EN

ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 10 January 2024 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/MoEvEQ

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

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement Call taking place on Wednesday, the 10th of January 2024 at 12:00 UTC. We have no apologies listed for today's call. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Hearing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our Chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

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.

MANJU CHEN:

Hi, everyone. Like Thomas said in the chat, Happy New Year, everyone. Welcome to 2024. I wish you all had a very relaxing holiday. If you didn't have a holiday, I guess your holiday will be waiting for you, like for me, in February, and I'm looking forward to it. I don't know if any of you have done the survey, like tested the survey, but I think we will go through it together during this call anyways. And if there are no questions, I guess we can just go ahead and get started.

So thank you very much, whoever pulls up this survey. And thank you for Berry, who has very helpfully put our drafted text, well, his drafted text, into the survey tool. Yes, and as Berry noted, there were three test responses submitted. I guess one of them is me. For the other two is, thank you very much. If you have noted down anything you wanted to suggest, please feel free during our review.

So this will be the first page of the survey. Let me just quickly check if I've noted anything. Oh, yeah. So for this one, I guess the first sentence, I would prefer if we just said, before completing the survey, please review through the framework. Because if it's recommended, some people are like, well, they don't want to do it or they don't feel like doing it. So I would suggest we just say, please review through the framework and document and stuff. Does anybody have any objection to this?

Cool. So I believe Julie is taking notes. And hopefully we'll modify this after the whole review. And Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I don't know if this is something that we do for all the surveys we sent out or we send out, but it might be useful at least to get a sense of how many questions or approximate time needed to fill out survey. It might be useful for people to know how much time they should allocate for this. I don't know if it's their fault. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, yes, I think that would be great. I think probably it will be, I don't know, in the email when we send out a survey. So they don't have to open this survey to know how much time is that. Do you guys think it should be in the survey or like in the email when we're telling them to do the survey? I guess we can put both too, but I'm open to suggestions. Seeing no reactions. I guess we can do both. And I also remember now, so for the third question, the question three, please enter the group you're representing. And I remember, so can we just put the drop down? Yeah, so it's only the stakeholder groups and constituencies or other, but I was thinking, should we put CCOICI members and task force? Or they could just put others. Or I mean, I don't know, or we add more exceptions because I feel like this will be confusing for those who are representing the stakeholder groups to participate in the CCOICI and then they don't know which affiliation they should choose. Berry, I see your hand.

BERRY COBB: So because we're collecting the name and the email address, we're going to know on the back end, whether they were a CCOICI member or not. But I remind the group back to the original purpose for this. We need formal responses from all of the formal

groups. It is these formal groups through their councilors that are going to make a decision about what to do with the pilot survey. So the total response pool is only going to be the number of groups that we have listed here and I almost don't even want to use other because there really isn't an other. It needs to be by group because we need solid direction about where this is going to go. It can't be like five ISPCP people and no NCUC people completing the survey. So it needs to be all of the groups, how the group formally thinks that they're going to—how they want the this framework to continue or suggest new changes.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, thank you for the clarification. I think it will be all right. I wonder if we have to add some explanation text to clarify this because when I was going through this, I wasn't sure. Because I am in a sense representing NCSG in this group, but then I'm not representing NCSG. I guess it's a special case for me because I'm the chair, I have to be neutral. And then I'll expect our chair of the NCSG who is filling out the survey to identify us NCSG and fill out a survey on behalf of NCSG. So I'm not sure if other members on the CCOICI will have this kind of unsureness as myself. But I'm open to any other opinions or suggestions. I'm not seeing any reactions. I guess we can keep it that way.

So for other, what do we expect when people choose other? I'm just wondering. Do they get like a field where they fill in what they think the other means or they just choose other and they don't have to specify?

BERRY COBB: I can add a field. But you know, again, I've got a feeling that if it's even used, it's probably going to be not a valid response when we see it on the back end.

MANJU CHEN: I guess a question I would like to put to everybody is, do we feel okay to actually get rid of other? Because apparently for the survey, it's not a valid field in the sense that we need people to identify which stakeholder groups or like constituencies they represent. So is it okay if we get rid of other? Jennifer is saying it's like if it's the intention, then we should remove what we ask. Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: As I was listening to Berry explain, and I see that Desiree has the same question in the chat, are we just asking one person from each constituency or SG to fill this out because it's representative, I guess? So we're just expecting one from each.

MANJU CHEN: No, I think, sorry, Berry, I think we agree that so former and present CCOICI and task force members and the chairs of all these SGs and constituencies is what we're expecting to fill out this survey. So that was why I was like, should we add the CCOICI, but then if we don't, I guess they will have to just put their, whoever put them on CCOICI. That's what I imagine, but Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: So again, all of the members here come from represented groups. I'm not sure that I see the purpose for CCOICI members to fill this out unless they're doing it on behalf of your group. You know, so again, if Thomas goes to fill it out as a CCOICI member, and then he fills it out as an ISPCP member, then I've got two entries of the same person representing the same group. That's going to throw off any of the calculations. So to your question is, should be one person from the represented group and how—and they collaborate with their members to come up with what these particular responses should be so that we can then inform the council about where the community groups are wanting to take this.

MANJU CHEN: Okay. So, so it's different than I guess how I thought it's going to be. So we are only asking one person per stakeholder groups to fill this survey. Is that what we're going to do? Do people agree that we only have one person per stakeholder groups or constituencies to fill out the survey? It could be either us who are representing our stakeholder groups and the CCOICI, or our chair after we talked about this and explained this within our stakeholder groups, I guess. Desiree, please.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Manju. Desiree for the record. Yes, I believe we also have Thomas agreeing. I think it will make the survey more meaningful if we were to only get an input from one person from the representative group as Berry was saying. So in that sense, I

think we could remove other and make it more simpler. And yeah, that's my suggestion. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Desiree. Yes, I guess I like this. [inaudible] seeing any exception. I think that's where we're going. We will have only one person per stakeholder groups or constituency to fill out the survey. I will count on you guys, the members on CCOCI to go back to your group, explain this and coordinate a response. Whoever's going to represent your group to fill in the survey, he or she will have to represent your groups well, in a sense. Susan, I see your hand.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. So I'm just wondering where this leaves someone like Desiree, because she is on the CCOICI, but she is not a member of, well, in her capacity as a CPH NomCom represented councilor. So she's not going to be filling this in for the registries or the registrars. So that means she can't fill this in. And do we not want the input from everyone who's been on the CCOICI, including past members who might not be on the CCOICI anymore?

MANJU CHEN: So actually I'm imagining for Desiree, she will choose NomCom and she will actually go to Anne and Paul, who are all NomCom appointees, to discuss how the NomCom appointees feel about this, because it's like a council thing. And for them, what put them on council is like their identity or hats as a NomCom appointee. So

I guess what I imagine is actually like three of them will discuss how they feel about the CCOICI and the whole pilot thing and task force and stuff. And because there is an option, which is NOMCOM. That's how I imagine it works. But I don't know if Desiree thinks it's okay. Or do you have any other suggestions?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes, if I could respond directly to you and Susan's question. I think it's important that we first get an input from the representative groups and then Paul and Anne and I could have a discussion as well and whether our views should be recorded as one at the council discussion or at the point of a survey. I like Thomas's suggestion to maybe instead of others, put the [inaudible] appointed. But Susan says it is us, it is me rather, filling in the survey as a CCOICI member. And that leads me to a question, would we actually need ourselves to fill in this? Because we are working on this to get input from the representative groups, not as us as members. So I wonder if anybody else has any thoughts about that, whether we should exclude ourselves as CCOICI members in filling in this survey.

MANJU CHEN: Yeah, that's a good question. Do we want to kind of avoid filling this by ourselves and like let our chair, whoever it is from our stakeholder groups or constituencies do it? Or are we confident? I personally think it doesn't matter if it's the representative on the CCOICI or the chair. I assume we reached an agreement that only one person, no matter who from the stakeholder group or constituencies will be filling out the survey on behalf of the

stakeholder group or constituencies. So it doesn't really matter who it is. And also, like Berry has noted, we will be putting our names. So for Desiree, I guess when you choose, like I said, there's a NomCom in the drop down menu. So we will know it's you. I see Berry say that no problem with NCAs each completing it on their own. Yeah, but within the stakeholder groups, we might not come to an agreement too. So I don't know if we are allowing a NomCom for these special, well, not special treatment, but I guess if we agreed that one represents per stakeholder group. So I would assume NCAs are like a group too. So they will have one person filling out on behalf of three of them. But I see Thomas is agreeing with Berry. I'm welcoming any other opinions. Okay, so I guess, I don't know, but then are we only making [inaudible]? So we're making an exception for the NomCom appointees in a sense? Is that where we're going? So one per.

BERRY COBB: Apologies. I don't view them as an exception to the rule. I mean, they aren't a collective body. They're individual persons representing on behalf of a particular contracted party or a non-voting member. You know, that's it. Even though they're all coming and designated by the NomCom, they're not representing their role on the council as the NomCom. So I don't think there will be a problem with the three individual NomCom appointees filling out the survey themselves, because they aren't bound to vote for the houses they represent either, to my knowledge, unless I'm wrong about that. But they aren't a collective group like the Business Constituency is.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I think you're right. They are not bound by their votes. And I see people agreeing with you. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm really struggling with what we're trying to achieve here. You know, do we want the feedback from the individual parts of the GNSO, so the constituencies and stakeholder groups, as to whether they think this works? Or do we want the feedback from people who've been participating in this process as to whether they think it works? And those, I think, might be two different things. And I think if we're doing one that's what do the stakeholder groups and constituencies think about this process, does it work for them, then I'm not sure we do include the NomCom appointees in that, because that's a different participation. But if we want to know what the people who've been in this room and had to deal with this process think about whether it worked, then that's a different question. But I think it's really valid to have that input. And it may be that they feel the exact same way as the constituency or stakeholder group that they represent. But they might not. I think there have been some real problems with the process, just by virtue of it being representative, that I don't see that we can fix. But I don't know that we're even going to elicit responses about that if we don't ask the people who are actually in the room trying to deal with this process. But as I say, I'm going round in circles. I'm not sure what our purpose is here. What are we trying to get out of this survey?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. I see Desiree's hand.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes, I think Susan, you raise a good point. I believe I have asked also earlier in the chat whether we as CCOICI members should at all fill in the survey ourselves. And I was leaning towards us not filling in the survey because we are doing this on behalf for the community and the groups, interest groups to express what they think about the process. I think it's not important what we think because we're here to facilitate the process. If it comes back to the council discussion, I think we could have a say. So for me personally, I could recuse myself if you want to make this a point in filling in on behalf of NCA appointed GNSO members, because I was a member of CCOICI. And therefore we would also avoid yourself or Thomas, unless you're a representative, filling in the survey, and Manju. And so it would be good to have one rule that perhaps we do not fill in the survey. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Desiree. So yes, it is a very good point. At first, personally, I thought we were just getting feedback from the members who have participated in this and how they feel about it. But then after several discussions, I think in the call we had, we kind of felt like it's valuable, it's worthwhile to have stakeholder groups, constituencies to fill out the survey to express how they feel about this as not a participant, but those who probably have been observing this or have been discussing this via their representative on CCOICI. So then I was thinking, oh, it's good that we both have members' view and then those who are not participating directly, but via their, well, in a sense, contact points to CCOICI. But then today it seems like we only want one

perspective from, like, one perspective per stakeholder group or constituencies about this CCOICI thing. So I'm actually as confused, I guess, as you guys are, because I guess we can decide here and now whether we want this to be a survey collecting both the feedback from the members and, well, in a sense, for lack of better words, outsiders, or do we only want per stakeholder group. So it will have to be a mixture or like a summary of both the representatives' and their stakeholder groups' view of CCOICI. I guess that's the two options we will be having to choose from. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: My thinking was the survey was to help gauge from the different constituencies what the thinking is. And eventually this is coming back to the team here to be reviewed. So if we were to take a path going forward, I would want to go with the point where we reach out to the different stakeholder groups, have them appoint someone to shepherd and lead imputes into the survey, and then it comes back for us to review rather than having we ourselves as members of the team putting in, because we can always table whatever point it is that we might want to marshal. So rather than members of this group being the ones, I mean, pulling feedback from us, we can always put that down when, I mean, put that into the box when we're reviewing whatever it is that the constituency is sending.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, thank you, Lawrence. So I guess you vote for, you didn't vote. Well, yes, I guess that's opinion supporting the second

option, which is one per say or the group. Does anybody else have? I remember in the beginning, we kind of have people [inaudible]. So I guess at first I kind of think of this as more like a self-assessment thing, but I think we are moving to the direction where this is actually not a self-assessment, but more like what do stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO think of this mechanism, which is called the CCOICI. Does it work? Does it not? And so it's more of stakeholder group's take on whether CCOICI should be the mechanism moving forward to deal with any improvement issues of GNSO. That's why we will basically— Well, so here, can we agree that we will have one per say on the group? And this is not a self-assessment kind of survey, but more like collecting opinions from stakeholder groups within GNSO on how they think of CCOICI as a mechanism of continuous improvement of GNSO. If we agree on that, because I'm not seeing any objections in chat. So if we agree on that, then we will have to decide whether we require members on CCOICI and [inaudible] to recuse from the survey and let whoever representing our stakeholder groups to fill in the survey rather than us. So Desiree has expressed that it will be better if we ourselves recuse ourselves from filling out the survey. What are others thinking? Do you think we should? Or it doesn't matter as long as there's just one per stakeholder group? I'm not seeing any response. I personally think it would be all right as long as, I mean, in ICANN we are used to wearing different hats, so we are used to represent filling things on behalf of our group instead of voicing our own opinions. But if we think it's a problem, we can definitely make a requirement that it shouldn't be the CCOICI members. But for now, I'm not seeing people feeling too strong about this. So I

guess at this moment, we will not make it a mandatory requirement to recuse yourself as long as you are confident that you are only representing your stakeholder groups instead of yourself. If that's okay, please put, I don't know, make a sign or put something in the chat to let me know that we can proceed to the next page.

Great. So I guess we can move to the next page. Oh, okay. So this page is the same page. Oh, do we have to put in, thank you, everyone, for putting whatever thing to lead us to the next page. So questions that one. I didn't find any questions about this page, but we can quickly, I guess, scroll through this one. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: So the reason Saewon was having trouble was because I was making changes in real time. As I suggested in my email, at a minimum, the first page are going to have to be required answers or I'm going to get ghost responses. So I made those two required. That's why she had to fill out her information.

Now my intention was for all of the questions that required a pick, a choice. So question four, strongly disagree all the way to strongly agree. I was also intending to make those required and leaving the freeform text ones optional. And my rationale for doing that is because we're going to be utilizing this quantitative data out of it to get the sense, the pulse of the room, so to speak, or pulse of the GNSO community groups, how they agree or disagree on this whole framework. So I just wanted to let you know if there's disagreement about not making these required, then it could throw off the results. If you didn't fill out question four, was the

framework clear, but you fill out question five and was it appropriate, then it kind of starts to disconnect things.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Jennifer, please.

BERRY COBB: Thanks, Manju. Thanks, Berry. So I agree that it should be mandatory, but this brings me back to the question I had in chat that wasn't really answered in the first place. If we're only requiring one person to fill it out on behalf of an SG or C, they need to have the full set of questions in front of them to be able to coordinate the response. So if we're going to make everything mandatory, which is fine, we should also send out with that email the set of questions in Google Docs the way we have it so they can go through it that way instead of having to click through real time, have the whole group there looking at it, et cetera. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jen. I'm sorry for missing your questions in chat. I think that's a good point. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Yeah, I was just going to say, yeah, I saw it. And like any of these kinds of surveys, we do send out the questions set separately from the actual survey itself. So you don't have to go in and ask whether you can save it or not, those kinds of things.

MANJU CHEN: Cool. Thank you. Thank you, Jen. Thank you, Berry. If there's no other opinion, we can move on to the next page. So for this page, Berry, do you have any notes about this page? Or should we start reviewing?

BERRY COBB: I think question sets one and two were fine. We didn't have really any changes from the previous draft. But getting into three, four, and five, then there were a couple of suggested changes.

MANJU CHEN: Okay. Sorry. I remember for this question set, we agreed to separate the assignments in the sense that we will ask questions per assignments. Or are we not asking? I kind of remember when we were reviewing this set, we were going to ask the questions per assignments. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Okay. I must have misunderstood that. So if I understand it now, there will be a set 2A, B, and C for the three different topics then?

MANJU CHEN: Yes. So for question eight, for example, we'll be asking, is the scope of WS2 recommendations within the CCOICI framework? We're clear? Or we can ask 8 and then 8.1 WS2, 8.2 self-assessment, 8.3 review of statement of interest.

EN

BERRY COBB: So I apologize because, again, my understanding coming out of that call, the original draft that I had taken from the four that were originally provided was trying to make a point of being agnostic to the actual topics that were discussed. And that if we have question sets at the actual topic level, does that really help to inform whether this framework is fit for purpose or not? And I can foresee that some people or some groups have no problem with the WS2 recommendations, but some groups will probably clearly have issues with how the outcome of the SOI was. And so we're going to get two separate pictures based on the topic that don't have anything necessarily to do with the framework itself, other than to note, did the framework not work at all or did it work? But I'm happy to go either way.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, so I guess my recollection of this discussion was that we are afraid, like you said, when people are not happy about the SOI thing, they will just strongly disagree because even if they thought WS2 or self-assessment is okay, and that would also kind of, I guess, in a sense be misleading because it's like one taking over all the other good stuff in a sense. So that's why we kind of, I thought we agreed to separate the assignments, but I welcome any other people correcting me or if your recollection is different, please.

So I guess we can make a choice here, whether we want to collect feedback per assignment or is the current set okay? So we either risk having, I guess, too many entries per assignments or we risk having one feeling overrunning others.

EN

BERRY COBB: So again, this is up to the group, but questions one, how we got to set one and set two was because there was a double barrel question. It was, were the objectives and the scope of the framework clear? And we needed to break those down so that we were talking specifically about the framework or the objective of the framework versus the scope. And actually I got that wrong. The double barrel questions were the distinction between clear versus appropriate, and we broke those down. But set one and set two kind of complement each other in that we're talking about the objective of the framework and is the scope of work also fit for purpose for that. Again, kind of going back to why this was supposed to be topic agnostic is, were the scope of the topics within scope of the framework or not? Again, not trying to drill down on the specific topics that were discussed in themselves. If we're getting specific feedback about the topics themselves, then does it warrant also asking whether the objectives of the framework for each topic are also in play or not? Because at the end of the day whether, and again, this goes back to the outcome part, the real question here is, was this group fit for purpose to talk about statements of interest for the broader of the GNSO? And is that a yes or a no? And why it should be agnostic to what the outcome of that result was? Because again the GNSO is faced with this looming question about how we're going to tackle continuous improvements going forward. And the main point of this whole framework is that it's nested under the management of the GNSO Council versus a group that maybe would be outside of the GNSO Council, but is represented across all of the SGs and Cs. I'll stop there. I'm rambling, it's too early.

MANJU CHEN: No. they're all good points. Thank you, Berry. I agree. I'm not like [fixated on] having questions per assignments. And if people are good with being agnostic to the topics, I think we can move on because I'm not seeing any objections in the chat. So let's move to the next page.

[inaudible] use of the CCOICI. Yeah, I guess we explained this also in our question set for the task force. So for this one, so for this page, I just had a minor suggestion. I think we can break the second paragraph into two so we can break it starting regarding. So the CCOICI handle and then next paragraph regarding the handling within the CCOICI of these [inaudible]. I just thought it's easier to read if we break them into two paragraphs. Thank you, Susan. If that's okay. I guess I didn't have any other notes about this page. If people are seeing anything you want to mention, this is your moment. And if not, we can move to the next page.

Oh, we're back again. I'm so sorry for you. Thank you. No worries. Take your time. No, no need to be panic. Next. So for this page, I didn't really have any notes. And people, we are slowly going through this page. If you see anything you want to mention, this is your time. Oh, I guess I have one actually. So I guess we can break this into two paragraphs too, so we can break starting one answering the question below. Sorry, I'm just not used to reading huge paragraph. [inaudible] So two minor edits here, we break it to two paragraphs starting one answer to question below and please do not consider [your or your SGs, Cs, not yours.] Other than that, if we're not seeing any questions or suggestions in chat,

we can move on. Thank you, Saewon, for going through this again and again and again. We can move on to the next page.

Yeah, no worries, Berry. It's good. It's fun, actually, to go through this again, I guess. So this page, I noted that for the second bullet point, there's a space missing. But I trust Berry will change that after we go through this survey. So avoid making Saewon go through the survey again. And for question 21, I was having a hard time understanding the question. If not, how do you foresee this [inaudible] being completed, if any. I actually didn't understand this question. What is this question for. Are we missing something in this sentence or is it just my English is too bad? Berry, do remember what is was this question for?

BERRY COBB: Sorry, I had to read it. How do you foresee this other work being completed, I missed the work between other and being.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, okay. So, I guess we can change that afterwards. And I didn't have any other comments regarding this page. So if you do, this is your time again. This is the final page. Do you guys need more time to read the first half of the page or are we okay? Not seeing any reactions.

So one thing that is very amusing is you get a score from this survey. I am not sure if we're keeping this. I think it's funny, but I guess it's not. I don't know. People may get upset if their score is too low. Berry, please.

EN

BERRY COBB: So what's going on in the background is there's a four to zero assignment. So if you strongly agree, it's calculating a number four. Agree is three, neither agree nor disagree is two, disagree is one and strongly disagree is zero. So I'll see if there's a way to hide the score, because I do agree that it's confusing. But the reason for doing it was when we roll up these quantitative questions in the background, they already have the scoring assignments to them. So it'll be helpful when rendering the results for each of the questions.

MANJU CHEN: So I guess if there's no way to hide it, probably we add an explanation of what the score means. For example, it means your, I don't know, satisfactory rates of the whole CCOICI thing. Or yeah, probably better to just hide it. [inaudible] We can probably, as CCOICI discussed, we'll add explanatory text to put there to kind of neutralize the feeling of getting a bad score.

But other than that, I think we went through the survey today good. We clarified what the survey is for, who to fill out the survey. Do we have any other suggestions or opinions or anything you want to add to the survey? If not, can we go back to the agenda?

So next steps and timing. I think today we went through the survey and there were all kind of minor changes, right? So I don't think we need another meeting to discuss the survey. It's okay after the minor modifications to be put out. I guess we will have to decide, like, when do we want the survey back? So when do we send it

out and when do we have it back? And may I ask, Berry, if you have imagined how many times, like, what time, how much time do we need? Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Thank you. I haven't imagined, so I'm reacting. You know, we could probably have this sent out early next week. We'll utilize Terri's team to communicate to the SG and C leaders. We'll put on copy the council. There will be a brief message about the survey itself. And on top of it, we can also maybe add a quick AOB item or have Greg announce it at the beginning of the council call that the survey will be sent out. So duration, I think because this is a group-coordinated response, we're going to need to allow time for the groups to actually coordinate before they send it out. So my instinct is telling me somewhere around like February 26th or so, that gives the groups enough time to probably meet at least once, if not twice, between now and then to compile what their responses are going to be. And then if we got it by the 26th, it shouldn't take me too long to compile the responses and create the output to deliver to this particular team.

And now I'm thinking about ICANN meeting as well. I'll answer your question with a question. What does the group think about having the groups use the ICANN meeting to—that's a lot of time between now and then. But I'm concerned that if we don't give the groups enough time, they're not going to have enough time to meet to discuss this. So I'm almost inclined now to still put a, to use the ICANN meeting to give the groups time to respond to these. I don't know. I'm rambling now.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I think they're all good points. I was thinking about meetings too. And also I was actually gonna check with Julie whether we need to get council to approve the survey before we send it out. I'm not sure if we need to do that, because if we need to do that, maybe we'll have to wait for the next council meeting, which is not this month. Oh, no, then I guess it's for our group to decide whether you think your group needs ICANN meetings to discuss the content of the survey or would it be good for us just do this all via online discussions. Julie, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Manju. Hello, everyone. So this is Julie from staff. There is not a requirement as to having the GNSO council review this survey. And I don't think it's necessary. It's probably better to get it out to the groups. I mean, keep in mind that each of the groups that's represented in the council is also represented here. So we should be able to go ahead with the survey. And just from a staff point of view, I think it might be useful to use the ICANN meeting to have people to the extent possible have face to face discussion to coordinate. We can still get it out—as Desiree notes, it's better to send out [inaudible], we can still get it out quickly. But there's no special time associated with getting the responses back. So you could consider whether or not kind of having the ICANN meeting is a useful way to coordinate responses. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Julie. Berry, I see your hand. And sorry, guys, we probably will be running over a bit.

BERRY COBB: I just wanted to build on what Julie said, and that that actually makes even more sense. While I'm not fond of waiting two months for the responses to this, this topic is very important and instrumental to the future for all of us. So I do believe it will require time. And the ICANN meeting is a perfect time to do that. So I would suggest that the representatives on your groups here communicate that back to your leadership to try to make it an agenda item, if necessary, for your respective group to discuss it at the ICANN meeting. And then we'll put a deadline somewhere like around March 18. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Yes, I agree. I'm not seeing disagreement from the chat. And then I guess we are pushing the deadline after the ICANN meetings, and there's really no rush to push out the survey as soon as possible, because you know how it is when the time is too long, sometimes you forgot. So I guess there's no rush, but we can roll it out as soon as it's ready. And I guess that [inaudible] between now and ICANN meetings, we don't really have any other things to discuss. Is that right, Julie? If I'm missing anything, please remind me. So we don't need to have any other meetings between now and ICANN meetings. Although it's sad to not see you all, but I'll see you during the council meetings anyway. So I guess it's good to have your Wednesday back too. And sorry again for running over a bit. We don't have any other things. I

don't know if anybody has any AOB. If not, like Berry suggested, please, when the survey is out, discuss with your group, make it an agenda item for your ICANN meeting. And I'll see you guys next week for the council meeting. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]