**Working Group Team, 28 Feb 2009 Mexico City**

**Brainstorming Comments/Issues:**

1. Tim Ruiz: consider whether we need a minimum knowledge/expertise set for this WG?
2. How does the team determine when consensus has been achieved?
3. Timeline: Work Plan should be first team deliverable. J. Scott suggests that we need by 21 March (15 days after this ICANN event). We will ultimately need to compare PDP and WG Work Plans and reconcile duplicate tasks before submission to PPSC.
4. Target completion of WG draft report should be Sydney meeting (June 2009)? Keep in mind that our process is that drafts are shared with PPSC before the Council.
5. Assignment: using email list between now and 9 March, each team member is asked to Identify interests of the (9) WG Model items on the WIKI.
6. Notes from review of W3C process (speaker):
	1. once approved/decided, they keep documentation closed vs. re-opening;
	2. avoid voting; W3C defines consensus (treat as “art” not science) which means agreement without formal objection (abstentions are OK);
	3. chair selection critical (respected judgment) and must be trusted to make neutral calls, thati is, not appear to have interest;
	4. important to have an accountability framework (oversight) with appeals process (used rarely), but makes it possible to deal with objections;
	5. tiebreaker may be needed in the process;
	6. decide role of staff, e.g. technical? administrative? part of accountability framework?
	7. Summary: mechanics require delicate combination of art and judgment (hard to do well), selecting right people, and interactions with process and influence other groups. Accountability framework is critical to success of W3C process. Size of groups can be a significant challenge to the mechanics. Members are appointed in W3C, but they can bring in other invited experts. All members are identified as to interest. WG deals directly with public comments (taken very seriously) and responds to them which becomes part of the record. Suggestion to GNSO that public comments be received early and not extremely late in the process. W3C Director (Staff) appoints Chair based on understanding of qualifications and neutrality; judgment call; no formal qualifications. Staff provides guidance on tools, processes, etc. They do stimulate a community of chairs to share experiences and learn from each other.
7. Notes from Review of IETF process (speaker):
	1. use “rough consensus” determined by chair (if more than one, jointly);
	2. use informal process for objecting to a rough consensus call (e.g. mailing list);
	3. appeal process is formal; however rarely employed;
	4. consensus “felt” by chair(s) though discussions and then reported via mailing list;
	5. WGs develop cultures and can be quite unique;
	6. important to know when decisions are made and when influence periods are to occur;
	7. agree that it is important NOT to go back and reopen previous closed matters;
	8. checks and balances;
	9. Summary: important to recognize the differences between technical work and policy matters; IETF may be less useful to GNSO for policy-making WGs. Consider WG Chair training (Avri Doria comment). No formal requirements to join or declare interests; however, there are behavioral norms that are enforced (e.g. respect, etc.). Abusive people can and have been banned. Area Director picks Chair; no certification; no tests. Often select a Sr. and a Jr. chair for development purposes. One qualification should be good knowledge of the process so that the WG is not confused.
8. Challenges in thinking about how individual interests are understood and how they might change over time and based upon specific topics (P. Sheppard).
9. Critical challenge: identifying capable Chairs both in terms of leadership and process management skills.
10. Liz asked the speakers to summarize what are some differences between the goals/work of W3C/IETF and ICANN and also cultures?
	1. IETF: language is always a challenge; they adopt norms around speaking slowly, enunciating, explaining unfamiliar terms, etc. – common sense. WG’s mostly comprised of engineers and deal with technical issues. Occasionally, there are conflicting goals and they just work through them, but it is less common due to the type of technical work. Architecture battles are either won/lost.
	2. W3C pretty much same answer.
11. Tim Ruiz offered a potential revision to WIKI WG Model #1 proposed. J. Scott recommended discussion via list before actual modification.
12. Nominations or expressions of interest were solicited for Chair of WG Team? J. Scott Evans was nominated by Avri. Seconded. No objections heard. J. Scott Evans will serve as Working Group Team Chair.