EN

ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 17 April 2024 at 13:00 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/TQMZEw

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 17th of April, 2024 at 1300 UTC. Desiree will be joining us a little late. Other than that, no list of apologies for today's meeting. Statements of interest must be kept up to date.

If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing 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

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.

behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to the chair Manju Chen, please begin.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Terri. Thank you very much. Welcome everyone, it's been quite a while. I hope you have all been well during the time that we haven't had any meetings. Do we have an agenda page for the next slide or do we-- Oh yes, so I think so that was my welcome and we will move on directly to the survey review and data analysis.

I would like to thank Saewon, Berry, and Julie for doing the survey, and thank you all for encouraging your SO groups and constituencies to fulfill the survey. Thank you all very much. So we can have results to review now, and because I don't know the survey results as throughout as in and now as our lovely Saewon and Berry, so I'll let them do the introduction of the data analysis and we can start the discussion after the presentation. Thank you very much. Thank you.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you, Manju. So I'll continue with the survey review and data analysis. My name's Saewon from staff. So as you all know, we conducted the survey during February and March and we've prepared a broad analysis of the CCOICI pilot survey results. We tried to capture the effectiveness of the CCOICI framework and to determine how to move forward through the survey as you'll know.

And we have shared the slides via email already, and they can also be found on wiki along with the raw data that we have

uploaded there. I'll share with you through the chat. So this is the wiki page that we have all the data uploaded on and for the direct links. So this is the slides and the data, raw data. I hope you can directly go into the links there.

To briefly recap on the survey purpose and the format as you all know, I mean this team created the survey and had many discussions on it. The CCOICI pilot survey was conducted to evaluate if the GNSO Council and the GNSO community see value in continuing the use of the CCOICI framework. Basically, as you all know, it was a satisfaction survey of each stakeholder group and constituency.

And the result obviously would be used to support the continuous improvement program, determining whether the objective and scope of the framework were clear and appropriate, if it should continue or if needed, how it could be improved. And if the survey results noted a significant issue, this should again be the trigger to initiate appropriate measures to deal with any such issues.

The survey consisted of 23 questions in total with 14 multiple choices and nine open-ended questions, giving options for rationale, comments, and suggestions for each stakeholder group and constituency to provide. And after several extensions, it was conducted for 48 days in total. As I briefly mentioned, the survey responses were collected from each stakeholder group and constituency except for Commercial Stakeholder Group taking the responses from each constituency within the group. And so we had eight responses in total.

So here is the overview of questions and average scores, and this was the result for the 14 multiple choice questions, which was scored on a scale between zero and four. You can see down below the scales between zero and four. With zero being the lowest score, implying strong disagreements, and four being the highest score representing strong agreements. An average of three and above indicated positive feedback on CCOICI, and as you can see, I have marked with the red line on the score of three.

So as you can see, the bars in blue scored three and above and orange red or nothing in this case were below three. And I'll get to those low scoring questions later in the slides. But the responses were divided equally with seven positive and seven negative.

So to focus on the positive results first and the two main questions which we're asking if the C-C-O-I-C-I and the task force structure should remain working on other assignments and if they were fit for purpose to continue, the broad agreement was yes, or in other words agree, as shown in the average score.

So this 75% also represents three and above. You'll see seven groups at a minimum agreed and one neither agreed nor disagreed. Now to look over those questions with lowest scores, well to Berry's huge disappointment, question 24, which was related to the names change scored zero with no group concerned about the name itself. And I'm sure Berry would like to speak up about this later during the discussion. And then the other lower scoring questions were mostly to do with the task force. So I see a lot of sorry's in the chat.

EN

So questions 18, 16, and 17 which was to do with its decision making methodology structure and the membership structure related to the task force were the lower scoring questions. Question six, which was related to the CCOICI framework also did not score above three with one group disagreeing to the fit for purpose statement based on the decision-making mechanism. Question?

MANJU CHEN: Is someone having some issues of unmuting or muting, I'm not sure?

SAEWON LEE: Hi, I had some background noise, so I muted suddenly, I'm so sorry. I'll continue again. So yes, the last question 13 had two neither agree nor disagree responses with the respondents questioning the decision-making methodology again. So slides 9 to 17 from here show each set questions with their results. It shows the scores for each multiple-choice questions and additional comments and rationale for those open-ended questions. I won't go into each question and responses in detail due to time constraints and also hoping that you all have examined them in advance.

But here you can see the set one questions related to CCOICI framework objectives, set two questions, CCOICI framework scope, set three questions, framework use of the CCOICI, which continues on to the next slide, slide 12, and then set four questions, framework use of task forces, which again continues

onto slide team, and lastly, set five future use of CCOICI and task forces, which answered those main questions this team was seeking, and this also continues onto slide 17.

So we tried to kind of get a summary out of each set questions. So set one and set two questions summarizes that all GNSO groups such as minimum agrees that the CCOICI framework objectives and scope were clear. Set three shows that some GNSO groups have hesitations about the CCOICI membership structure and decision-making methodologies.

Set four is related to the use of task force framework, which has the lowest scores. This had nearly half of the GNSO groups having problems with the task force. But in set five concludes that with 75% of the GNSO groups agreeing that the CCOICI and the task force are the right mechanisms for working on the remaining assignments which also shows that they should execute the continuous improvement program.

So again, according to the survey results, what is working, it's pretty clear that the groups were satisfied with the CCOICI framework objectives and scope and what was not working, the framework use of the task forces and the CCOICI, which centered on the membership structure and the decision-making methodologies. And knowing that this team will have to present the survey results and findings to the GNSO Council at the May or June council meeting and suggest the way forward for this committee, the leadership and staff have come up with the following through proposals for the GNSO Council.

First is that revision is needed for the use of task forces advising the GNSO Council that the task force requires changes to its membership structure and its decision-making methodologies. Second is that improvement is needed in the use of CCOICI, again, advising the GNSO Council, that the CCOICI mechanism needs improvement, which includes both membership structure and the decision-making methodologies.

And last is advising the GNSO Council that each CCOICI and task force framework should continue with their work provided that certain revisions are made to their working mechanisms as suggested in the first two proposals. This, I think yes, is the end of my presentation and the slides that I've prepared for you, and I'll now turn it over to Manju to open the floor for discussions. Manju, would you like to go ahead?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Thank you, Saewon, thank you very much. And so I don't know if any of you have read the slides deck before this meeting. If you did and you have any comments to make, you're welcome to make it now. I'm not seeing any hands for now, but I was actually quite surprised that everyone was like, oh, you should keep the CCOICI going on. I thought everybody will like stop doing this and we can all be free from this and we can all start something else. But yeah, people were happy with CCOICI, but of course, like we have seen from the results, there are changes needed. So do you guys have any questions per the results?

For example, when you were discussing with your SO groups or constituencies, did you have any point you wanted to share with the CCOICI about what you thought about the survey? And for example, would you like to elaborate on your answers or are there anything you feel like is good to bring to discussion with the group? Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks, Manju. And I think just to react to that kind of, you are surprised that people are happy to keep the group going. Why would they not, we've done good work. But I mean, I think also, we all recognize that there needs to be some place to have discussions about improvement, and that's all part of this idea of kind of continuous improvement and holistic review and it's all kind of interrelated.

And so kind of given we have to have it, we could disband this group and start a new one or we could give it a different name, but basically it would be still the same thing unless we're gonna try and do continuous improvement within the whole of council kind of like, we could reform, but it's still basically gonna be the same group with maybe a few new participants and a different name.

In terms of the responses, I think it was actually quite a lot of alignment. Maybe more than I was expecting because I know sort of my group and some others had expressed some dissatisfaction about the kind of decision making, I can't think of the term.

I don't mean structure, but you know what I mean, the test for kind of decision making or whatever and the concerns that there wasn't

really a path to reach consensus, but I thought it was really interesting that actually kind of groups that I felt maybe were more happy with how things went in terms of the outcome also felt the same. I think maybe that's something, you know, for us to obviously look at is just kind of, is what should be the kind of decision-making standard because it doesn't feel like anyone was kind of entirely happy with what it currently is.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. Yes, actually I definitely agree that we actually have more alignments than we expected, and we all agree. I think it's good that there's this mechanism in six and we all agree that we need improvement. But I guess this question I will pose to everyone is do you think this proposal for the GNSO council is, is okay?

Are we all fine with bringing this proposal to the council? And if yes, I actually have a few questions regarding the details of this proposal. For example, if we need to revise or improve, who are the people? I'm assuming it will be us, but does that bring any conflict of interest because we're improving ourselves? Is that an okay proposal to make?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Hi, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Yes.

EN

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sorry, just to pipe in, but I'm thinking when people say they want to reconstitute or change the membership, quite frankly, I think they need to come to the table with a more solid proposal as to who or how exactly they would reconstitute it. I guess I'm saying I'm fine just sort of saying we're gonna continue on with who we have. If people have different ideas and something specific, I think that would give a little bit more credence.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Thank you, Damon. And I see Berry's hand up.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju, Berry Cobb for the record. And I'm gonna build on Damon's intervention here because I think it's important about what is presented specifically on this slide. And so there's really gonna be two points, one of which is the decision-making methodology. I think first what's important here is I'm gonna start with the membership structure. And I was personally kind of surprised by the responses, and my only conclusion is that maybe we lost sight of why the membership structure was laid down the way it was in the early deliberations of what formed this pilot for a standing committee on continuous improvements.

So the CCOICI, which I'm gonna use frequently now since this is the name that's going to stick is to essentially a, for lack of a better term, a forever small group or small team attached to the GNSO Council. The membership of that was supposed to be just GNSO council members to provide oversight on the types of work that

this would be formed. And because not everybody is on the GNSO Council, the membership of the CCOICI is restricted to council members. And if the particular task is squarely within just the GNSO council's remit, that type of work would only take place in the CCOICI.

Conversely, or maybe building on it, the reason for task forces is because probably a decent chunk of the work that would be assigned to this standing committee is not squarely within the GNSO council's remit, a.k.a. some kind of future organizational type of review after continuous improvement is loaded in.

And so, even while I think that there's plenty of opportunity to revise the charter of this group and make improvements with respect to membership structure, generally speaking, the task forces were meant to be more broad in participation from the larger GNSO community, especially on topics that aren't necessarily within the remit. I think from the CCOICI perspective, I don't know how we would change the membership structure of that because its intent is supposed to be representatives from each of the stakeholder groups and constituencies on that.

Now, that always brings up a challenging question of, well, who gets how many seats in those kinds of things, which is directly related to the decision-making methodology. But in general, CCOICI is just supposed to be a represented group, a balanced represented group from the council without having to do this work at the full council level. So that takes me to the decision-making methodologies. And there's really three routes as I see it, and I think to specifically why I raised my hand on Damon's intervention here is whether it's the structure or the decision-making

methodology, it would be helpful if this particular group can also put forward possible solutions to these proposals.

Put another way, I don't like hearing about problems unless somebody that's telling me what the problem is if they've got a solution or possible solutions to rectify the problem. So the way I see it in the realm of the decision-making body aspect is we've got three options. One, is remain in the status quo, which is essentially full consensus for anything to be elevated or return back to the council for any final decision-making. And I honestly can't remember all of the deliberations about why the full consensus option was used.

But I believe there were concerns that if we use the traditional consensus model as outlined in our working group guidelines, that that would also trip things up. Which leads me to option two, and that is instead of full consensus, that the CCOICI and the task forces operate under our standard decision-making methodology, full consensus, consensus, strong support, significant opposition divergence, so on. So that's the other option. And then the third is that we somehow invent a whole new decision-making methodology, which I would question is whether in scope, and even if it were in scope, I'm not sure that that's entirely possible.

So to conclude, it's fine that if this group decides to just submit the proposals as they are for the GNSO Council, but these hard or more challenging types of topics are gonna have to be had at the council if there's no substance about to help the council how to make the decision on membership changes or the decision-making methodology. And if it's not gonna go to the council, then I would encourage you to reach back to your groups about coming

up with what those ideas are so that they can be properly deliberated at the council about this. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I have a follow up question before I give it to Susan. So I guess in a sense, every CCOICI recommendations has to go to council, and council has to approve it. I guess my question is, I don't really see the difference between option one and two, because whether it's a full consensus recommendation or it's like a divergence or strongly support with strong opinion, that one, there's no difference because it has to go to the council and it has to be voted in the council.

I guess the problem is in CCOICI, we actually didn't have the methodologies of decision-making. They have one for task force, but not for CCOICI, so my question is, we definitely have to have a methodology, but does it matter that, well, after all, it's all going back to the council anyways, and council in the end makes the decision.

I guess that was the problem we were having during the strategic planning sessions also, that some recommendations even though it was either divergent or has strong support get voted down or for in the council, despite the original intent of the recommendations anyways. So is that something we want to point out to the council, or is it something we just kind of let go and hope that it doesn't happen again in the future? I guess that's my question to all of you. But I'll stop here and I'll go to Susan.

EN

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks, Manju. So it was on this point actually. So I don't think it would've probably changed the outcome, don't get me wrong, but I think it would've changed things a little bit for how the CCOICI handled things and what we sent to council if we'd used that range of like full consensus, consensus support, but opposition, blah, blah, blah.

Because actually, we were operating on full consensus only, and because we were such a small group, effectively, full consensus meant we had to be unanimous because even if one person had been opposed, we were a tiny group, or we are a tiny group, so that would automatically-- because we're such a small group, one person's a big part of the group. So we didn't have any scope, so we basically-- the moment like one or in actual fact, I think it was two of the participants, it might have been more, but it was a significant proportion of the very small group were opposed to the kind of compromise that some of us thought was okay.

And I understand why and all of that, but we never even sent that compromise back to council as like, here's a recommendation, it didn't get full consensus, but it's at least got significant support, but significant opposition or whatever the standard would've been. We never even sent it to council. We sent back to council to say like, we haven't been able to reach consensus on this aspect, so we are proposing the status quo on that because we're basically saying we can't change it because we haven't reached agreement. In the end, I don't think the council decision would've been any different, don't get me wrong, but we didn't even send it back to council because of the standard we were using.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. I think you raised an excellent point. We were actually frustrated at the leadership and staff level too, because there was no methodology whatsoever that we can follow. That's why we had to fall back to whatever it was that we sent to the council. So that's definitely one improvement we are expecting for the CCOICI. And Thomas, please. You're still on mute.

THOMAS RICKERT: Does it work now?

MANJU CHEN: Yes.

THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. I was unmuted, but I had to change my audio setting. Sorry for that. Let me repeat what I said in the chat. I think we need strong support, but significant of position t-shirts for CCOICI members. But joking aside, I think we need to be very clear in terms of what we're asking because since we are not really making decisions as, I think the best that we can propose to council is that we sort of test the waters to see what level of support certain recommendations enjoy within the CCOICI to inform the council deliberations, which are then ultimately going to lead to a decision by council.

I think that it makes sense to probably deviate from the unanimity principle because that might not be suitable for instances, but then just say that we did it test vote or something, or testing of the waters, using the same methodology without giving the impression

that the CCOICI is going to be a body that takes independent decisions.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Thomas. I guess what we probably will all agree is that this slide, when we are presenting to the council, we have to be more clear on, for example, what revisions we are recommending and what improvements we are recommending to the council so that council has more context and details on whether to agree or not.

And also, I wanted to remind everybody, this is still a pilot, so I guess the first recommendation we will have to the council is that we formalized this pilot so it will no longer be a pilot, but before that, these are the revisions and improvement needed to be formalized. And I guess that will be the direction that we are heading to and what we're gonna propose to the council. But definitely, we'll have to give more details, provide more details to the council in terms of what we suggest as revision and what we suggest as improvement.

And also, if you don't want to pronounce it as CCOICI, we can always do it as just in does, which is cookie. So that's like at least cute but then it has other meanings too, so I guess probably not very appropriate in the public, I don't know. But yeah, did anyone aside from the pronunciation part agree with what I just said about what we're gonna do for the next step? I am not seeing any objection, so I guess that's what we're gonna do. We will kind of draft of a first set of-- Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, just to reflect what's being discussed in the chat and that I would be happy to also convey Berry's proposal to council in the name.

MANJU CHEN: SCCI.

THOMAS RICKERT: Correct.

MANJU CHEN: How do you pronounce it, C or a SC? Well, I mean we can discuss about the name later probably, but yeah, I guess we will work on the leadership and stuff. We'll work on more detailed revision, suggestions, recommendations to council, and we will have the team review it before we send it to council. And I see Berry's hand.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Berry Cobb. If I might offer up a slight alternative, I do think a status update to the council is warranted. Obviously, it's not gonna happen for tomorrow's council meeting, but the May meeting I think would be a good time to spend 15 minutes, kind of like what we've done here at the start of this call to brief the full council about what's going on, not anticipating any decisions maybe some initial comments from the groups, but trying to forecast what's gonna happen here is these proposals or

possible options to the proposals for the council to consider is going to easily wind up kind of coming back to us to do some heavy lifting, so to speak.

So to Manju's point, we're memorializing the standing committee at a minimum that will require some red line drafting to the current charter to make it a permanent standing committee which would be a great opportunity for name change. And then, of course, then on the substantive matters about the membership structure and the decision-making methodologies will also probably be some hefty redline changes to the charter.

So my intervention earlier was being able to put forward possible proposals for the council to consider, I'm slightly amending my original intervention and that it's more of an update and with the council's blessing that this group would take on those next steps because if it's not this particular group, then it's gonna wind up being another small team coming out of the council to go do this heavy lifting. And so the way I see it after the briefing at the council level, a confirmation of the next steps, that very next step would indeed let's take a fresh look at the charter. Staff can start redlining on some of the things that were agreed to as removing words like the pilot, those kinds of things.

And then we can create a series of steps to determine what changes to the decision-making methodology are going to be. Based on what I'm hearing, it's sounding like the consensus model we use in working groups is probably going to be more favored than the current full consensus one. But my point is that it's likely this team that's going to be doing the work to really bring this home and to memorialize it. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Good point. I guess so we will have to be careful with the wording, in a sense, when we present to the council. Of course, I'm not suggesting that we finish every revision before we put it to the council. I guess what I think what I was suggesting was that currently, like as this slide reads, it doesn't really give any kind of what improvements or revisions we have in mind.

For example, we have discussed this for the last 40 minutes that we all agree there are some improvements and revisions that specific direction that we have to move towards so that we can maybe phrase it like this is the directions that we are aspiring or we are planning to move forward to.

We are going to create a methodology for the CCOICI, we're gonna clarify the different structures of task force and CCOICI so people don't confuse them, those kind of specific points that we will be working on, and then council will have more context to understand what we're talking about. And so yeah, I guess we all agree to that level. But yes, I see Susan, your hand, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, and sorry about this. This is kind of a tangent, but it was just when Berry was suggesting their name of the SCCI, that was kind of ringing bells with me and I was thinking like, isn't there a group called that already? And it's not, but it's called the SCII and it's the Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation.

EN

And it looks like it was set up in 2011, and the last meetings looked like they were in 2016, although I don't think it's been disbanded. And I don't think it's intended to cover what we've been covering, but it says it's responsible for reviewing and assessing the effective functioning of the GNSO procedures and the working group guidelines. But I think there might be a bit of a kind of overlap in function between that and maybe a task force.

And I don't really know what I'm saying because I only just remember this group even existed, but I wonder if we need to as part of our efforts, we need to kind of make sure that we can identify the distinction between those two groups or maybe if a staff member can say that the SCII has been disbanded and we don't have to worry about it anymore. But it sort of feels like maybe some of the task force efforts-- aha, Julia is saying it was disbanded and it had a different purpose. Then that's okay, then I'll shut up. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. I am not aware of that group and thank you Julie for the explanation. Berry, you have your hand, but mind you people, I still need to update on the CIPCWG thing, so we need to move faster. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Yeah, I'll just be brief history lesson. So, coming out of whichever organizational review it was back in 2009 that set up the bicameral structure of the house, there were remaining recommendations that needed to be implemented the SCI was set up as something

EN

maybe more recently familiar kind of PDP 3.0 that was probably for lack of a better analogy PDP 1.0, they completed their work.

I think the original idea was that it was gonna kind of be a standing committee, but there wasn't enough work in the pipeline to justify keeping it in its existence, and therefore it was disbanded. And believe it or not, the SCI acronym as part of the reason how we wound up with the CCOICI because this was also debated at the council about the naming of it, and I believe the SCCI was put forward.

But a few council members at the time were concerned that that was confusing to the SCI. So that's kind of the history of it. That group no longer exists, this is the only committee that is deemed in scope that would be handling these continuous improvement aspects. And I'd also note that back in those days of 2011, there was no foreshadowing or forecasting that the entire concept of organizational reviews in those types of improvements would change how they have that is being currently worked on as part of implementing ATRT3. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Thank you. I know nothing about this and I'm happy I'm learning a new thing today, but we definitely have to move on. I'll try to be fast in my presentation. Can we use my slides? Oh, thank you.

So this is a bit too big, but as you all know, I'm stepping down for the GNSO council rep for CIPCG, it's a cross community group, it's not a working group, it's only a group that works on the

continuous improvement of the whole ICANN because per the ATRT3 recommendations, they wanted to get rid of the organization reviews of each stakeholder groups I used to have by the independent outside reviewer and just do the improvement inside of ICANN by the community themselves, and that's why we're doing this. And thank you very much Damon for being willing to take up the representative of council on this group. So yes, that's the CI-

DAMON ASHCRAFT: You're most welcome. I look forward to it.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you very much. So that's what the CIPCG thing is, and we are in this period where we are gonna seek your feedback and report what we have been doing. So can we move to the next slide? So this is the ATRT3 recommendation that I was talking about. So you'll know this, if you've been here long enough and like what I just said, they wanted to get rid of the organization review and do it ourselves. Next slide.

So this is the roadmap, we hope to like have an initial kind of framework by the end of this year, and then probably start kind of experimenting how to adopt the framework. And then it will take three years, and of course, in between, the board will consider if this pilot is working, it's like we considering if the CCOICI pilot is working and that is they will memorialize it, formalize it, and it is like establish real CIP assessment in 2028, so it will be a long time afterwards.

And the next slides please. We had a meeting during San Juan, these are us. Look at me, I was very savvy because it was a savvy meeting. No, it was fine, we're all good. We were doing good work. And please, next slide.

We kind of finished the first step of the CI-PCCG in a sense during San Juan where we-- can we move to next slide-- where we just established the principle of the framework. So this framework will go on this like hierarchical kind of structure. The first one we will have principles, but of course we all know all different groups and constituencies and advisory committees and supporting organizations in ICANN work in different ways and have different structures and have for their own ecosystem in a way.

So we cannot enforce to the details how they should improve themselves or how they should implement continuous improvement. So we only have the fixed principles for the criteria and the cater. They will have to develop themselves, but it's not like we want them to create everything new by themselves. We will provide a list of criteria and indicators, and then they will all, each sale groups consistency SO/AC will check which criteria fits or works for them, indicators they can use to match or to be aligned with the principles. That's how this frameworks idea is gonna work. So we already established the principles. We can go to the next slide, please.

That's what I was talking about. It's a common base. The principle will be a common base, but the indicators and criteria are the tools SO/AC and other structures can use to allow for customization for each of the structure. We can go to the next slide.

EN

This we don't need to see, this is just the current objective of organization review. These are the principles that we have developed, so I'm not gonna read them. And of course, if you have been attending membership meetings within your SO groups or constituency, you probably already have seen this so I don't have to read them all again. But these are the principles we have established. And so that means we will be working on the indicators and criteria starting next month. And I believe your representative in this group will be coming back to you guys also within your SGRC to seek your feedback on these principles. Next slide, please.

So yeah, these are the homework given to the members of this working group. We will have to represent our SO groups, constituencies, or SO/AC to decide which indicators and criteria's work for us. And I'm not going to do the examples because I don't think it's very enlightening. We're just gonna skip the example.

So this is what I'm talking about. So each member are going back to their own SG SO/AC and C to ask them, do you feel comfortable with the principal? And this is the question I'm gonna pose to you too because you represent, in a sense, the GNSO council continuous improvement structure. Do we agree or feel comfortable with the five principles? We're gonna share the slides in the chat later also, so you can read through the principles too.

But I think the principle is quite non-controversial, but I don't think we'll have time to fully discuss this today either. If you guys read the principles and feel like this merits this full-on discussion, we can definitely do that in the next meeting. But if not, I guess we just let it kind of we just send back the idea that we agree with the

EN

principles or we can start the discussion in the mailing list and see if the nerds are full time, like a full meeting discussion. Next slide, please.

So yes, these are the next steps. We are now between phase two and phase three, right? Phase two is where I come to you and I ask you guys if you are comfortable with the principles. And phase three, we'll come back to the cross-community group and share how are the other groups or SO/AC feel about the principles. And then in July, August, we will have a draft framework to be published. Oh, no, we will start working on the framework and we hopefully will publish the framework in October or November. So yeah, that's it, that's my presentation.

And I invited Damon to be here because he is gonna do the work from now on. And of course, like I promised I'll stay as an alternative, so I will still follow this discussion too, so we can always have a full discussion whenever we feel needed during our CCOICI meetings. And that's it, I open the floor to any kind of questions or comments. I see no hands and no comments. Do we have a next agenda item? I don't think so. It's next step, right? Yes, next steps. Do we show the principles again? Sorry, Saewon.

SAEWON LEE: Sorry, Manju, I didn't print.

MANJU CHEN: The principles of like my slides and probably page. I don't remember which page, but up, up, up. This one. Yes, these are

EN

the principles. So Susan, do you want to comment on this or you just wanted to see them again?

SUSAN PAYNE:	No, really I just wanted to see them again because there's lots in your slide deck, isn't there? And then, so you probably explained this and I probably missed it. So are these principles gonna be what basically frames the framework that you develop? Is that how it works?

MANJU CHEN:	Yes, so these principles will be the principles that we all agree on, and then according to each principle, they will have a set of criteria as an indicator, well, was it indicators, criteria as an indicators. And then each SO/AC and the structures will choose whatever criteria or indicators they feel like fit for purpose for its structure. So that will be something that your representative from IPC on this group, we'll go back to IPC and talk and ask you like if IPC feel like this criteria fit for purpose for IPC and for us GNSO council.

Damon will be the one who check the criteria and indicators and see if they fit for purpose for council. And of course, when he is finished with the checklist, I'm sure he is gonna present it with the council and let us know if-- well, actually probably just CCOICI and we will see if we agree with the checklist.

SUSAN PAYNE:	Okay. Thank you. Got it. Thank you.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. I guess we can move on to next step because I'm determined to end on time today. So for next step, like we discussed, we will present the survey result at the next council meeting, which is May. I will be on the cruise. Oh, no I won't. Oh, thank God. I won't be on the cruise by then. I will be on the ground by then. I will probably, I hopefully will do the presentation. Do you guys think we will need another CCOICI meeting before we do this presentation to the council? Or do you think today we have discussed everything sufficiently and thoroughly?

Well, I'm not seeing any suggestions to have another meeting before next council meeting, so I guess I will be entrusted to do the presentation to the council. Of course, we will update the slides we use today to incorporate the revisions and suggestions we had during this meeting. And we will circulate them on the CCOICI mailing list and get you guy's approval before we present it to the council. And yes, Jen, we can definitely work on the mailing list if we think any improvements or suggestions are needed. I guess I'll see you guys my Friday 5:00 AM for the council meeting.

And if there's no any AOB, do we have any AOB? Oh yes, Saewon, thank you. We will update the slides and circulate it by what? What do you mean? By April. Oh, okay. So we have to submit the slides to the council by 6th of May. So we will have to circulate the slides on the CCOICI mailing list by the end of April.

EN

SAEWON LEE: Yes, April and beginning of May as long as we submit everything by May the sixth.

MANJU CHEN: Yes. Thank you very much. And look at us, we are two minutes before the ending time. Do we have any other AOBs or comments or anything else? If not, I will happily give you back one minute of your life to do whatever you're planning to do after this. Thank you very much for joining, thank you very much to listen to me, and I'll see you very soon. Bye.

SAEWON LEE: Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]