

Summary of RDS PDP Organizational Lessons Learned

PDP Initiation/Prep		
	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
PDP Initiation and Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the board's request, a draft Issue Report was published and Expert Working Group (EWG) was formed quickly to help prepare for this PDP. The EWG produced an in-depth report that reflected significant research and near-consensus among members with diverse perspectives. Bringing together experts who were committed to problem solving and not obligated to represent an SG's position fostered open dialog and compromise until just before the final report was published. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entire initiation and prep phase took roughly 5x as long as anticipated. Top-down PDP initiation and limited-participation closed group likely contributed to controversy at time of EWG report publication and rejection by parts of the community. Top down initiation of the EWG created controversy. Although, the EWG work was important the way the former CEO unilaterally chose to constitute the group without community involvement led to long term distrust of the work. Ultimately, the EWG report informed the process framework but played a very limited role in the PDP WG's deliberation. Causes likely include softening of board's request and strong resistance from a minority of WG members.
PDP Process Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration between GNSO Council and Board on developing an agreed framework for a Board initiated PDP which made expectations and steps clear at the outset Breaking this PDP into smaller focused PDPs was considered but rejected due to extensive dependencies. Instead, the framework clearly identified dependencies between questions to be addressed by this PDP, and recommended a sequence in which questions might be addressed to resolve those dependencies. While it is unclear that this PDP's broad scope worked as intended, planning for inter- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GNSO/Board working group developing the framework was created with representation from each community but not all participate to create a framework that their communities would agree to. As a result: possible lack of ownership / buy-in ownership from the GNSO side for the process framework Lack of engagement from the Board side following the finalization of the process framework which could have created additional incentive / pressure Basing policy on agreed requirements was intended to overcome decade-long impasses. In practice, the same community differences that long prevented policy overhaul also inhibited consensus on requirements. Ultimately, WG members resisted the sequence laid out in the framework. In particular, the WG found it difficult to agree upon requirements without

PDP Initiation/Prep

	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
	<p>dependencies did prove helpful.</p>	<p>delving into detailed policy, and the iterative approach recommended for Phase 1 may have inhibited closure and fostered repeated revisiting of debates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EWG Final Report was expected to serve as a basis, but many in the WG did not seem to want to accept that principle (although in many cases, and after lengthy deliberations, the WG would often come to the same conclusions or agree upon the same approach)
PDP Issue Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Issue Report provided an organized, comprehensive catalog of relevant inputs to inform the EWG's efforts. The second Issue Report provided similar guidance for the PDP WG - essential for an issue with over a decade of history. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Issue Report had to be entirely redrafted 2.5 years later, following completion of EWG report and process framework. Community feedback on the second Issue Report was largely deferred for consideration by the WG itself. Possibly some comments would have been more effectively resolved earlier?
PDP Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including a charter in the Issue Report likely saved time, as some WG members resisted aspects of the charter right from the start, suggesting that achieving WG agreement on a charter would have been quite lengthy and difficult. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The charter limited the extent to which we were able to separate into subgroups - although subgroups may have been helpful. The charter discouraged subgroups in Phase 1 to help the community "get on the same page" by understanding each other's requirements. However, this goal was not achieved. Lack of inclusion of deadlines and/or expected delivery dates for milestones, which if included might have incentivized progress. Arguing about which charter question(s) to address first got the WG off to a rocky start. The WG then decided to focus on a subset of charter questions in hopes of making progress on the "easy parts" - only to find that difficult as well. In hindsight, working through the charter questions more methodically might have reduced "churn." To this end, a

PDP Initiation/Prep		
	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
		<p>sequence of tightly-focused PDPs, with fewer milestones of shorter duration, might have been more achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Community appears to have problems working together in most existing PDP's. The RDS WG may have seen the most extreme problems but this is a universal problem in creating policies.

Leadership		
	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
Composition of Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having vice-chairs from the different groups definitely worked Having a chair and vice-chairs as it makes clear who at the end has the authority to sign off on documents / messages, etc. (even though at all times the full leadership would be involved and consulted) The leadership team had a shared goal of reaching consensus. This fostered creativity and compromise to overcome roadblocks. Agree the leadership team composed of each of the SG's from the GNSO was helpful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duration of the WG has meant that it has not always been easy for all members of the leadership team to continue with the same level of engagement / commitment. Choosing vice-chairs from each SG created the impression that SGs are responsible for appointing chairs, when the WG was responsible for selection of its own leadership team. In hindsight, it may have helped to share chairing responsibilities more. Chuck did such a good job that the consistency of Chair appeared to move things along but we may have placed a larger burden on Chuck than necessary.
Weekly Prep Calls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having the leadership meet / communicate regularly worked well Weekly leadership team meetings in advance of WG meetings worked well A dedicated leadership mailing list results in frequent, effective communication within the leadership team. 	

Leadership

	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We did not routinely react in a coordinated manner to mailing list 'abuse'. Maybe some kind of rotation could have been established during which the leadership team would be responsible for monitoring the mailing list and responding in a timely manner if/when things would go off track? • Progress may have been hampered by differing viewpoints on when a community was intentionally blocking opposed to discussing the issues.

Working Group

	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
Polling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The polls to reach tentative agreements helped us move on without requiring formal consensus decisions at the given point in time • Polls allowed those not present on a given call an opportunity to voice their opinions, which in theory should have led to more continuity in deliberation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Polls a bit of a double-edged sword - while they enabled us to move on without formal consensus, they've left us in a position with little formal consensus to report. • Having members who did not participate in polls but then opined during WG meetings and questioned the outcome of polls meant polling had to be repeated, resulting in further delays. • Too often, we focused on poll responses from a minority with objections rather than embracing points of agreement and moving on. Repeated polling on minor variations of the same agreement tended to weaken support and reduce poll benefits. • Some members found the polls frustrating and often didn't respond to them because they were unsure what was being asked and what their response would mean.

Working Group

	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subgroup mailing lists were more effective than the full WG mailing list. Contributing factors may have been the smaller group size, proactive moderation, the focused assignment, and/or tight due dates. While subgroup list participation varied, subgroup lists were rarely plagued by off-topic threads or inappropriate behavior. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a lack of Adherence to the ICANN standards of behavior. Disruptive WG members should have been dealt with better. This isn't unique to this PDP and was discussed during the GNSO Council retreat. Without a moderator, it is difficult to shut down mailing list discussions that are off topic and on the edge of what is and what isn't acceptable. Topics discussed on-list were often disjoint from topics discussed during calls. The sheer volume of messages made the list difficult to keep up with. Some members participated only (or primarily) on the mailing list with (presumably) the goal of being disruptive. Agreements on calls didn't always carry over to the mailing list. The PDP was never able to leverage the mailing list for effective deliberation and decision making forcing those tasks to be done on the calls only. This slowed progress.
Calls		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive amount of chat during WG calls, often on multiple subjects was distracting and interrupted progress Difficulty in closing of topics resulting in revisiting issues because members did not prepare accordingly and/or review previous meetings. Calls held at an alternative time once a month were often attended by different WG members, triggering changes in direction that were then not embraced by others the following week.
Subgroups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of subgroups sometimes helped make progress. Subgroups that included diverse participants, were given focused assignments, had proactive moderation, and were strongly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subgroups that were more homogenous sometimes produced outputs the rest of the WG did not embrace Subgroups without moderation or due dates tended to never deliver anything

Working Group

	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
	<p>encouraged to adhere to due dates produced the most output.</p>	
Composition of Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A core subset of WG members reliably participated in calls and polls - these committed members were instrumental in crafting most of the agreements reached by this PDP. • As one of the first tasks the working group looked at composition to ensure there weren't any under-represented groups - there was a broad range of representation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the Working Group presented many challenges • Overall lack of interest in changing from the status quo • There was a lack of commitment to work toward consensus • There was a lack of knowledge or respect for ICANN (and other IG) processes (a lot of the anti-abuse people had zero experience with ICANN) • There was a lack of knowledge of previous efforts / history etc. • It's not just that people had a lack of knowledge about previous efforts/history, it is also that that knowledge was quite challenging to acquire. • All of the above plus, large number of individual participants without any clear accountability / representation as well as limited experience in the topic and ICANN policy development meant that a lot of time was spent on either educating or positions / opinions that were only supported by one individual. • The large number of participants made consensus-making nearly impossible. • Representation from each community is critical and responsibility for reporting back to community with agreed upon positions would have been helpful. Definitely saw disagreements between individuals of the same communities.
Other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We spent months cataloging possible requirements and a purpose statement for the RDS, only to set them aside. We often spent a long time forging a set of agreements,

Working Group		
	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
		<p>then switched gears and never returned to build on them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should have been more willing to “record” areas where consensus was not reached and what the issues preventing consensus were. • We sought guidance from data protection experts and independent legal analysis, but those did little to overcome WG points of disagreement. Waiting to seek legal analysis on concrete recommendations might have been more effective. • Members didn't always adhere to the Expected Standards of Behavior - this should have been emphasized more. • The WG agreed to guidelines for email list use but the leadership did little to discourage non-compliance.

Community Engagement		
	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
Early Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive prep period provided at least 4 formal opportunities for community input in advance of this PDP (i.e., two public comment cycles on draft EWG reports, public comment on the process framework, public comment on the second Issue Report.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the time the PDP reached the actual Early Engagement step defined in the PDP process, there was little more left to say - and thus little additional input was received at the time of WG launch. • Controversy over the way the EWG was created and disdain for the output led to lack of engagement.
Cross-Community Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging teams of WG members to present the WG's rough agreements seemed to work well, as did asking concrete questions of the community to solicit input. 	

Community Engagement

	What worked as intended?	What didn't?
On-Going Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vice-chairs regularly relayed progress reports to their own SGs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some received little input from their own constituency until the GDPR brought the issues to everyone's attention.