic, and thereby can see it from a different point of view but still understand the topic from the start. He/she can be prepared by reading a summary of the work done so far, as well as the outstanding questions.
- Provide background documents and access to the wiki so that the person can see what the WG has done on issues of concern. Make staff and WG chairs available to discuss questions.

Q4: If a community facilitator is to be used, how should he/she be selected?

- By the Council: 2 (COMMENT - It still has to be someone outside the WG, in order to provide new input, therefore either selected from ICANN staff or by GNSO Council)
- By the WG chair(s): 2
- By WG majority agreement: 0
- By ICANN staff: 1
- Other: 1 (COMMENT - Council and/or staff subject to WG approval)

Q5: Should remote participation continue to be made available, or should these meetings be in-person only (funding and other logistical details permitting)?

In-person and remote: 5

In-person only: 0

COMMENT - The value is from F2F but members shouldn't be excluded. Remote with listen only.

Q6: Should WG participants be asked to keep their communications limited only to other WG participants while the meeting is in progress?

Yes: 5

No: 0

COMMENTS –

- But recognize that this is not practically enforceable.
- The goal is to be focused, but sweet Jesus do you need to phrase it carefully.
- Yes but good luck with that.

Q7: Do you find the level and extent of funding available for each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency satisfactory? What can be done to enhance representativeness and participation in these F2F WG meetings?

Yes: 1

No: 4

COMMENTS –

- See comment above about number of nights that ICANN will pay for.
- Travel support was allocated on a stakeholder group level. The CSG exists only as a device for vote allocation within the GNSO council and has no role in the policy development process. Support should be allocated on the constituency level, at least within the NCPH.
- It would be preferable if ICANN can assist with a free extra hotel night, in order to increase the possibilities of in-person participation.
- Full lodging and incidentals funding should be provided where there is a gap between the F2F and when the person would otherwise need to arrive.

Q8: Do you find the level and extent of funding available for each ICANN Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee satisfactory? What can be done to enhance their representativeness and participation in these F2F WG meetings?

Yes: 2

No: 2

COMMENTS –

- WGs should more carefully consider the pro's and con's of active participation by people outside the SO that commissioned the WG.
- See above: One extra hotel night would increase the possibility to participate.

Q9: What role should ICANN policy support staff play, or continue to play, at these F2F WG meetings?

- Continue level of active involvement that occurs for phone calls.
- Continue the role of preparing documentation, agendas, handling logistics, including follow-up, taking notes, and participating actively in discussion when they can add information. These staff are critical to the success of WGs and to F2GF meetings in particular.
- Staff's usually excellent level of support is adequate for the f2f meetings.
- As usual: to be there in person but in the background, to be available for questions on facts, time schedule, etc.
- Be involved in the same way as staff is on calls.

Q10: Should ICANN staff from other departments (e.g. GDD), if relevant, participate at these F2F WG meetings? If so, should they participate on the same footing as the WG members?

Yes: 5

No: 0

COMMENTS –

- Participate to the extent that their subject matter expertise is needed.
- At least available as a resource.
- It was useful in PPSAI to have some input from the Registrar team.
- If relevant, and in order to both get direct info on the discussion, as well as - if asked - provide replies to practical questions.
- Participate as resources, as they do as needed on calls.

Q11: Is it satisfactory that the GNSO Council invite (select) a PDP WG for such meetings at the conclusion of the prior ICANN Public Meeting? If not, please suggest alternatives.

Yes: 2

No:2

Other: 1 (COMMENT – I would schedule F2F for all PDP WGs.)

COMMENTS –

- No, the WG that can benefit best may not be known yet.
- That's OK but where possible longer advance notice would be preferable.
- No, selecting groups is difficult, as it's hard to predict where a WG will be at the time of meeting. I would have a more collaborative approach between chairs and council.

Q12: Should the option of a F2F WG meeting be made available to all PDP WGs on a periodic basis (e.g. by rotation), or should the current system be continued, where a particular WG at an important phase of its work is invited to make use of the opportunity?

Offer to all periodically: 1

Continue current system: 4

Other: 0

COMMENT - As the topics for each WG differs, it is better to have F2F meeting for those WGs with special needs, meaning that it may even be 2 times during the WG's period for the same WG.

Q13: Further suggestions for improvement

- Well planned and focused agenda is critical. We actually did not have the experience of an outside professional facilitator so hard to say whether that could have worked.

- It is necessary that the facilitator at the end makes a conclusion of what the WG has agreed upon and what further questions/issues that needs to be dealt with, including a proposed time schedule. Like when a Mediator at the end summarize what the parties have said/concluded.