

Council Workshop | 29 September 2020 | 18 UTC

For detailed notes made by the groups themselves during the workshop, go to:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1QxMv1-ybTXNXAHaLUxOMJxiCIVHIRWJ678OszdJeg/edit#gid=0>

Notes from the break-out rooms:

PART 1

Group 4 (Katrina)

- We need to be able to adapt quickly to changing environments, to avoid being obsolete
- Leverage social media tools
- What if we would have our own legal team, to speed things up?
- Separate the WG work from the icann meetings

Group 2 (Byron)

- To be clarified: rules on GAC input
- If GAC does not provide feedback within a certain deadline, allow us to move forward nonetheless.
- All volunteers should commit to actually do the work

Group 3 (Nick)

- Lightweight process. No long comment periods, ping pong between various constituencies not needed
- What causes delay?
 - o Time limit is always maximum.
 - o Project discipline was lacking. Timelines were not respected
 - o Board agenda is busy, could cause several months of delay
- Do things in parallel. Accept initial report, simultaneously seek public comment and GAC input in parallel
- Requesters should due diligence. What they request should be within scope. Do not add additional delays by issue manager

Group 1 (Stephen)

- Carve-out is complicated
- Only 2 public comments: 1 for initial report, one for policy document
- Concern regarding majority plus 1 vote requirement. Getting the majority vote might be difficult.

PART 2

Group 3 (Biyi) with Demi, Laura

- Main discussion around the structuring. Online or rather at face to face meetings? Get as much time as possible during the icann week sounds ok, but the week in itself

is already very hectic. Increase frequency of meetings, decisions face to face, and most work is done online.

Group 4 (Barrack)

- Collaboration/participation/contribution to documents. How to make non-native speakers eager to participate in face to face meetings? Speaking, or contributing to documents? Some do not feel comfortable with the language
- Use of mind maps can illicit contributions from various people, regardless of their backgrounds
- Adopting the concept developed by GNSO: Consensus playbook. Would work for the ccNSO too.

Group 1 (Pablo) Jordan, Stephen, Ai-Chin

- Try to focus on a shorter period of time. A lot easier to commit, for volunteers.
- Staff support. Concerns regarding what zoom can offer. Flipchart exercises?
- Members to focus more, be more diligent to deliver

Group 2 (Nick) Giovanni, Alejandra

- Risk that if you take shortcuts, you may need to repeat things
- Look for opportunities to work in parallel
- During an icann meeting you can accelerate
- Ccpdp4 is highly technical, expert people, no need for further machinery

Conclusive remarks and summary by Jordan:

- Overall too long
- Some progress improvement
- Flipping: no agreement
- Theme of diversity
- We should run our processes in such a way that you can contribute in various ways: in writing, by attending the meeting etc