WRT Guidelines

**Core values**

Transparency

Neutrality

Consensus building

The purpose of a Chair is the following:

1. call meetings
2. preside over group deliberations
3. manage the process so that all participants have the opportunity to contribute
4. Compile reports on the results of the team

Chair's key functions are:

1. To ensure an attendance list is made
2. to be responsible for fulfilling the terms of reference in the time specified,
3. to be responsible for working group discipline, focus and achievements,
4. to prepare and chair face-to-face and on-line sessions,
5. to ensure that the Group operates in an open and fair manner,
6. to ensure that discussions are relevant (the Chair should propose a set of topics for e-mail subject headers),
7. to intervene to stop off-topic communication,
8. to summarize outcomes of each issue and
9. to achieve interim and final objectives in conformance with the terms of reference.

The Chair – and any Vice-Chair(s) – must play a neutral role by refraining from pushing a specific agenda, ensuring fair treatment for all legitimate views and guaranteeing objectivity in identifying areas of agreement.

Elections

The WRT Chair will be elected by the members of the WRT by simple majority vote/ or should we hold to a specific percentage 60% or 66% for example.

Quorum - A majority of the total number of WRt members constitutes a quorum. Proxy votes shall not count toward the presence of a quorum.

Need to define

Majority -

Proxies (temporary)

Alternate representation ( in cases where someone is not able to continue on the team)

Transparency -

Neutrality – supports an equal and fair consideration of all sides of the argument

Consensus Building

Adhere to Roberts rules

**Voting**  
From time to time progress will be advanced by holding straw polls to determine the majority view. A motion to approve a draft proposal or report (or any section thereof) may be made by any member of the Working Group. Once seconded and approved by the Chair, such motion shall be put to a vote of the Group members. In such an event, the Chair shall poll the Group members. Motions that receive a majority of votes cast shall be deemed approved.

**Consensus**  
Because of the diverse nature of the group the results of any vote will be taken solely to assist with progress within the group.

• Unanimous consensus position   
• Rough consensus position where no more than 1/3 disagrees and at least 2/3 agree  
• Strong support (at least a simple majority), but significant opposition (more than 1/3)  
• No majority position

**Speaking at meetings**  
Both at physical and telephone meetings the Chair will recognise three types of intervention in the following order of priority:

1. A point of order
2. A point of information
3. A normal substantive intervention

At a physical meeting, an member may raise a hand and wait to be recognized by the Chair and during a teleconference an NC member may speak in an appropriate gap and say immediately "their name to speak". This will be noted by the Chair who will invite the intervention in due course.

To ensure balance, the Chair has the discretion to delay an intervention by a frequent speaker to allow others to speak. By way of guidance for the Chair, a member is not expected to speak for more than three minutes at a time and the Chair should solicit the views of other members before returning to the same speaker on any one issue. Such discretion should not be exercised for a "point of information".

A point of information is for members seeking information from the Chair or other members about meaning or procedure - it is specifically not intended to provide information

Many conflicts can be resolved by simple votes. The majority view goes forward and is documented in an interim report. However, where there is a significant minority proposal, this proposal should also be documented in the interim report of the Working Group. The interim report should contain:

1. an abstract of all proposals which achieved a meaningful level of support,
2. a clear statement of what is being proposed and its underlying rationale,

Support Staff - Support personnel are non-voting members, but included in all teleconferences and face-to-face meetings, and on the mailing list.

. Meetings and conference calls

a) Frequency (weekly, **fortnightly**?)

b) Call length (60 or **90 minutes**?)

c) Call days and times (fixed days/times, **rotating schedule**, Doodle polls?)

d) **Open** to public or not? If normally open, Chatham House Rules **applicable** if requested?

2. Documentation

a) Call documentation (notes, recordings, transcripts, Adobe chat) posted - **open** to public or not?

b) Mailing list archive **open** to public or not?

c) Other documents (input information, draft reports etc) **open** to public or not?

3. Public input

a) **Permanent** forum open for public comments by email?

**Drafting** **working group**

The author(s) of the working group report will play a crucial role in building consensus, and should be distinct from the Chair. The drafting group should ideally comprise a variety of voices, to help ensure that the outcome is constructive and broadly supported.

**Draft final report**  
The goal of the Group process is to produce a Report containing recommendations for submission to ICANN.

The Report should contain the following sections:

1. Executive summary
2. Terms of reference,
3. Conclusion - a clear and concise statement of the proposal discussed in the Working Group and the conclusion reached,
4. Impact analysis - a full analysis of who might be impacted, including other supporting organisations, and in what ways, by such a policy,
5. Record of outreach - a record of outreach to any segment of the Internet community that might be affected by the proposed policy,
6. Minority reports - a fair statement of points in opposition and a substantive analysis of their merits and the intensity of the opposition,
7. Supporting arguments - a summary of the best arguments for adoption of the policy and

On the other hand, dissenters should not be able to stop a group's work simply by saying that they cannot live with a decision. Instead, they should propose an alternative that would be acceptable to them and could also meet the needs of other members of the working group. When the Chair believes that the working group has duly considered the legitimate concerns of dissenters as far as reasonably possible, the group can decide to record the alternate view(s) and move on to other issues.

Conflict of Interest policy – ICANN’s or draft our own

**Scope of WRT**

To assess the extent to which existing WHOIS policy and its implementation:

\* is effective,

\* meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, and

\* promotes consumer trust.

This assessment will include an analysis and determination of ICANN's performance against the AOC requirement that ICANN implement measures to maintain timely, unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete WHOIS information, including registrant, technical, billing, and administrative contact information.

**Draft final report**  
The goal of the Group process is to produce a Report containing recommendations for submission to ICANN.

The Report should contain the following sections:

1. Executive summary
2. Terms of reference,
3. Conclusion - a clear and concise statement of the proposal discussed in the Working Group and the conclusion reached,
4. Impact analysis - a full analysis of who might be impacted, including other supporting organisations, and in what ways, by such a policy,
5. Record of outreach - a record of outreach to any segment of the Internet community that might be affected by the proposed policy,
6. Minority reports - a fair statement of points in opposition and a substantive analysis of their merits and the intensity of the opposition,
7. Supporting arguments - a summary of the best arguments for adoption of the policy and