
ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 08 June 2022 at 12:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/ERR1Cw>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday, 8th June 2022 at 12:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please let yourselves be known now? And I will actually momentarily be dialing out to [Juan.]

We do have apologies from Philippe Fouquart.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to say your name before speaking.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you. And over to our chair, Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Devan. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Thank you for joining with us. And let's remember the work that we have been doing. Can we check the work plan status and see all the greens we have? A lot of greens completed, we're doing a good job.

And we still have things to review. So we will continue with—let me check the agenda. And I remind you about. Remember, please, the status designations about complete, partially complete, action decision required, not applicable for action, implementation plan, implementation ongoing and won't be implemented are the different status designations.

And so we have done quite a good job until the moment, so we have to continue with the review of recommendation number six, supporting organizations by subcommittee accountability and then [inaudible] document that will be shared in the screen and I will give the floor to Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much, Olga. So please give me one moment to pull up the document. I also put the link in the chats so folks can review this on your screen. So recommendations six. So I will just read the beginning paragraph that provides the kind of overview what this recommendation is about. Each SO/AC group should implement these good practices to the extent is practices are applicable and an improvement over present practices. It is not recommended that implementation of these practices be required. Nor is it recommended that any changes be made to the ICANN bylaws. It should be noted that the operational standards for periodic organizational reviews conducted by ICANN could include an assessment of good practices implementation in the AC or SO subject to the review.

So this recommendation is basically about best practices related to the accountability, transparency, participation, outreach and updates to policies and procedures in each ICANN community group. And as the introduction paragraph noted, this is not a mandatory recommendation. So it's not a big deal if GNSO Council deems that a recommendation, even if it's applicable, it doesn't wish to implement it because it's really just about best practice to enhance the accountability of each group.

So just to give you kind of a quick glimpse of the staff assessment, when we go through each of these individual recommendations, we believe the vast majority of them have already been implemented by the GNSO Council just based on our current practice and rules, guidelines noted in the operating procedure. So we've already done most of it. And then the rest of it is mostly not applicable to the GNSO Council, with the exception of one

recommendation that we believe might be applicable to the Council, but it's up to the Council to decide whether you want to implement it or not. Because it's not a mandatory requirement.

So that's a quick overview of this recommendation. And I will go through the detail one by one so we can do a more detailed review of each of them. And then we'll also provide the rationale for our assessment.

So let's take a look at the first group, it's 6.1. These are all the recommendations related to accountability. The first one says 6.1.1, SO AC groups should document their decision making methods, indicating any presiding officers, decision making bodies, and whether decisions are binding or nonbinding. So the staff assessment is that the Council has already completed this, because in the GNSO operating procedure, chapter 4.0, voting, the section, it has documented the decision making method, and I'm just going to quickly click on the link here. This is Chapter 4.0, about voting by the Council. So you can see there's a quorum, voting thresholds, requirements, details regarding the motions, and also absentee voting. So I'm not going to go through every single section of this chapter, but as you can see, the Council's methodology for decision making is very thoroughly documented in the operating procedure. So we believe this recommendation has already been completed. I will stop here. That's the first one.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. Comments, questions, reactions? I have a question, but it's not about our issue. When was this GNSO operating procedures chapter voting established? Just [inaudible]. Do we know?

ARIEL LIANG: Maybe I will defer to Marika or [inaudible], they're the expert.

OLGA CAVALLI: Just on anecdote question.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, I would need to take a guess. But I think that all comes out of the 2004 review, I would say. Maybe there are some minor changes that have been made. But at least I think that the kind of consensus designation I recall discussing some of that, as well, as part of all the review work that went on, I think, coming out of the 2004 review, which basically got implemented, I think around 2008, but of course, operating procedures have gone through a number of updates and changes. So some things may have changed here. We don't maybe have the exact date at hand. But I think this is already kind of a long-standing section that is in operating procedures.

OLGA CAVALLI: So exactly. That's my question. If it's long-standing document, we all know that it's well known by GNSO. Any comments, reactions Marika, Julie says Marika is correct, long-standing section, well documented. So everyone is aware of this document. This was my question. Any comments, reactions? Agreements with the suggested assessment from staff. Are we okay with it? Manju says agree. Thomas agrees. Thank you, Thomas. Wisdom, very satisfied with the document. Thank you, Wisdom. Plus one from

Sebastien. Flip, plus one, also agreed. Desiree. I think we have agreement. Unless I haven't seen all the comments. Okay, thank you very much, Ariel. And this, we can mark this as complete. Thank you very much.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, everybody, for the inputs. We'll move on to 6.1.2. It says SO/AC groups should document their procedures for members to challenge the process used for an election or formal decision. So staff assessment for this recommendation is it's not applicable for action. Because the challenge process for election or formal decision is not envisioned in the GNSO Council operating procedure. And the Council already has a very detailed method for voting as you have seen in the operating procedure. So it has a designated process and timeline to consider a decision or conduct an election.

And in particular, we want to note that usually for a voat, it has included a very reasonable timeframe for the Council to consider the matter, and then provide input prior to the vote. And there's also an existing mechanism for Councilors to amend a motion or defer a motion. So because of these existing mechanisms, it's not envisioned that decision, once it's made, it can be challenged or appealed. It's final. So that's why we believe this recommendation is not applicable for action due to the existing mechanisms and methodologies documented in the operating procedure for GNSO Council decision making. So this is our assessment for 6.1.2. And happy to hear others' comments and input on this.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Ariel. Reactions, comments, agreements with the assessment made by staff? Thomas agrees. Antonia agrees, [inaudible] I think this is looking good. Plus or from Flip. Wisdom agrees. Manju agrees. And plus one, agree from Sebastien. Antonia agrees. Thank you. And let's move on. Thank you very much.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, everybody, for the comments. So we're moving on swimmingly. And also, I will put the recommendation number in the chat so we know what folks are commenting about. So now we're moving on to a 6.1.3.

So what it says is SO/AC groups should document their procedures for nonmembers to challenge decisions regarding their eligibility to become a member. So what it implies is for non-Councilor to challenge a decision regarding their eligibility to become a Councilor. So if you read it that way, it sounds pretty odd in the Council context. And indeed based on staff assessment, it's not a applicable recommendation for the Council, because the Council is a representative body comprised of members appointed by stakeholder groups, constituencies, as well as appointees from the Nominating Committee. So if any challenge pertaining to the membership eligibility arises, it should be addressed in the SG/C and NomCom level, not at the Council level, because the Council is just a representative body. So that's why we assessed that 6.1.3 is not applicable for action. Happy to hear others' input on this.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. So for 6.1.3, any comments, reactions, agreements with the assessment about being not applicable for action? Agrees, Flip, Desiree says not applicable. Thank you. Manju agrees. Plus one from Sebastien. Wisdom agrees. Thank you, Thomas. Okay, I think we heard from everyone. Thank you. Thank you very much everyone. Ariel, floor is yours so we can continue.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay, sounds good. So moving on, we're heading to one 6.1.4. This recommendation writes SO/AC groups should document unwritten procedures and customs that have been developed during the course of practice and make them part of their procedural operation documents, charters and or bylaws.

So for this recommendation, we also believe it is completed, because the Council is known for having extensive procedures in various areas of work and this is reflected in the Council operating procedure. And then the operating procedure also has annexes. For example, there's one about working group guidelines and then there are other procedures and processes documented on the public facing website for the GNSO Council. So we already have a lot of procedure for many areas of work.

And in addition, this group is set up because its purpose is to allow for continuous scoping, execution of projects that are focused on the GNSO structure, procedure and process improvement. And for example, if any additional unwritten procedures and custom that arises and need to be memorialized, this can be addressed by a CCOICI in the future.

So because the Council already has the mechanism in place to document unwritten procedure, and then this mechanism is basically the CCOICI and this framework of continuous improvement, that's why we believe this recommendation has been completed and no further action is needed beyond what the mechanism was already put in place. So yeah, that's our assessment and happy to hear others comment on this.

OLGA CAVALLI:

So about 6.1.4, Desiree agrees. Let's see whether other colleagues agree. Flip agrees. Thomas agrees. Wisdom agrees. And Sebastien agrees. Plus one from Antonia. Thank you. Thank you very much, everyone. So let's move on to 6.1.5.

ARIEL LIANG:

Sounds good. Thanks, everybody. And so this recommendation is the only one we believe that action decision may be required. So I'll provide some detail about this one. So the recommendation reads each year SO/AC groups should publish a brief report on what they have done during the prior year to improve accountability, transparency and participation, describe where they might have fallen short and any plans for future improvements.

So in other words, this recommendation is about a specific report on accountability, transparency and participation. And as we know, the Council does not currently have a dedicated report on this subject matter. But staff also note that the Council has already published a variety of materials such as the report stemming from

the strategic planning session and to assess the Council's effectiveness as a policy development process manager. So that can be related to accountability, transparency, participation in working groups, for example.

And then there's also other materials such as the candidate statement from the GNSO chair during elections. So the chair will provide some assessment on that, we believe, to touch on that topic in their candidate statement. And then we also have other materials like the policy update webinar, just for the GNSO Council and the policy briefing document that provides supplementary information PDPs participation level, the progresses it has made, the challenges it's facing. And so all this information should help hold the Council accountable for its manager role as for the PDPs.

So we note there are existing materials that may have touch on the subject matter, it's just not in the form of a dedicated report. But because the dedicated report does not exist, and if the Council wish to consider to develop that in order to satisfy this recommendation, then it probably should have a dedicated report just for this on the subject. And it can be a report that's published on an annual basis. But at the same time, we want to note that this recommendation is not mandatory. So it just serves as a best practice. And if the Council doesn't believe it's necessary because we already have other mechanisms in place to hold the Council accountable and report on that to the ICANN community, then we can possibly do away with the report too. So I will stop here and see whether there's any comments, feedback, questions about this recommendation.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. I think GNSO does document many, many things. I was not aware that we didn't have a kind of annual report that gathers all together. Perhaps it could be a good idea. I [don't] think it could be a lot of work just putting together different pieces of text and in certain order. And but it's not mandatory. So I will hear what our colleagues think about this. Comments, reactions? Should we have that report? Should we live with what we have and just as it is not mandatory, so we can just avoid this?

Marika says there is an annual report that ICANN Org produces that also reports on GNSO activities but not specifically covering accountability, transparency and participation. Okay, thanks, Marika for that. Should we live with what we have and not going towards annual report from the GNSO? Thomas, the floor is yours.

THOMAS RICKERT: Hi, everybody. I'm inclined to follow the staff suggestion. However, I'd be interested in learning what the next inflection point at which an annual report could be called for would be, because I think that it's important to evidence accountability and transparency and all that. So maybe we can reserve that for later. But I'm not sure what the options are.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Thomas. Manju says kind of nonchalant on this one. I don't know the word nonchalant. Happy either way, do it or not.

Just a bit worried about the workload, no matter if it all fall on staff or us. Thank you very much, Manju. And I have Marika next.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks. To Thomas's point, of course, at any point in time, if the Council believes it needs to do more reporting or if that's a request from stakeholder groups or constituencies, I don't think there needs to be kind of a set point at which that happens. Anyone can kind of bring that to the table and put that forward as a suggestion. But having said that, I think as you're all aware, there is already a lot of reporting that happens on the GNSO side, in addition to some of the things that are listed here, there's of course, as well, your project management tools that the Council has and that are, for example, the project packages for each initiative that are shared on a monthly basis that also report on participation and attendance.

And those records are also of course publicly available for each report. From a transparency perspective, I think everything is publicly available. So I don't think there's anything that is kind of not publicly shared. And so I'm kind of assuming that this is something, this report, which was seen in—maybe for those parts of ICANN where maybe that is less of a tradition or where there is a need to kind of change those practices and procedures. But at least I think on the work that the GNSO does, all of that is already happening and may be less relevant to kind of report on changes to that as it seems that it's already at a very high level.

And of course, if there is a need to kind of bundle that up, that is something that could be done. I think, as some pointed out in the

chat, that of course does require additional resources. And I think that the group would then really need to think about what purpose would that serve? Who would be the audience for that? And what would it document that is not already available?

And I had also a question, I think for Ariel, so if the group should decide that all the information that is published is already sufficient and there may not be a need to create another separate report, what would then be the appropriate label to just take on this? Would that be not applicable? Or would that be considered already implemented, as it's believed that that information is already publicly available in a separate report and it's not necessary to kind of demonstrate the accountability, transparency and participation levels?

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. Thomas next.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yeah, sorry for putting myself in the queue again. Wouldn't it be a way forward to ask for language on ICANN's website or in the annual report pointing at web information on accountability, transparency and participation can be found? Some boilerplate language so that those who are interested in those topics, if they go to the accountability section on ICANN website already, and maybe I should know whether the information there is sufficient, but maybe we could just say for those interested in ICANN's reporting on accountability, transparency and participation, please go to those resources, linking to them, as they speak to exactly

these points. I'm making this up on the fly now, but I hope that you can understand the idea.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Thomas. I think it is a very good idea. And also Sebastien agrees with you. He says he wanted to suggest the same. Sometimes the information is, but it's not easy to find. So a clear point where people can find it could be very useful. Marika, your hand is up next.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks. And I'm probably looking at both you and Ariel, who are I think more familiar with the work that the coordination group is doing, because as far as I understand, I think the coordination group will also look at this specific recommendation more from a kind of overarching perspective. So it seems that if there is indeed a desire that this is done at an ICANN Org level or indeed further linkages provided there, it seems that that may belong in the conversation with the coordination group, because of course, this group is purely focusing on the Council's perspective and applicability of these recommendations to the Council's work, but I think the Coordination Group is more specific in looking at kind of the overall picture and whether there are kind of joint ways in which these recommendations need to be or can be implemented.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Any other comments, other reactions? I see none. So, the suggestion made by Thomas could be feasible. Could we consider that as an option? Ariel, your hand is up.

ARIEL LIANG:

I want to provide some information about what the coordination group has been considering in terms of implementing this in a consistent manner across SOs and ACs. So, this is a template they plan to develop on the community wiki page. So, basically, it will just be like page and it has three sections, one is accountability, then second, transparency, third, participation, and then it will have like two boxes under each section. One is report on prior year, then that's one box. The second box is future plans, that's a second box under each of the sections. So this format will repeat for all these three categories of things.

And what they envision is the wiki space was set up and each community group, if they decide to report on this, they can go to the page and write down the content directly on the wiki. So everything will be in one place. But this template is pretty barebones. It's pretty simple. And then it's up to the group to decide what content to populate on that wiki. So that's what the coordination group is envisioning.

I'm sorry, I really shouldn't say it's the coordination group. It's more like the coordination group within ICANN policy staff that support each group. So this isn't like a staff suggestion. It hasn't been brought up to the CCG yet, because it's not one of the recommendations or kind of tasks the CCG should tackle, it's something to be worked out among each individual community group. But that's a staff suggestion how it can be implemented. So it's rather simple.

And another idea I just thought about is because the Council already has a lot of existing materials, so maybe we could just put the links in that wiki page, under each segment, and then say look at this report from the strategic planning session, for example, to check on the reporting on accountability for the prior year, and then look at this section in the report for future plans. If we already have these information, then we can just link to it on that wiki page. So it's possibly a simple way to fulfill this recommendation. But at the same time, I know that somebody has to take responsibility of doing this. And it will require some work even if it's just repurposing materials or linking to materials. So yeah, I just wanted to provide some information on the staff suggestion how to implement this.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Ariel. I see comments in the chat. Thomas, I think we need to be clear also saying that the information on the [inaudible] SOs and ACs can be found. Marika, I think that option would need to be passed to the coordination group. And it looks that they're already working on it. And Thomas says strong recommendation to the groups should be made that they actually publish information on a regular basis when we worked in this in the CCWG, when the group members at the time actually saw the need for more information to be published about the different SOs and ACs and agrees that should be passed on. Okay, I think that these links here can be useful. I cannot evaluate if it's a big workload and who should be responsible for that. Any other comments, reactions? Also, we can live with what we have now. So this is not mandatory. So for the moment, let's have this in

mind and move on. Maybe we can park this one and see and think about what we should do. Because it's not mandatory, at least we already have a lot of information. And we can check later if we need the links or not. Any comments to that suggestion? If someone strongly disagrees, please let me know. I see no reaction. So thank you for that. Okay. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Olga. And also, Thomas for the comments and suggestions. And now we're just wondering from staff side, would you like us to do some fact finding and then see whether we can find the existing language about accountability, transparency, participation on ICANN org website and then see whether there's any linkage we can make in order to help complete this recommendation? Is that the expected action item for staff to do? I'm happy to be corrected. I think Marika's writing's in the chest to me.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, I can speak to that. Because what I understood from Thomas's suggestion is that there should be on ICANN org website, link that kind of provides information about where general information about accountability, transparency and participation can be found. I don't think that he was talking—and Thomas, please correct me if I'm wrong, he was specifically talking about the Council's information on those items. But that would be more kind of a general, this is where people can go. And as you indicated, I think that the template that's being developed—Thomas gave a thumbs up. So I did understand that correctly. So I

think the template that's being developed seems to be a tool to allow for that. And once that has been filled out, I think it's just a question and I think that probably belongs more in the coordination group to kind of indicate to ICANN org that they would like to see that somewhere prominently linked to from the ICANN Org website for those people that are interested to know more about these issues.

So from what I understood, I don't think there's a specific action here for staff, I think there's still the open question is, what will be the appropriate label for this recommendation. If the group agrees that there is no need for a separate report, but we're able to kind of provide links as part of that template, is that sufficient to call it a report? And in that way, can we mark this as completed as information is available, and once that template is available, that the Council can provide the links or staff can help with linking to, for example, the project packages, and where people can find transcripts and recordings, that kind of demonstrate the transparency? So does that make sense? And to mark this as complete, but note that work is ongoing in this CCG that that will allow for kind of further promotion or publication of that. So I don't know, Ariel, I know you're more familiar with the kind of status designations. Does that make sense? Or should this be a not applicable as we're not suggesting here, it seems, to publish a dedicated report but we do believe that kind of the essence of what is being suggested here is already being met through all the information that is already publicly available from Council's perspective?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Marika. I believe we could mark this as completed because the Council did already have a lot of materials related to accountability, transparency, participation, it's just not in the form of a report. But once this template is up and running on the wiki page, and possibly we can ask whether we can link this wiki page to ICANN org website for more prominence, then we could just simply include GNSO Council's existing materials in that wiki and without writing new content, because all the things are in the existing reports already. So perhaps we can just mark it as completed and then note, I guess, pending the final launch of that template, and then the wiki space so that we can include the relevant materials from the Council in there to fulfill this recommendation. I see also Berry has his hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ariel. Berry, you're next.

BERRY COBB: Thank you. Just thinking about this, I tend to agree that this is the right approach for now, at least just trying to get an inventory of the things that might go into such a report. And the reason I say this is, instead of actually trying to create an annual report now, is when we think about from the results of ATRT3, and at some point and parallel to the holistic review, the pilot of the holistic review, and kind of assuming what comes out of that is that this notion of continuous improvement is pushed out to the SOs and ACs instead of organizational reviews and those kinds of things, one requirement for that would be that there is also an annual report created by each SO and AC that would highlight the things that

were improved or worked on in the prior year in the context of continuous improvement. And most of the items you have listed here are the very types of materials that would also go into that, in addition to just a higher level of accountability and transparency stuff. So just kind of, in summary, the inventory of all of this is a good start, let's not necessarily try to go and complete an annual final report just in this context, but keep it as a parking lot item for when this bigger action comes the GNSO's way, and maybe we kind of merge them together. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, berry, for the suggestion. Any other comments, reactions, agreements? So my summary for the moment is that if we can have these links included in this Wiki, that will be the next step. Or staff should check about how much time do you need for that. And we can just say that with all the information provided and produced by GNSO, this is already completed. Berry or Marika, are we going to do the link thing, or we just consider this as completed? I'm a bit lost at the moment.

ARIEL LIANG:

Let me see whether there's any other status that might be applicable to it. So maybe we could also use this kind of status to indicate the current status as partially complete. Because we already have these existing materials in the Council that could potentially populate the content of that report. But it's not done yet because we haven't seen the wiki page being set up and the template is up and running. And there may be some further instructions to help the group populate the content in that report.

So once we've seen that, then we could try to link to the existing materials to Council, then it will be fully complete.

So maybe, at this point, we could just mark it as partially complete. And then from staff side, we could touch base with the colleagues that are overseeing the Work Stream 2 recommendation implementation and see whether we can find additional information on this recommendation. And then maybe we can socialize the idea of linking the existing material from the Council to that template and then see what their feedback is and whether that will be regarded as completed, if we do it that way. Maybe for the sake of progress for now, and then we can mark it as partially complete at the moment. And then after we touch base with the other colleagues that are working on Work Stream 2 recommendations, we can come back and provide further details to help the group fully complete this recommendation. Open to suggestions.

OLGA CAVALLI: Very good suggestion, Ariel. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: I think Ariel made a very good suggestion here, because I think that kind of reflects as well in the rationale, we can kind of say, look, we consider this complete from the perspective that all this information is already available. But the partial part is that we think, indeed, once this template is available, we could provide it there. And then there will be a kind of one stop shop for anyone interested in this topic can find information both on what Council is

doing, but also any other group that publishes its information there. So I think that is really for the CG to kind of lead that and we can link to that. And of course, once that work has happened, then I guess the status will change to complete.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. So the question to the group is, are we okay marking this as partially complete? Comments, reactions, agreements, non-agreements? Should I take silence as a yes? Manju says yes, partially complete. Thank you. Thank you, Thomas says yes. Flip says okay. Plus one from Sebastien. Yes for Wisdom. And [inaudible] Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Thank you very much, Desiree. So I think it's a very good suggestion. And let's move on.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, everybody, for the input and suggestions. So moving on to 6.1.6. This recommendation says each empowered community decisional participant should publicly disclose any decision it submits to the empower community administration. Publication should include description of processes followed to reach the decision.

So this recommendation, we believe it has been completed because, first, for the GNSO Council, all formal decisions, including future decisions to be submitted to the EC, are published or will be published on the GNSO website. And it's in the form of the resolutions. And I'll just quickly click on the link. I believe everybody should be familiar with this page where all the resolutions are documented. And also all communication from the GNSO Council to other entities such as ICANN Board, the ICANN Org, other community groups, and also the empowered community administration are published on the correspondence page on the GNSO website. And I would also just want to quickly show it. This is the correspondence page where all these letters, communications are published. So in that way, we have satisfied the requirement of publicly disclose any decision in this recommendation 6.1.6.

And the second point I want to make is that in the previous meetings, we went through the guidelines and templates that were developed for the Council to fulfill its role and obligation as a decisional participant in the empowered community. So in the guidelines, it has include requirements, process, and also timeframe for communicating GNSO Council's decision to the EC administration. And also what to include there, and there's a requirement for publicly disclosing these decisions too.

So I won't go into detail of that because we did look at some of these relevant materials in the previous meeting so this is just a reminder that for EC related actions, the Council has templates and guidelines for that. And it has the requirement for publicly disclosed decisions submitted to the empowered community. So

because of these mechanisms already in place, we believe this recommendation is completed. And happy to hear comments, suggestions, input.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Ariel. Are we in agreement that self-assessment 6.1.6 is complete? Manju agrees, yes, completed. Thank you very much. Okay from Flip. Thank you. Thank you, Thomas. Agreed. Plus one from Sebastien. Wisdom agrees. Desiree. But I think there's general agreement. So let's move on.

ARIEL LIANG:

Yeah. Thanks, everybody. So we're going to the last sub recommendation under 6.1, accountability. So the one we're looking at is 6.1.7. It says links to SO/AC transparency and accountability policies, procedures and documented practices should be available from ICANN's main website under accountability. ICANN staff would have the responsibility to maintain those links on the ICANN website.

And I think this might be the comment from Thomas earlier about having a prominent place on the ICANN Org website to link to transparency accountability related information. So what we've assessed is it's not applicable for action, because it clearly indicates it's for ICANN staff to have the responsibility to maintain those links on the website. So it's not applicable for action for the Council. But I guess what I want to note is once this action is being implemented, then maybe Council will need to coordinate with ICANN Org staff to make sure we got the right materials to be

linked from that webpage. But anyway, this hasn't happened yet. And we'll just wait and see [inaudible] ICANN staff come back to the Council for this. But this is not applicable for the Council.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Ariel. Are we okay, considering that 6.1.7 is not applicable for action for the GNSO? Comments, questions, reactions. Are we in agreement with suggested course of action from staff? I think this is quite clear, the responsibilities that yeah, it's not applicable. Thank you, Sebastien. Thank you, Thomas. Agreement. Wisdom, Flip. Thank you very much. Yeah, it's clear that it's not related—related with staff. Thank you Antonia. Also agreement. We still have five minutes. Thank you, Desiree. Marika, your hand is up.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, thanks, Olga. I think you were getting to the same point, as we only have five minutes left, maybe it makes sense to pick up on 6.2 for the next meeting and maybe we can just have a few minutes to discuss when to have that next meeting.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay, should we have the meeting right after the ICANN meeting? This means the week of the 20th, or we could give us one week for recovering from the ICANN meeting, and we meet on the following week of the 29th. Your comments, suggestions are welcome. Should we meet on the 22nd or on the 29th? Marika, are we in a hurry with this? Are we okay with the timeline? Are we behind schedule?

MARIKA KONINGS: I think from a staff perspective, I think we're making really good progress. So from our perspective—and I think that has been tradition to take off the week after an ICANN meeting as many people may still be traveling. So from our perspective, it's no issue to have the next meeting on the 29th.

And just to note, after this recommendation, because now we've kind of gone through a number of recommendations where it's more merely a question of confirming status, the last recommendation on the list is one that may require a bit further work. I think from a staff perspective, we're hoping to have some conversations with experts on the human rights framework to get a better sense of what might have been envisioned so we can also kind of prepare that conversation. But that will be a slightly different approach than what we've done so far. But from a staff perspective, I think we're making really good progress. So no problem in reconvening on the 29th.

OLGA CAVALLI: I see comments in the chat that. If we are not behind schedule, we can skip the week of the 20th and go directly to a meeting on the 29th. I think there's agreement. And okay, Desiree, thanks for letting us know that you're busy July 1 to 8.

Okay. Thank you very much for all your inputs, comments. I think we have a very productive meeting. I wish you good flights or trains or however you're getting to The Hague. I will take a very long flight as usual from the south where I live, and I hope to see

you in person next week. Thank you very much, everyone, and thank you, of course, Ariel and Marika, and Julie for all your work. Thanks, everybody. See you soon.

DEVAN REED: Thank you for joining. Once again, this meeting is adjourned. Bye everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]