
ICANN Transcription

PDP3.0 Webinar

Tuesday, 15 September 2020 at 21:00 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/EQebC>

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

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and welcome to the GNSO Council PDP 3.0 webinar taking place on Tuesday the 15th of September 2020 at 21:00 UTC.

All lines are muted at this time to avoid background noise and will remain muted until the question and answer portions of the webinar. The webinar room is equipped with a chat feature and a Q&A box. The box is found at the bottom of your Zoom window.

To chat, please change your dropdown to include all panelists and attendees to ensure everyone can see your message. To ask a question, click on the Q&A box and type in your question. All audience questions

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.

will be answered towards the end of each Q&A section on the webinar. You may also raise your hand during the Q&A portion.

This webinar is being recorded and will be posted on the GNSO calendar and agenda Wiki page shortly after the end of the webinar. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it over to our GNSO chair, Keith Drazek. Please begin.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Terri, and hello everybody. Welcome. I'm Keith Drazek, GNSO chair, at least for another couple of months. I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome you all to the GNSO council's webinar on our PDP 3.0 implementation. We'll get to some slides here but I did just want to note, as has been typed in the chat, we have the opportunity for people to submit questions. There's the chat feature, there's also the Q&A pod, and as well as the opportunity to raise hands at some point. So I certainly encourage this to be a dialog and to have a back-and-forth in the Q&A to answer any questions. Next slide, please.

Our agenda for today, I'll make some opening remarks, and then we will focus on four distinct areas that had the PDP 3.0 focus, first being working group dynamics, second being working group leadership, third being project management, and fourth being consensus building. And there's some additional information there on the screen that we'll get to in a little bit more detail here shortly, and then we'll have some closing remarks. But again, I think after each one of these segments,

we're certainly interested in answering any questions that may arise. Next slide, please.

I'd just like to tee up this webinar by first acknowledging the tremendous amount of hard work that the GNSO council over the course of several years with excellent support and engagement from ICANN staff have developed and have put forth in terms of engaging in this PDP 3.0 journey. It has been a multi-year effort, it has taken place over the course of several GNSO councils over the course of years, but we're very proud with the outcome and the output of this work and this effort. And I think importantly, you'll see as we go through the update that there are some linkages between some of the items and concepts identified in the evolving of the multi-stakeholder model effort over the last year or two and the work of the GNSO in the PDP 3.0 effort.

And second, I'd like to note that we first gave an update and a detailed briefing to the ICANN board at least as where we were in the process back in January, and there was an interest in having further discussions and briefings at ICANN meetings on the implementation of PDP 3.0 and what our experiences are and where we're seeing success and opportunity.

We had initially planned to have community briefings during the virtual Cancun meeting that we ended up having to scrap due to the changes. So we're now very pleased to be able to produce this community webinar providing insight and update on our PDP 3.0 efforts. Next slide, please.

I'll give a quick overview here of what we're going to talk about today and what PDP 3.0 is. I think it's key to note that what we're talking about here are 14 incremental improvements aimed to tackle four overarching challenges and to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of GNSO policy development processes. We'll talk about each one of these in a little bit more detail, but I think it's really important to flag that, that the GNSO council working with staff identified these four overarching challenges and then drilled down on each one of those to identify the 14 incremental improvements, but the overriding goal was to try to make our policy development work more efficient and effective, both in terms of timing, in terms of output, making sure that we're scoping things appropriately, and to make sure that we have the right participation levels. So we'll talk about each one of these in more detail here.

But you'll see on the screen that we have the four overarching challenges. One is working group dynamics. One of the challenges that we found is that the size of groups was getting bigger and that we needed to find a balance between input and decisions. So three of the items of the incremental improvements here were statements of participation, alternatives to an open working group model, and criteria for joining of new members once a PDP working group was already underway.

The second bucket was working group leadership, making sure that we as the council were clear in setting our expectations and having reviews and coordination of co-chairs. The incremental improvements that we sought were to determine an active role and clear description of the council liaison to a PDP working group, expectations for working group

leaders, and a review of working group leadership. We'll talk more about that in detail shortly.

Three, overarching challenge project management. This was really an important area of focus for us this year at council and working with staff, was to be better at projecting, to focusing on project management and program management, understanding deadlines and timelines and making sure we had visibility into when something might be slipping.

So the incremental improvements here were to enforce deadlines and ensure bite sized pieces of work for PDP working groups., notification to council of change in any workplans, criteria to evaluate requests for data gathering, criteria for PDP working group updates, and resource reporting for PDP working groups.

And then finally, perhaps one of the most challenging things that we always face in engaging in our ICANN processes and in the ICANN community is consensus building. To the extent that working groups and working group leadership needed some additional guidance, we developed a consensus playbook which is a suggested or recommended set of options. Nothing that's specifically required but a guide, if you will.

And then provide further guidance for sections 3.6 and 3.7 in the GNSO working group guidelines, we'll get into that in more detail shortly, and independent conflict resolution. So those are the four overarching challenges that the council identified and the items that we identified to try to deal with those. And again, just to reiterate, can't say it enough, is the overriding goal is to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of our

council processes and our GNSO policy development work. Next slide, please.

We've actually deployed some work products and some have been applied to ongoing working groups. So we'll talk about these, as I said, in additional detail, but working group dynamics, statements of participation and alternatives to an open working group model, working group leadership, talking about the active role and clear description for the council liaison, expectations for working group leaders. These are items that we've actually already implemented in certain cases or made available in certain cases. So we're already on the path to learning and benefiting from the experience of some of these groups and some of the ongoing work. Next slide, please.

At a very high level, if you're asking yourself what is PDP 3.0, the answer is it's a nonprescriptive toolkit, it provides additional guidance and guardrails, and expects evolutionary and continuous improvements.

What is PDP 3.0 not? It's not intended to fix every multi-stakeholder model challenge, and it's not an endpoint. But we do think that this is a very helpful and important set of tools, set of recommendations and frameworks that we can take as we consider next steps in the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model effort. Next slide, please.

The structure for today's webinar, first goal is to review the purposes and examples of work products applied in ongoing GNSO working groups, and Rafik and Melissa will take care of presenting goal one. Goal two is to kickstart GNSO council's preliminary assessment of the PDP 3.0 impact, and Pam and I will facilitate that. Our third goal is to help SOs

and ACs evaluate the applicability of PDP 3.0 improvements in their processes. And we certainly welcome any input or engagement from participants, any feedback and any thoughts at that point.

So I think with that, I will hand of the next section to Rafik and to Pam. Rafik, over to you. Thank you so much.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith, and thanks to everyone for making it for today. So just as a reminder for this segment, we will have discussion and opportunity to comment and that will be facilitated by Pam before we move to the next part of the presentation, so please prepare your question. Next slide, please.

Okay. So this is one of the first recommendations, and the goal here is to ensure that working group are committed to work together, to find consensus and to respect the ICANN expected standards of behavior, and this is one of the recommendations that seek to address the working group dynamics challenge.

So, what we are requiring here is that the working group members, before joining, is to assign or affirm a statement of participation. And as you can see in the slide, we have a list of commitments that are expected from the working group members with regards to the multi-stakeholder bottom-up consensus policy development.

In more of a practical side here is that this statement of participation was, if we can [inaudible] and innovation for the EPDP team, and it was the only one that implemented it from the beginning. For the other

working groups, they were not required to implement it as they have been in operation since 2016 and they are expected also to conclude their work before the end of this year.

So why it's important to have this statement of participation is to help for the membership recruitment and also to set the expectation. For the EPDP, we didn't have to reference this statement of participation to hold members accountable or to [inaudible] any disruptive behavior, and so we just didn't need it in that case, but it's always helpful in a situation when it's required. So it's an important product to outline what is expected for working group members and can be leveraged anytime if it's needed or required. Next slide, please.

Here we are moving to the recommendation with respect to alternative to open working group model, and one of the goals here is to try to identify a fit for purpose model, trying to balance different criteria or objectives such as representation, inclusivity, expertise, empowerment, accountability, and participation. And this is another recommendation aiming to address the working group dynamics challenges.

Why we could have or we have this recommendation is in fact the PDP manual itself provides the flexibility to consider different type of PDP team structures, so we can have working group, taskforce, committee, [inaudible] or drafting team. So you can find this in the PDP manual.

Here, we are trying to ensure representation, and as well, the empowerment of working group members, and for that, we can consider different structure. For example, having individuals joining either as participants or observers, or members designated by the

SOAC, stakeholder group and constituency, and that model that worked in what we call the cross-community working group. So there is no model that one size fit all, and so we should always try to explore the best fit approach for each PDP.

If we can just maybe explain what we have here, it's the kind of ... We have those different elements that you can see here between working group model or about the chair or vice chair, co-chair and the member expertise, and those different elements can be modified or mixed to create what is most appropriate or fit model or structure for the PDP.

And what we are expecting here is when chartering a future PDP working group, the GNSO council is required to consider the appropriate model based on the criteria such as timeline, cost and budget, expertise, leader requirement, community interests and the PDP outcome impact, and when doing that selection, the GNSO council is expecting to provide the rationale for choosing one and to indicate that in the charter. Next slide, please.

Here, we have an example of a model, and this is the EPDP team representative model. So in fact, that recommendation is coming from the EPDP team experience as it's predicted, and here we have an alternative membership structure, what we call the representative model instead of the usual open working group model. We didn't apply something similar to the other ongoing working groups since they started and they are ongoing.

So what you can see here in the slides is the composition of the membership, and those members are appointed by their corresponding

groups. So in fact, they designate members and alternate. What we also have here is the different liaisons, so we have as usual the GNSO council liaison, we have liaison from ICANN board. Also, the observers who are interested can join the mailing list with read only access, and so following the deliberation on the mailing list. But also, during the EPDP team work, we tried to make improvement in terms to have the observers to follow the EPDP team conference call.

What we also have is the expert contributor. So we got here a professional facilitator since there was a budget for that purpose, and also, the legal counsel. So we have those expert joining or helping and supporting the EPDP team since we got a budget for them. So they were helpful on the different area. So for the legal counsel, it was important to have someone who could answer specific legal questions or give clarification, so that is helpful for deliberation with regards to the policy. And for the professional facilitator to help in particular during the face-to-face meeting and support the chair.

Another thing that I forgot but is important to mention here is with regards to the chair, for the EPDP, it's an independent chair that was appointed by the GNSO council and so not counted as working group members per se. Next slide, please.

And here, I think we stop for a little bit for the Q&A and that will be facilitated by Pam.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Rafik. Hi, everyone. Maybe we could go back to the last slide if possible. Thanks. Okay, firstly, thank you again for joining this

webinar. I just want to acknowledge that the timing of this webinar really is not ideal for a lot of you, those in Europe, and even for Rafik, it's still very early, and very late for some of you. Thank you. And this is one of the challenges for us as a community, the tyranny of time zones. It's really difficult to find a time zone that suits everybody. But we really appreciate your participation in this webinar.

As Keith has just alluded to earlier, one of the goals of this webinar is really to help GNSO to assess as a sort of preliminary step, if you like, how some of these improvements may benefit our work or achieve its intended goals to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the PDP process.

So I thought it might be a good idea if we could get your thoughts. It'd be lovely to hear your thoughts about this particular area, the group dynamics and these improvements, whether you maybe participated in the EPDP directly or observing afar to see whether some of these improvements you think worked or didn't work as well. So we would love to hear your thoughts on that.

Particularly, I personally feel this is one of the major changes from the PDP we were used to, and I recall about ten years ago when I first joined the ICANN land, the one thing that kind of struck me was everyone is welcome to participate and the PDP is open to everyone. But with this alternative model, if you can see here, we actually now have trialed this representative model with a different allotted number of members from different groups, and that is really, to me, quite a departure from this open PDP model, and that was trialed in the EPDP. And the composition is here on the screen, you can see. I would really love to

hear your thoughts on what you think, whether this model really worked well in the EPDP or not so well, and why.

With that, I'll pause to see whether there are any questions or comments from you. Thanks. No questions. I can't see any hands at the moment. Rafik, would there be anything you would like to add in terms of you as council liaison to the EPDP to see how this representative model worked and whether the composition was the right one?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Pam. With regards to the liaison, we'll cover that later, but I understand your question is to kind of my perception of how this-model worked. What I can say, being the GNSO council liaison but also at the end as chairing for the last part of the EPDP and being vice chair, what I can see is this model helped in terms of, I think, first ensuring regular participation since we have designated members and alternate, so there was that guarantee to have at least a representative from each group, those who expressed interest to join and participate in this EPDP, and I think it's quite important for any working group, is to have that regular participation and involvement along the life cycle of the PDP.

And I think also, it helped to see the different position and views of the different groups and to make it easier for the chair to see the different positions, how to work and how to get consensus and to let different groups interact more and work toward a common position. I think it helped to make things more clear and to encourage more participation of groups that might not have been more active beforehand to be more

in this EPDP. So I think that was important and something we can learn from.

But at the end, we chose this model because for this specific EPDP, we tried to get all groups that expressed interest. And also, I think having the expert, maybe we could have more or other expert, but having at least the facilitator and the legal counsel was an important addition to the EPDP. So I believe there are many learnings from the EPDP team, this representative model. I'm not saying that it is the solution or a silver bullet for everything, but I think this experience was helpful in many aspects that can be useful later on when we'll decide, choose a model for the next PDPs in the coming years.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you very much for that, Rafik. I hope you can all see the chat. Due to time constraint, I wouldn't read out some of the messages in chat, but Amr did type in the Q&A pod a comment, so I'll just quickly read out. Amr has actually replicated that in the chat. Amr's question is how the council leadership intends to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of this model. I guess that'll be not just a council leadership, it'll be a whole council effort.

My initial thought would be if the working group actually deliver its report on time or whatever output that was expected on time, that will be kind of one measure, and we could think of other measures to measure whether it's being efficient or effective.

One thing I'd like to mention is, as you can see on this table here, even though all groups within the ICANN community were invited, I believe

the ccNSO and the RSSAC actually declined to send their representative to join this effort, and that might be for good reason, maybe the topic didn't have a direct impact to their group, and that might be the reason.

So just to wrap up this representative model, my personal concern is how we're going to be able to really also achieve the goal of inclusiveness and then using this representative model, and would that have unintended consequences resulting in a sort of a haves and have not divide, if you like. Some groups may have more resources, more expertise available to join this sort of working group while others may not have, and then also, regional differences in terms of time zones where these meetings may not be easy for some of the members from a particular region to join, and those concerns. So I guess it is a balancing act and we have learned that or trialed this in the EPDP. And as Jeff rightly says so, the jury is still out and it's early days, and we're going to learn more as we go. But all in all, I think this was a good experiment in the EPDP.

With that, I think we can now move on to the next topic, which is the working group leadership. Over to you, Rafik. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Pam, and thanks for the comment in the chat. Again, just as a reminder, after this [portion,] we'll have the Q&A and that will be facilitated by Keith. But moving then to the next slide, here, we are moving to the recommendation which is trying to tackle the challenges related to the working group leadership, and as you can see here, we tried for this work product to list the expectation for the working group

leadership as well as the skills required, and based on those expectation. So we summarized those expectations and skills in different buckets.

Maybe what we can emphasize here is the skill requirements for the working group leadership and their neutrality and consensus and diversity, and efficiency. So we want to have a chair able to refrain from promoting specific agenda and they can ensure fair, objective treatment of all opinions within the working group that they can help working group members to understand that consensus is a decision that we all work to reach and that majority of working group members can live with. This is an important idea, that we can live with what we have as consensus. Also that we want the working group leadership to ensure that closed working group decisions are not revisited or reopened unless there is consensus to do so in a really kind of narrow or specific situation, for example that there is new information brought to the working group's attention. But it's something we should avoid, reopening what was closed or agreed previously.

Also, we want working group leadership to halt disruption, in extreme case, [exclude] working group members from a discussion. So that's why we have those expectations and we are counting on the working group leadership to have the skills to achieve that. So, how we can ensure this is when we charter a future PDP working group, the GNSO council is required to clarify the leadership team composition, responsibility, skill requirement and specific expertise using this work product or tool, and this work product is intended to work hand in hand with improvement number two, which is related to the working group leadership structure determination and selection, and improvement number 13, which is the

regular review of working group leadership and member survey with respect to the leadership performance. We didn't have that yet implemented or initiated since it's not a requirement for ongoing working groups, but we are expecting to do so in the future PDP. Next slide, please.

Okay, so here is more practical example with regards to the working group leadership selection, and that was for the case of the EPDP team, and so this was useful in terms of experience to help for the improvement or the recommendation.

So for the EPDP team case, the GNSO council appointed skilled and qualified chair, one for phase one and another for phase two, and this as you can see is not usual practice that we had in the past, so it was something new for the GNSO council to do.

In terms of process, we had staff publish a request for expressions of interest for the role of chair, with the criteria and expectation for the EPDP team chair which is described in that expression of interest. And as you can see here about the questions, they were about trying to detail the requirement for the skill, knowledge, time commitment and so on, and so to have those candidates or applicant to respond to those questions and to help the GNSO council in terms of selection.

The candidates then were assessed by the GNSO council against the list of identified skills, so it was the GNSO council leadership and standing selection committee leadership jointly reviewing the response and proposing a chair for the GNSO council consideration. Once the EPDP team formed, there was a selection of one vice chair to assist the chair.

So we didn't have this like co-chairs or many vice chairs. It was kind of simple working group leadership.

[inaudible] but my own experience is that I think this was quite interesting experiment, and to have this selection of chair for the working group and in fact also helped to bring, for example in the case of Janis, someone who is not participating in ICANN for a while but knowing and having the experience to deal with working groups in different settings, and bringing that expertise and experience to ICANN and to have him leading the EPDP team for phase two.

Also, I think for the case of Kurt in phase one, it was helpful to have someone with knowledge about RDS and WHOIS and to ensure that he is neutral and working for phase one. So from my experience, I think it was quite important experiment to bring those two persons at that time to lead the EPDP team. Next slide, please.

Here, we are moving from the description of what we are expecting from working group leadership to more the role and description of the GNSO council liaison. As you can see here, we have the different expectations outlined for the liaison. So those are kind of the important expectations we have outlined for the liaison, and the idea is trying to get them more kind of to help them in their work as conduit between the GNSO council and the PDP and also to assist in their role the working group leadership as needed and when required, and to help in terms of reporting to the council about the progress and also to assist for any challenge that is faced by the PDP working group.

Also to help working group with many aspects, for example about understanding the GNSO operating procedure or the PDP manual and so on. And we are trying here to emphasize that the liaisons are expected to fulfill their roles in neutral manners, so we are not expecting them just to participate in working group calls or reporting status and so on, but we want them to do that in a neutral manner. Next slide, please.

Here, we are moving to more practical example. You can see here the three current GNSO council liaisons to the working groups. Again, as you can see here, that's what we are expecting them to do, is to participate in working group meetings, reporting to council on the working group progress, and assist when there is any challenge.

But something I should have highlighted here is that what we see in terms of the list of expectations and what was outlined in the previous slide is to provide that supplemental guidance for the liaison to help them in their work, and that's something coming from the experience we had like in the EPDP team, and we tried to have kind of the checklist that referenced and expecting the liaison responsibility as described in the EPDP team charter. So this guidance is helping the current liaison to check about what they're supposed to do and to give them that guidance. We also have the handover briefing, since as you know, after AGM and when maybe some councilors are leaving, we are replacing by another councilor in the role of GNSO council liaison, we have that handover briefing to help and support smooth transition.

What I can maybe say here [inaudible] practical case is for example for the EPDP team, the GNSO council liaison played the role of interim chair and also role of vice chair. It's not really usual, but for that case, it was

proposed. It's also to ensure that regular working group communication to the council when there is any question or request for guidance for a specific question [inaudible] during the deliberation within the EPDP, and also to refer any question about the charter to the council. And it happened already, and GNSO council provided guidance and instruction to the EPDP with that regard.

The other also experience that's happened for example in RPM, for example John assisted the co-chairs to chair the working group meeting when they were unable to do so. So playing that role of interim chair when needed. He also assisted with dealing with an incident involving a community member who abused ICANN expected standard of behavior and anti-harassment policy, and also the previous RPM liaison, Paul McGrady helped to handle this matter and communication to the council. So here just to highlight kind of practical example of what the GNSO council liaison doing, and also for example for the case of Flip Petillion, is to give regular update to the council about the progress in the SubPro working group.

With that, moving to the next slide, please. Okay, so we will stop here since this is the Q&A part or portion, and this will be facilitated by Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Rafik. Thanks for the overview, and I'd like to open it up for any comments or questions, any input or feedback. I think if we could go back to the first slide in this portion, please, just so we can see the list of items that we covered.

So this is about working group leadership. We obviously talked about the role of the chair, the role of the liaison, the process for appointment and identification of a chair in this particular chair in this case where it might not have been left up to the group but the council took responsibility for appointing a neutral chair. So these are the items that we're happy to engage on today, so if anybody would like to pose a question or provide feedback, please put up your hand or type in chat, or type in the Q&A pod.

And while folks are thinking, I'll just point out I think one of the most important things that we've achieved as the GNSO council this year is the work that we've done around empowering the council liaison to a PDP working group to have a more active and defined role. I think it's been helpful for both the council but also for the working groups themselves to make sure that there are open lines of communication and expectations are set.

I think it's also been very important for our engagement with our ICANN staff colleagues as we do the tracking and the engagement, making sure that timelines are met and that resources are being allocated and applied appropriately. The role of the liaison, I think, has been helpful in each of these cases. So I just want to tee it up, so talking about expectations for working group leadership, etc.

And Jeff, you're saying, "So, are we covering the remaining areas?" Anything in this section before we move on to the next? Okay, I don't see any hands, and I don't see any questions. One popped into Q&A. I see that Amr has put in the question pod, "Not that this hasn't been the case already, but the GNSO council liaison would ideally be well

informed on his or her responsibilities as well as the GNSO working group guidelines.”

Absolutely right. I think certainly, the responsibilities—and I think we've made great progress in that regard over the last year or year plus. I think it's incumbent upon all GNSO councilors to have a good understanding of the GNSO working group guidelines. But certainly, maybe a little bit more critical for somebody who's in a liaison role. But I think that's certainly an expectation, that we would have, for all incoming and existing councilors, a familiarity with the working group guidelines.

I see a question also from Olivier. Thank you, Olivier. He says, “Have the designers of PDP 3.0 estimated the workload on volunteers that will take part in the new PDPs, such as the number of hours expected to spend on a PDP per week?” Great question, Olivier, and I will perhaps hand that back to Rafik. Rafik, if you have any direct response to Olivier's question, that would be very welcome. I think it's certainly something that we always struggle with in the ICANN community, is the amount of time for various work tracks and work products. So let me pause there. Rafik, do you have a response for Olivier?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. We'll talk more about—this is more related to estimation and about the workload, and maybe it will be covered to some extent by the next portion or section regarding the project management. But for the EPDP, when we chartered it, we discussed about all like the representation model, etc., and when we defined the number of

representatives from each group and so on, we have some rough estimation about how much is required, but at the end, I think the most important factor was the timeline by when in particular like for phase one, the EPDP team needed to deliver, and that pushed or added more workload. It's not something we intended for, but that was a constraint that added more to the workload for the EPDP team members, even if we in the beginning during the charging we thought we have kind of [inaudible] rough estimation how much is needed or required.

And also, it's quite important to know that when we initiate working group, we are expecting that they come back with their workplan, etc., so to factor that in that effort when they share workplan or timeline and so on. But one important thing coming from PDP 3 is always to focus on the scope and to try to have more PDP that they don't run more like beyond one year or year and a half, just to ensure that they can deliver and to avoid more that pressure or adding to the workload of the PDP working group members. I hope that answers the question. And I know that maybe still, we are not there yet in terms of having more accurate estimation with regards to what's expected for a participant in a PDP.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rafik. I don't see any further questions or hands in the air, so I guess we can hand it back of the next section. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. Let's move to the next slide. But before, just as a reminder again, after this portion, we'll have Q&A and that will be facilitated by Pam. Now, we are more in project management aspect

with regards to the PDP, and as objective, we wanted to have improvement to enforce meeting milestone in PDP, trying to mitigate risk and ensure completion [against same] timeline. This is basically [inaudible] goals.

So what we can see here in this slide is the several kind of trying to put the different work product for the management purpose that we are currently using by GNSO council or working group, and they are working hand in hand. So in the first column, one important thing is when the GNSO chartered the working group, so it's the charter, and we are expecting here that the PDP should have a narrow scope and try then, in case when the subject is brought, to break it into more manageable pieces to make the deadline pressure more achievable. And for that, it might require a more regular use of drafting team to prepare a charter for GNSO council consideration.

And yeah, so we try here really to focus on the scope to limit, to kind of fix the issue that we were describing previously. And with that, then we can move to the second column or part here in the slide, which is how the working group managed the project. So when we have those different work products that you can see listed there, and they are primarily managed by staff in consultation with working group leadership and the liaison, and they are intended to document and guide the progress of PDP working group from start to finish, and those work product are public and posted regularly. It's not just for the working group or for GNSO council, but they are also to be consumed by the fully community when they want. So we have, as you can see, timeline, work plan and so on, and we will go in more details in the next slides about this work product.

In the last column, we have a tracking tool for the council usage, and so here, as you can see, is the project list which was enhanced—I mean it enhances the status reporting and provides a snapshot for any activities or PDP in particular about the timeline, so to indicate if there is any slipping in the timeline, and also the overall health and performance of the PDP.

We also have two new tools developed, but here, they are more a continuation of the PDP 3.0 efforts, so another improvement that we had, and those tools are for the council to track larger programs and prioritize action and future work and are here to assist the council to assess bandwidth and resources. So those are the new tools and the program management tool and the action decision. [inaudible] is a result of continuous improvement and we will see later on more details about those work product. Next slide, please.

So here, we are in kind of the practical example of work product. Here we have the project list and action decision radar. I know that it can be a little bit difficult to read them, but what is more important to have in mind, these tools are not just for council but for the whole community, so you can check them anytime and you get an idea what the council is working on or is planning to act in the future.

So for the project list, as you can see, we are splitting things in phases from the planning to issue identification until going all—the usual life cycle of the PDP, and then like council deliberation, board, for the end, implementation. So you can see the whole lifecycle.

But what's more important to highlight here is those columns, the status and health, and kind of the color code used here to give a quick information about the status or the condition of PDP, if it's on schedule, if it's in trouble, at risk, etc., and those kind of color codes are there to help GNSO council to act more quickly and also in terms of the communication about the progress for PDP.

For the ADR, we are organizing the different activities, PDPs [into] programs, and as you can see, we have different time periods [like in planning,] from zero months to one month, one month to three months, and I think the next is three months to six months. So we put here the different actions that need to be decided or taken by GNSO council in terms of urgency and how to determine the urgency and by when we need to launch a new effort. And for that also, we have to have in mind about the bandwidth, resources as factors for decision making.

For example, more concrete, if we take the RDS program, here, you can see [in the first column,] the program, the RDS, but the different part of that program was split here in different phases, for example like about the EPDP phase two or RDS review, or the IRT, etc. And when the council need to take action, we are listing here the proposed action , and we have also linked that to the related pages or information. Next slide, please.

Here we have another work product. This is the project change request, and here, we are aiming to enhance the accountability of PDP working group and oversight by GNSO council. So we don't want PDP working groups to keep falling behind schedule and missing target, and so

entering in what you can see here as yellow, the at risk or in trouble condition. So we don't want, here speaking from GNSO council perspective, to easily permit timeline extension to EPDP without serious consideration.

So for that, the escalation process to assist the PDP working group and council leadership in assessing the health of a project and determine when [disruption] requires council attention. So when milestone delivery dates are expected to change, a PDP working group needs to submit a former written request to the GNSO council to modify any deliverable or baseline delivery date, and most important, to provide the rationale and impact assessment. So that will be considered by the GNSO council for the decision.

The council has the right to reject such project change request, and grant the request with condition and consequences. For example, if revised target date is missed, council can for example terminate the PDP. There are other actions that can be taken by the GNSO council for that.

What you can see here, to prepare the project change request, there is interaction or work collaboration between the working group leadership, staff and the liaison to create this project change request, and we are expecting the working group leadership to provide further explanation and answer questions during a council meeting, and then the GNSO council considers whether to approve the project change request or not. Next slide, please.

This is about the PDP timeline, and what we can see regarding one of the work products is the project change request. It was used by all PDP, and so we have like the SubPro and RPM project change requests that were approved by the council in March 2020, and also, the EPDP submitted a change request twice, once in December and again in June.

Also, this is about the change request, but with regards to the timeline and work product, EPDP used all the project work product and during for phase one and phase two, but in terms of the timeline and with regards to the PDP finishing, we need to also acknowledge that it benefited from additional factors that contributed to help to much faster competition, is a clear charter, [possibly] using the alternative model to have a single neutral chair. Specific budget, I think that was an important thing, and also like face-to-face meetings. So those are kind of the different factors in addition to all the project management work product for the EPDP. Next slide, please.

So we have now the Q&A phase. Thanks.

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, Rafik, for that, walking us through all the various products, tools we have for the council to work closely with working groups, all those project management tools. We have a question in the Q&A pod from Amr. Thank you, Amr. I will read that out, and hopefully Rafik would be able to respond to that. Amr asks, "How would conditions attached to approved project change requests be enforced?" Rafik, would you like to answer that, or Berry? Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry, Pam, can you repeat, please, the question?

PAM LITTLE: How would conditions attached to an approved project change request be enforced? For example, if the council approves a change request but attaches some conditions that the working group must do XYZ as a condition for approving that request. How would those conditions be enforced? I guess that's Amr's question.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Pam, and thanks, Amr, for the question. Well, Keith gave one of the measures that can be taken here. As I tried to explain, when we have a project change request, the GNSO council doesn't accept it as is. We review, we ask many questions, and also depending on what we see as proposed measure or what is suggested to mitigate the risk, we can add other measures, like more regular reporting, like fixing a strict deadline. For example, you can remember for the EPDP when we asked our last change request, it was granted but the extension was only to 31st of July. We could not go beyond that.

So we have this more regular reporting to check the status, adding that strict timeline, and as Keith mentioned in the chat, like that one here in this extreme case is to remove the chair. I can say that GNSO council is not just granting extensions endlessly, but it will be with conditions that need to be met, and if not, those measures will be taken.

PAM LITTLE:

Thanks, Rafik. There's some discussion in the chat. So I guess, yes, removing the working group chairs could be one option, but as some have recognized, that is actually a nuclear option. It's also difficult to find qualified chairs or people who are willing and able to chair working groups. And obviously, the council will strive to work with the working group closely to hopefully help them resolve issues and be able to move forward with the project.

Could I just perhaps ask staff to go back to the slides that show the project list and the ADR? I just want to share with you all about this project list and the action decision radar that was recently developed by staff and, to me, seemed to be very well received by the council.

You can see the project list gives council a view of what we have to do, what we are managing, all these ongoing or soon to be initiated work or efforts or projects. But the council action decision radar, the ADR list, actually translate those items into sort of a timeline and give us a sense of when we have to do those things. And even with an item on top, you can see if you click the link there, that is including things that council didn't even plan.

So for us, in terms of prioritization, it is really important to figure out for and plan work, how we're going to squeeze into already jam packed project list or things we have to do, and then list out those things we have to do in zero to one month and one to three months. That gave councilors really a much better view of what we have to do and when.

So if you are interested, take a look at that and you can see. And [inaudible] also probably go some way to answer some of the questions

the community members might be asking, why isn't council doing this or that. You can see there is already a lot on the council's plate. And for the community as well, we have limited resources, and if we are talking about new projects, new initiatives, we've really got to find out how to really fit that particular project or new work into the pipeline. So that's something. But these tools have been really useful for council to manage the ongoing work, and it's a lot, as you can see.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Pam, can I add?

PAM LITTLE: Sure, go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I just wanted to add, before we move to the next section, even we tried to present the different project management tools and work product, it's not that easy to show them in details just by slides. And I think Berry can share the different links to those work products, and you can see by yourself the level of details and information you can find. And again, they're not just for GNSO council or PDP working group, it's for the whole community.

As Pam mentioned, I think the ADR is one, I think the most important tool. Another one, you cannot see here, the project management tool which goes into details about the different programs. It's kind of like a Gantt chart. So you can see about the different expected timelines for all activities. We're not just talking about PDP. And also, the project list

when you get quick snapshot about the working group, about its situation, condition, health and so on. So I urge everyone to check those tools, and if you have any comment, please feel free to share them. and [inaudible] maybe he can share all the details in the chat. And with that, thanks, everyone, for your attention. Thank you, Pam.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Rafik. Okay, with that, we'll move to the next area that everyone is very interested, I'm sure, about how to build consensus. So, may I introduce Melissa Allgood for ICANN Org? Melissa, over to you. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Hello. I am Melissa Allgood and I am the conflict resolution specialist for Org. I join you today specifically to discuss the consensus playbook. As you all know by this point, the playbook has its origins in this initiative that we're discussing today, but ultimately, it was created as community guidance for developing consensus beyond the GNSO itself. So I'm happy to have this brief discussion today, and I'm also happy to be a resource for this document in the future. Next slide, please.

A brief history of the consensus playbook. January 2019, the GNSO council submitted an additional budget request to Org for the development of the playbook. That ABR was approved in April of 2019, contingent on the playbook applying to a wider community, not just the GNSO.

In December of 2019, CBI, which is the Consensus Building Institute, was selected as the experts to develop the playbook. In early 2020, CBI began conducting interviews throughout the community focusing on understanding people's experiences with consensus, and people who had been in leadership roles, people who had been participants in the process.

They also drew on their experience participating in EPDP phase one, and ultimately, in then spring, CBI consulted with Org staff on the document. We then soft launched it for feedback, collected that feedback, and this summer, the final version of the consensus playbook developed by CBI was published. Next slide, please.

So the result is this. We have 100 pages of consensus guidance available for the community. I would like to point out what it is and what it isn't. So it is a practical toolkit of best practices for building consensus. It includes tools for bridging differences or breaking deadlocks. It is a resource guide that can be used in really two primarily different ways. It can be used start to finish, generally, or it can be used step by step, or as we say, kind of play by play to fit a particular situation or challenge a working group might be facing.

I do think it's important to note what the playbook is not. it is not a change to the definition of consensus, it is not a change to methods of decision making, nor is it a new set of rules or procedures. Next slide, please.

What I thought might beneficial today is to kind of generally talk about the two approaches to the consensus playbook. Obviously, we have a

start to finish model and a play by play model. Utilizing the start to finish model, there's 15 plays that can guide the consensus journey in a strategic and deliberate manner, and this can cultivate a culture of consensus, it can give you points for consideration at every stage of the process.

Now, it's important to bear in mind that not every point for consideration would necessarily be relevant to every community. The playbook really focuses on creating working group expectations, procedures, norms and structure up front to help guide the group as they move through their process, and real benefits of this is you can build trust through this utilization which really helps in building consensus.

So a quick overview of the holistic view to consensus playbook. I would direct you to appendix one which contains the consensus building checklist. And I would argue there are a number of themes throughout the playbook, but I'm going to discuss five today. So the first two themes I think that are heavy throughout the playbook are, again, getting these norms, processes and expectations memorialized up front, and selecting the right facilitator. Both of these themes have been included in Rafik's discussion of the global PDP 3.0 initiative here today.

And in terms of the consensus playbook, these themes are heavily seen in plays one through six. And tangibly, they include ensuring that the problem to be addressed is neither too broad nor too narrow, utilizing the right group structure for the problem at hand, establishing, again, those norms and expectations before you begin your substantive work.

And the playbook recommends considering things like defining what consensus means for that group up front, clarifying the chair or facilitator's process for polling consensus and establishing clear work process agreements. So for instance, in the GNSO context, many of these things I just described might be found in the working group guidelines. That might be the appropriate place to have those decisions land.

A third theme of the playbook is really the nuts and bolts of best meeting practice, and that can be found in plays seven through eight, structuring your meetings in ways that best fit the needs of the problem that you're trying to solve and the structure of the group. A real significant theme throughout the playbook is theme four, and that is around facilitation, naturally. So plays 9 through 12 really discuss this at length. 14 and 15 as well, and also Appendix 2. So these go into more detail on discussions of ways a facilitator can approach the work to help move the group towards consensus, including specific tools for facilitation, like facilitation questions, interventions, as well as ways to anticipate and overcome deadlocks.

The fifth theme is really about creating the workable agreement which I often hear as I observe your community as the "I can live with it" or "I cannot live with it" situation. So play 13 really discusses this with reference back to play three. And there's also some decision support tools around developing those workable "I can live with it" type agreements.

So ultimately, this is a topline summary for the holistic approach to the consensus playbook, it's fair more detailed, and again, every step might not be relevant to every particular group.

Now, the play by play approach is different. It allows communities to address specific challenges that are immediately impacting them or they anticipate will be impacting them in the future. So a real practical example is if you have a community member who is repeatedly interjecting on the same points even though that individual has been recognized, the point has been recognized, it can start to feel like an intentional disruption.

The playbook would encourage leadership to go to play 10, which involves meeting the emotional needs of the participants. It gives tools around active listening and summarizing so that participant understands that they are heard, and then it would encourage leadership to then take the temperature of the working group to see if others align with that point. If they do align, is it appropriate to have that discussion now, or should it be put in the parking lot and then come back to at a future discussion.

So very tangible, straight forward ideas. And this type of thing, while it seems very logical and basic, it really can build trust between the facilitator and the group, because everyone then knows that they're seen and valued and heard.

In the same example, if you have an individual who won't stop interjecting, the playbook could then direct you to play nine which is about facilitating the process. And play nine encourages the facilitator,

the working group chair to really put the needs of the group before the needs of the individual. And it would encourage leadership to intervene to keep the group on course assertively and respectfully, and there's some ideas around that in terms of calling for the discussion to move on or potentially referring the group member who keeps interjecting to the working group guidelines, or whatever's appropriate for your group.

These types of interventions can feel uncomfortable, but the playbook would encourage leadership to utilize those for the benefit of the group as a whole versus the individual. So, very brief top-level overview. I will say that parts of the consensus playbook may feel aspirational, but I do encourage all of you to consider utilizing it for incremental benefits to your consensus process.

That being said, unfortunately, this is not intended to be a complete solution for every challenge that you face in the multi-stakeholder model. It is very complex. I wish I had a magic ticket, but I don't. but I do encourage all of you to see where these tips and tools and concepts really might benefit your community.

So with that, I'm happy to take any questions about the playbook. I do ask that if there are questions more broadly about consensus, that maybe the councilors will jump in on those. But with that, that ends my brief overview. Any questions?

PAM LITTLE:

There is a question from Jeff.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Hi. Hello. This is Jeff Neuman, I'm one of the co-chairs, along with Cheryl, of the Subsequent Procedures PDP. But this comment is just in my personal capacity. I really like the playbook. I think there are some really great tools in there. I think that there are some tools that are not necessarily natural within the ICANN environment. I think they're still good to use, but I think it's a mindset we kind of need to change because the tools are useful.

So one example is that it encourages private conversations between the leadership team and individuals that are having a conflict to see if you can broker some sort of solution away from the larger group so that you can bring that to the larger group ultimately. But that's something that is not really inherent to the ICANN environment [inaudible] group tool.

But the biggest issue—and I've written a couple of articles and submitted the comments, and I haven't really seen these addressed because they are very difficult issues—the consensus playbook nor PDP 3.0 at this point, it doesn't really solve the issue of making sure that everyone that participates has the incentive, the willingness and authority to actually enter into a compromise.

The tools are great, but if someone's unwilling to want to compromise or they feel like they're in a better position by not compromising, then that's what they're going to do, and that's a huge problem in our ICANN environment that we really need to address with PDP 3.0 or 4.0, or whatever you want to call it.

And then the other issue—and we've run across this in SubPro to some extent, I don't think anyone will be surprised by this—is that we don't really address—although we have to clarify before a PDP begins—what happens in the absence of consensus. Right? So we need to determine up front what levels of consensus do we need to have the product go forward. But we also need to make sure that there's a common understanding in the group as to what happens if we're not able to achieve consensus. And that's important, but also dangerous because it ties to the first one, of incentives and willingness to compromise, because if someone likes ...

Let's say the default situation is absence of consensus is just “do it the way we did it before, keep doing it the way we were doing it.” If someone really likes that better than any form of compromise, then they're not going to have that willingness or incentive to compromise. So I think these are fundamental issues that we need to solve as a community. And I think it's the most important issues to solve, because if you don't solve that issue or those issues, then changes to the structure, changes to the project management, changes to the leadership, it's not a recipe for success without solving this last issue. Thanks.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

If I may just address part of that, Jeff, I actually have the opportunity to observe your group, so it's nice to officially meet you. What you were first talking about, those private conversations, we refer to those as caucuses, and those can be a very effective tool of navigating very specific challenges and would be something that I for instance would

encourage groups to establish transparently in the working group governing documents, whether that's appropriate in the charter or your guidelines or whatever happens in your particular community and working group as a way to address the fact that that absolutely feels like a culture shift, and I see that.

Also, to the same point with your absence of consensus, what does that look like, those are things that you can attempt to address on the front end in your documents, in your guidelines for instance, before you start your process. Again, that is not a magic bullet solution, but when I'm talking about potentially utilizing it as a holistic solution and establishing things up front, having those things memorialized really might help down the road as those issues become ripe.

But globally, I do hear you on your incentive to compromise issue, and I do recognize that this has only an incremental benefit to that challenging problem. Does anyone else have any additional feedback on Jeff's points?

TERRI AGNEW:

Jeff, I see your hand is still raised. Did you have a follow up question?

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Okay. Are there any other questions about the playbook? If not, I will yield back to Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Melissa, and thanks for all the work that you put into coordinating with the community and everybody on the guidebook, and for presenting this today. We really appreciate that and look forward to putting it to good use over the coming years.

So I'm going to just make some closing remarks and then we'll go through next steps. I just want to take a moment to sincerely thank all of the councilors and all of the staff that have been engaged in this PDP 3.0 effort over the last several years, and for other parts and members of the community who have contributed to our engagement and who will, I'm sure, continue to bring questions and input and feedback for us.

As I said, this has been a multi-year effort, and I should note Rafik has done a great job in shepherding this process with the council and on the council leadership team. Pam has contributed significantly, and other members of the council over the course of several years have as well. And of course, our ICANN staff colleagues, as always. We wouldn't get any of this done without them, so sincere thanks for all of that.

Let's go to the next steps slide, and then we'll move to wrap up. We're a couple minutes over. The next steps in terms of our PDP 3.0 work, our first step is as we consider new PDP working groups and initiating new work, is to charter those groups using the new charter template that references all of these PDP 3.0 improvements. And as we discussed earlier, it may be that a representative model might work for some in terms of participation and not for others, and it'll be up to the council and the community to review, to assess and to determine what fits right for a particular group on a particular topic.

That'll also include questions of whether we go for a full-blown PDP that requires an issues report, or an EPDP that does not. And these are all really important factors. But I think the really most important point in this step one is to make sure that as we're chartering new policy development work, new PDP working groups, that we are as specific, explicit and focused as we possibly can be as it relates to the actual scoping and the charter itself.

We as a community and as the GNSO council need to do a better job ensuring that these PDP working groups are set up for success from the beginning, and I think that that's what a lot of these PDP 3.0 improvements will deliver.

The second step is to deploy all relevant work topics in newly established PDPs and to develop next generation capacity management tool and invoke certain work products in special circumstances. We have a couple of items where we have not deployed in ongoing PDPs, the criteria for joining of new members after a PDP has begun, review of working group leadership, those are things that we haven't implemented yet but that we need to as we move forward.

The next generation capacity management tool is resource reporting for PDP working groups. It's number 17. This is going to be critical for ensuring that the council and the PDP working groups and working with staff are on the same page as it relates to resource requirements and ensuring that we are allocating the right resources and time, and anticipating the appropriate timelines, and then being able to hold everyone and each other accountable. Those tools are going to be critical in our ability to have that visibility and transparency.

And then invoke certain work products in special circumstances, I think a few examples of this would be criteria to evaluate request for data gathering, being able to provide further guidance around section 3.6 and 3.7 in the working group guidelines as it relates to working group member behavior, and then independent conflict resolution. These are important tools that we need to be prepared to use, and we have some experience with some of these and we'll continue to learn from this.

Step three, we'll eventually need to conduct a review of the PDP 3.0 implementation to determine effectiveness and whether we're actually delivering on the goals that we set out to ensure that our processes become more efficient and effective. And this goes to the point that we previously mentioned, that this is an iterative process, this is not the end goal. This is a tool or a set of tools to help the GNSO community and the broader community continue to evolve and continue to improve.

And then finally, step four is after implementing all of these items, to be able to make necessary updates to the GNSO operating procedures where appropriate. So at the end of the day, this set of tools and guidelines should inform us and be able to highlight and flag where our current operating procedures might be deficient and could benefit from some improvement.

So that's sort of looking ahead, I think for the next council and the next councils, that that's the roadmap ahead for PDP 3.0 and the implementation and review work. So with that, let me ask if there are any final questions, any other comments, questions, feedback, thoughts that anybody would like to share at this point, and if not, we will go

ahead and wrap up the webinar. But let's hold it open for a minute here to see if anybody would like to chime in.

Any final thoughts, please. So I see John McElwaine has his hand up. John, please.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thank you, Keith. Going over that next steps slide, particularly step one, there's a comment that I put into the chat earlier which is I really would encourage folks to take a look at play one of the consensus playbook, and that we consider, as a council, of conducting an assessment and an assessment report as part of that early convening process and chartering process.

I think there's a lot here that really speaks to me about developing a charter and scoping out a working group's plan, shall we say, to help drive to a successful PDP process. So I would just commend that and maybe get some input from Melissa with our next chartering process as to how this play one can be utilized, exactly where does it fit in with our chartering process. That's it. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, John. I think that's a great idea, and as most folks on the phone know, particularly councilors, we do have a number of work tracks and work efforts that will be initiated here over the course of the remainder of this year and going into early 2021, including the phase two RPM work, as you know as the liaison to that group, that there's a new opportunity right around the corner for doing exactly what you

described, I think. But we probably have three or four different items where we could apply that. So, thank you, John.

Any other hands? I thought I saw another hand go up but then it went back down. Okay, well, I don't see any other hands going up or any other comments or questions in chat, so I'd like to thank everybody for joining, and for all the hard work that went into this, thanks to staff. And we look forward to seeing you on an upcoming webinar or council meeting soon. Thanks very much. We'll conclude the meeting now.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. All recordings will be stopped and all remaining lines will be disconnected. Stay well, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]