

18 September 2024 Small Team on Board Readiness Notes

Agenda

- Kurt Pritz shared the [Draft Letter to ICANN Board](#) for discussion
- Discussion around who we would select to be interviewed
- [Draft Survey Questions](#)

Notes

Board Letter

- Note to Tripti to make Board members available to interview as part of this. Likelihood that the Board may not want to participate, so the letter should be crafted with care and all comments are welcome in the google doc
- Question if we are intentionally alluding to anonymity?
- Question: should we make references to the (GPI) work, and ask if we should apply the framework and if they have special tools they apply as the Board? Board's rejection will be based on Global Public Interest framework and ask whether they have special methodology to help reduce the risk of friction
 - GPI is already setting up tests so to speak, are there additional tools by which they apply the GPI? There hasn't been any involvement in the GPIF since it was launched and is it still relevant?
- Necessary to add to the letter that the Board will be able to review results prior to publications
 - Agreement with adding that language, with anonymity, or Board review. Having a Board review would cure the concern perhaps more than a lack of anonymity might.
 - Way to tackle it is not a way to state "anonymity". Instead use language that the small team will aggregate and synthesize which implies this.
- AI: Kurt to send staff updated draft for google doc

Survey

- Took a poll over who we should interview from the registration data PDPs
- Noted that the attendance rate is a bit misleading as Ben, for example came, in late, so a high attendance rate may not reflect the reality of the situation for the working groups
- Discussed as a conversation starter the survey Kurt sent out selecting five individuals on the survey
- The issue with it is that it felt like guessing a bit if you were not familiar with this particular case. Having generally excluded Councilors, is that perhaps a correct thinking? Generally excluded people who have left the community as well?

- Reservations were expressed about the task given that we may not be familiar with the PDP
- Questions with regards to candidates? Whether we do have any eligibility criteria if we inadvertently ask someone who left the sector may skew the results?
- If you don't know some of these names, it is difficult to know who to pick. Without any criteria or context this can be quite challenging. We want this to be fruitful and successful so we will need to refine who we selected
- Phase I and Phase II continuity in the two sets, do we pick people who went through the entire process? Or asking different people in Phase 2? Each has its distinctive benefits and drawbacks
- Proposal that it could perhaps be good to have someone gone from the ICANN community as they might be more “objective”
 - The trouble is it depends on the timing when they left and if they haven't paid attention to what the Board then did with the recommendations they cannot really answer adequately
 - Maybe or maybe not, it depends what interviewee left before the end they shouldn't participate
- Necessity of getting a good spread of stakeholder groups for a more representative sample
- It would be useful to pick someone from this PDP and Susan from SubPro and think you really need some inside knowledge about individuals joining late to give a bit more context than the survey asking the small team to pick five individuals
- Given the participation in this group it would probably be better to suggest some who participated knowledgeably and so on to try to get a selective representative sample
- Thomas and Kurt will be helpful in EPDP I and II and IIa
- For the SubPro PDP Susan, Justine, would be helpful to narrow it down to 3 or 5 individuals to interview out of hundreds
- **AI: Kurt write down some draft eligibility criteria**

Questions

- It would be helpful to try to improve the questions collectively through the google doc.
- What would the role of support staff be in this when it comes to interviews? Consensus reached that it would be better to ask only subject matter expert staff rather than general support staff given that staff can not candidly opine on these issues, but can assist with broad observations only
- Issue: how to fashion a constructive set of questions?
- Third bullet point under the Rejected Policy Questions to PDP Chairs it is perhaps not sufficiently to the point. Did the PDP have all the resources or

expertise to develop the recommendations? Applicant support major issue would have opened the floodgates and bankrupt ICANN, Javier could have enlightened the group, that doesn't mean the WG has to follow this, to build in Board's fiscal responsibility.

- Core question for the survey is to assess if the groups were able to determine the implications of what they were recommending.
 - For example, EPDP team needed to talk to someone about authentication and why it is expensive. Financial info is important

Admin Queries

- Does all this have to go to Council? Set of questions and keep Greg informed and send a note off to him before it is sent to Tripti.
- Council gets an update from this small team, not a vote
- Next week we have an informal meeting with GNSO appointed Board members and this is on the agenda.

Action Items

- Kurt: Draft eligibility criteria for selecting team members to interview
- Staff: Compile and distribute draft letters in a shared google drive [completed]
- All: comment and edit Draft Board Letter and Draft Survey Questions