
ICANN Transcription
Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement
Wednesday, 15 September 2021 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/OwNyCg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gns0.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 15th of September, 2021 at 13:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no role call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. I do recall Flip will be on telephone only for about 10 minutes. And if there's anyone else on telephone only, could you please identify yourselves now? Hearing no one, we do have listed apologies from Kristian Ørmen.

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 e-mail 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 the ICANN multistakeholder process are to

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.

comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Terri. You sound somehow not very clear to me. I don't know. You don't sound very clear but I got everything that you said. Thank you for that. Thank you very much for the introduction and thank you for starting the recording. Good morning from Buenos Aires. Good afternoon, good evening for those of you joining the call. We have a very good group of people today, which is very good. Let me check the agenda with you. Stephanie says, "Like you were in a well—slight echo." Yes. There was some echo. Just for you to know that your sound was not very clear.

Let me check with you the agenda and you let me know if this is fine. Welcome, we already did. Overview of proposed project plan and approach. We have sent a document with the invitation for this meeting. We will review that document, which is an Excel file. Thank you for that, Marika and staff.

And then, we have the Google Doc that we shared last week. I have been adding some comments. And also, with the fantastic help of our staff, there are some questions that we have been adding in order to enhance the document before we go forward with the assignment. So we will review that. That is also in the Google Doc that you already have shared in that link. And then, we will review what's in those two documents and we'll see what the next steps are. And we will confirm our next meeting, hopefully for next week at the same time.

Do we have any comments, or additions, or suggested changes to our agenda? I will check the chat because sometimes I don't see it. I see none so I think we are okay. I take silence as a yes. The agenda is okay.

So perhaps we can go to the first review of the document, called "Project Plan," which is a timeline that is a suggested timeline for the work of this committee. Okay. It's coming by Marika. Oh these fantastic Excel files, they are really impressive—at least for me—all the information together and all the things that are linked. So I give the floor to Marika and she can go through it. Please let us know if you have any comments or questions, along her explanation or at the end. Hola, Juan Manuel.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olga. What you see on the screen, it looks indeed like an Excel document but it's actually created through a new tool that we have access to, which is Smartsheets. I'm still learning as well. This is actually the first one I created so I'm hoping it looks good. At least it looks nice. But of course, the group will need to look at the details to make sure that it makes sense.

So what I've tried to do here is map out, at a high level, different steps that the group is expected to take and attach to that an expected timeframe for that. Of course, we're at the very early stages of our work. So this is, at the moment, really just an estimate that's being made. Of course, we have the ability to adjust as needed.

But this is also used as a tool for the Council to see where are things at, when things are expected to happen, and of course, if there are major

updates that are being made, especially with regards to delivery of milestones. That indication is provided to the Council and a reason for why certain deadlines are not met.

With that, I think the main focus for the group is really here on this part that I'm currently highlighting, which is basically that the current task we are looking at ... We had our first meeting. We're in the process of understanding the charter, and organizing our materials, and developing an approach for tackling the assignments that the group has been given, the first one being the completion of the task force assignment form, which is the next agenda item that we'll look at in closer detail.

From a timing perspective, at the moment, we've really aligned that with Council meeting times. This is a document that will need to go to the GNSO Council for its review and either approval or non-objection. So at the moment, the delivery of that document is tied to the document deadline for the October meeting.

Of course, if the group can complete its work at an earlier date, there's nothing preventing it from submitting it to the Council. But the earliest that the Council will be able to consider it is likely during its October meeting. And of course, the other way around as well. If more time is needed—if you think it will take more time to do this task—we can as well change that and update that accordingly.

I'd already included, as well, the two specific work items that the framework, as part of the pilot, will look at, which is, first of all, the task force that is to be created to look at the statements of interest. Again

here, this is just for illustration purposes at this stage—at a very high level, what this group is likely expected to do.

Once the task force is formed, it will be responsible for developing its own work plan and providing the detailed steps it will need to take to deliver on the assignment that it has been given. But this gives, at a high level, an idea, or at least from a staff perspective, what we think may be involved, and as well, a very rough time estimate for how long that might take to complete that assignment.

And then secondly here is the Council committee assignment, which is looking at the working group self-assessment. Again, we anticipate that this work would only start once the group has completed its work on the assignment form for the task force. Again, we've outlined here a number of steps that we think may be helpful for the group to undertake as it looks at this specific issue and provided some indications of the time that might be necessary.

But again, we're really hoping to hear from the group if you think this makes sense. Is too much time associated with the different steps? Too little? Are we forgetting about important milestones that should be added or do we, at a high level, have things covered here?

And then, we've already added as well, at the end, the steps that the Council will need to take, eventually, when it comes to reviewing the pilot and determining whether or not this is working as intended, whether course corrections need to be made, or whether something completely different should be explored for addressing the remaining

items that were identified as possible topics for the framework approach.

And based on what we currently have here, that would only happen in the April–May timeframe of next year, when we would anticipate that both the Council committee would have completed its assignment on the working group self-assessment but also the task force would have completed its work on the statement of interest. We’re assuming that the Council would want to review the work on both of those items, even if they might finish at different timeframes, but before it can conclude on how the pilot was working.

So I think that’s it, at a high level, from the project plan perspective. I hope you all had a chance to look at this. Of course, if you have any questions, feel free to ask them. As said, if you think that timing is not realistic, that there should be more time or less time for certain items, do let us know as well.

We will probably—and I’m probably looking at little bit at Berry here—share this with the Council for their information so they know what the Council Committee is working at and some of the timing it has in mind. So of course, before we do that, we do want to make sure that everyone’s on board with what’s included here. So maybe we can take an action item that everyone reviews this ahead of next week’s meeting and flags any concerns, comments, questions, suggested changes before that time. And after that meeting, if there are any changes that need to be made, we can do so. If not, we would basically go ahead and post this on the wiki page and share it, probably, with the Council as well.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Any comments, questions, suggestions? Berry, any comments? You're the expert in this. What's the name of this tool, Marika? Intelligent Worksheet? No?

MARIKA KONINGS: It's Smartsheets.

OLGA CAVALLI: Smartsheets. Okay. I have a comment/question. In between the 2.5 and 2.6, my understanding, this all is about the task force, right? And this is about the Council Committee, 2.6, right? And this is October. Okay. This is task force. So this date matches with this date. That's how I understand it. Is that correct?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Basically, the information here for the task force is more for illustration purposes at this stage. Once that effort kicks off, I think we would basically take it out here and they would have their own sheets, basically, with their project plan.

But I think this is just to illustrate that, of course, this is part of the overall pilot program. So at least from an overall timing perspective, we can factor it in here. I think there's also a way that you can link to that new sheet once the task force is up and running. So again, I think that is purely here now for illustrative purposes. The work for this group is

really this part and then it will continue here with this part. That's what the Council Committee will be tasked with.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. And another question. This will happen—this 2.5 and the task force assignment will happen—once the GNSO Council has reviewed the task force assignment sheet that we have to work with now. Is that correct?

MARIKA KONINGS: Correct. So at the moment, the start date for this effort is aligned with the October Council meeting. I think it's the 27th of October, if I'm not mistaken. So that would be the starting point for that effort.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. I see Berry has his hand up. Berry, the floor is yours. Good morning.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Olga. Good morning. Just to build on what Marika was saying, rows 2.5.2 to 2.5.5 ... I guess I first should say these number assignments are what they call work breakdown structure. It's basically a unique number assignment for each task. But the 2.5.2 to 2.5.5, as Marika noted, once that task force kicks off, it will maintain its own project plan, once they determine exactly what they think that they need to work on to complete the assignment.

And in essence, for this particular project plan it will essentially collapse into one row. And as Marika noted, then we can link these together so when that particular plan is updated ... And if it changes—for example, if they missed a delivery date—it automatically will reflect in our overall CCOICI plan here.

And then, the final thing I'll add to this is the predecessors over to the right. This is a technique used in project management, in essence meaning that task 2.5.2 can't start until 2.5.1 is done. And when we get into the details of the different task force assignments, some tasks can be worked in parallel while some can't start until others are completed. That's the concept of the predecessors.

But what it advantageous here is that if you happen to miss the date on the previous task and we update to a new completion date, it automatically cascades new dates down the row so we have an immediate visibility into what the date shifts might look like and what impact that will have, not only within this particular plan or for this particular group to manage the task force. But ultimately, it connects into the Council's larger tool that we call the portfolio management tool so that we have a higher-level visibility into all of the different moving parts of working groups and those kinds of things. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Berry, for your clarification. And also, I commend you for your work with the larger version of this Smartsheet. Any comments? I see that Stephanie has some comments in the chat.

Maybe you can speak up or can read them. I have to open the chat to see that. Let me check.

BERRY COBB:

What I'll also note, to Stephanie's comment about the magnifier glass is absolutely. Project plans, or project schedules to be more accurate, are a precision instrument and sometimes they can get rather large. I believe what we'll also be building out, once the other task force kicks off, is really what we're terming as a work plan. It's really a more tactical version of the project plan but its intent is just to set out the meeting schedule and the tasks that are immediately in front of the group.

This tool is really more for staff and leadership to use as a guide to see and measure our progress. We have no expectation that community members become project managers overnight. And these things can be difficult to read sometimes so we'll create a more simplified and tactical version to this to help manage the work.

OLGA CAVALLI:

I think that creating a softer worksheet could be okay. But in my experience, at first sight, it's a lot of information. But once you go into detail and understand the logic, then it all makes sense. But sometimes, at least for me, it's a matter of taking the time to read it in detail. But I agree that having, perhaps, a simplified or summary of all the information could be very helpful. Thank you for that suggestion, Berry. Stephanie, any other comments? I'm going to check that chat.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm just teasing.

OLGA CAVALLI: Oh. Okay.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think this looks wonderful.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'll just use my widescreen. That's all. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. That's something. For all these kind of documents, I use the big computer on the wide screen and for other purposes, I use my smaller-screen computer, which doesn't help in this case. Any other comments? Any other thoughts about this worksheet? I see none so I will take silence as everything is fine. Thank you very much, Marika and Berry, for taking the time on the explanations.

And now, could we please put I the screen the Google Doc so we can see the suggested questions that were made by staff? Thank you for that. I don't know what happened with my throat today. No COVID. I promise. I'm vaccinated. So what staff did with this document—and thank you, thank you very much for that—they added some questions

into some sections of the document, trying to review it in detail and see if you are okay or you want it to be redrafted or adding more details.

And also, I did some comments. I don't see my comments. Oh. For some reason, it appears to be one of my other Gmail accounts. But this is me. This is one of my projects. But this SSIG LAC, it's me. I added some comments here.

So we will review it and see the questions that are marked in yellow and see if you are okay with the questions. We have more comments and we can add more information for every question. Perhaps you can comment in this meeting, or in the next week, or answer this question.

The first part is the short description of the assignment it says, "task force to review statement of interest requirements and make recommendations accordingly. This should include soliciting input from the community on the current use and experiences with the statements of interest, as well as suggestions for possible improvements." So the question we have for you is, "Is this short description enough? Is it sufficient? What additional information could be provided? This may be a section that is best completed when other parts of the template have been filled out."

My comment is if I am not involved with this and I read this short description, I don't have a sense of what's the purpose of—what is expected as outcome of the task force. So my suggestion would be to include what is expected. What happens when the task force finishes its work? But that's just my suggestion. Any reactions to these questions?

Any comments? Any ideas that we can enhance this part? I have Marika and then Thomas. Marika, go ahead, please.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Olga. Just maybe as a reminder for the group, what this document is intended to be or become is basically instructions for the task force. It's basically their charter for what they're expected to do. There was a template that was provided in the framework documents that had the basic headings and the expectations of what needed to be filled out. So we used that at a starting point and basically asked the group to look at this and start putting in your ideas and suggestions.

We saw yesterday that there was little of that at that point. So we thought that it might be helpful, indeed, to be more specific about what are the questions that the group needs to answer or provide input on that we can then use to translate that into specific language to be included here?

We've suggested to Olga, from the staff side, we're happy to hold the pen based on the feedback that you share. Of course, if someone in the group is willing to take up the pen and write the proposed language for these different sections, that's more than fine with us as well. So I think that's what we're really trying to do here—walk through each of these sections and decide what direction does the group want to take and focusing on what does the task force need to deliver on its project?

I think Olga made here a very good point. And maybe just to flag as well, there is a section a bit further down that we've added here, that really says, "What are the questions to be addressed?" And maybe here is also

a part where you want to spell out, in addition to the questions, what are you expected to deliver? Is that, indeed, a rewrite of the provisions that are currently in the operating procedures? Is it more specific guidance? Is it a combination? Anything is possible.

So again, the more guidance the committee can provide to the task force on what they're expected to do and the questions they're expected to answer, the more likely they are to be successful, without having to come back with too many questions.

The first one here, we did note that maybe this is one where the group will need to come back to once you've gone through the other sections because this, of course, to a certain degree, is a summary version of what's in the rest of the document. But as Olga noted and others may have comments as well, it's maybe important to focus on what do you expect to be included here? We already took note, indeed. Expectations of what the task force is expected to deliver or provide is, of course, an important one here.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. I have Thomas next. Thomas, go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Hi, everyone. Thanks, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello.

THOMAS RICKERT: I was just wondering but maybe Marika has already, at least in part, responded to that point. I think that probably at the outset of the document, if we actually get to the point where enforcing inaccurate SOIs or not providing an SOI at all would become part of the outcome, maybe it would be good to reflect that in the language at the top of the document. We are talking about current use and experience but not where this might move. So maybe it would make sense to at least throw in the word, like “accountability consequences,” or maybe a native speaker has a better suggestion on how to tweak this so that this aspect of the work is also reflected at the beginning. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Thomas. Very good suggestion. I have Berry. Berry, go ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Olga. Just to build up on what Thomas was suggesting, staff is working on methods by which to enforce that a statement of interest is a part of any new group that spins up, in terms of enrolling for that specific PDP or working group that requires a statement of interest. Right now, it’s manually performed, in terms of the upfront stages of that group’s spinning up. But we are working on a different process and a system whereby it is an automatic requirement for enrollment. So at least that part, we’ll know, will be 100% that they won’t be able to complete enrollment until they have that SOI filled out. Enforcing the contents is an entirely different topic. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thomas, is that an old hand? Thank you, Thomas. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. I just wanted to note—and I think Berry already kind of mentioned there at the end—there are, of course, two aspects. I heard Thomas use the word “accuracy.”

So I think, indeed, on the one hand, there’s how can we make sure that someone has an SOI before they’re able to participate? And I think Berry noted that a solution is in the works for that. I think, indeed, now that is manually checked and people are sent reminders and harassed. So they’ve actually done that. But there is a process in the works that might automate that and ensure that, indeed, someone needs to complete that step before they’re able to participate.

Then, the other question is, indeed, the accuracy and enforcement, or potential enforcement of that. This is probably not the forum to get into the details of that but I think it’s worth, if that is a question the group wants to look at, to make sure that it includes in the guidance or the background information the conversations that happened at the time of the development of the original SOI.

I do remember that there were conversations around, indeed, how can accuracy be ensured? Who should be doing that? And in what way could that be done? And I think, at that stage at least, staff clearly said it’s not a role that we feel we can take on. Maybe there are other mechanisms or other tools that could be considered. But as said, for the

context, it may be worth for the task force to look back at the history of that conversation, as it is something that I recall was also discussed in the context of the original SOI. But I think at that stage, there was at least not a solution found or identified that could assure accuracy of the data that was provided by those filling in the statement of interest.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. I have Thomas again.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah. Sorry for getting back into the queue.

OLGA CAVALLI: No. That's okay.

THOMAS RICKERT: At this stage, I'm not suggesting any way to deal with this. I think that would be premature. But I think it would be good to find some words to describe what we're up to—maybe enforcement or escalation. Otherwise, it would be said too much. But I think what the idea behind this is, is that we want to discuss ways on how to improve the usefulness of that information.

And I think we don't want this to be a too-high hurdle for volunteers to surpass in order to be part of the community. So I think it shouldn't sound too draconic or too deterring. We want to be very inclusive. I think talking about accuracy has multiple facets. If you declare one

more interest than you're actually pursuing or advancing at the given point in time, would that make the entire SOI incorrect at that point?

I think we need to be very careful in where we are navigating with this. As I said, it's premature to predetermine the outcome. But a few words on what we're up to and maybe you guys like the idea of how to increase the usefulness of this information, which could have an enforcement aspect to it—could be a way to frame this. Thanks, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Thomas. Perhaps my suggestion of expected outcome was, perhaps, too much. But I think that you make a good point about it. My English is limited. Maybe other words can be used, apart from "outcome." Stephanie, welcome and go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I actually like "outcomes" because I think one of the questions primordiales that you have to ask is why are we asking for an SOI? What's the purpose? I do think, as pointed out in the document—or at least it's referenced in the document—there's a difference, I think, in purpose between an SOI for a particular type of working group and ones that a leadership position in an advisory committee might have because the policy goals are somewhat different. So determining exactly what the goals are, maybe we can't have a one-size-fits-all SOI for everyone across the community because the needs, the way I see it, are quite different.

And I think that maybe a word that might help is “rigor.” At the moment, in my opinion, this form has no rigor. It’s just a form. When I say people need to be interrogated, I mean the firm needs to provide more guidance about what to put in a section. I wasn’t suggesting torture. And I think is clear the goal of this is not to squeeze customer lists out of people. But we do have to understand, basically, whose interests an individual might be representing.

I can think of examples of people who, over the years, as I’ve seen them come up to the microphone, they’re very clear who they’re representing. Others are less clear. And I think that clarity about representation is a worthy goal, I think, in a working group. Anyway, I’m getting too deep into the substance here but I do think we need something like, perhaps, the word “rigor.” Thomas says he doesn’t like “enforcement.” But “rigor” is a little broader-based. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Stephanie. Philippe, welcome. Go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Hi, everyone. I was about to stay, on a totally separate point ... Stephanie has made those that I was about to put forward. It’s essential to identify, either here, and probably within the task force instead, the end customer—maybe not explicitly but at least what the information is used for. The difficulty [inaudible].

OLGA CAVALLI: You sound very strange, Philippe. I didn't get everything that you said. I don't know if others had the same—

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'm sorry. I'll just put my note, then ... I'll put it in the chat. I don't want to waste your time.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. The last part of your comment, I didn't get. I don't know if others did get that but sorry for that and thank you for your comments. Stephanie, is this an old hand? I think Philippe is an old hand. Marika, you're next.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Olga. That may allow me, as well—the comments that I think Philippe made, and others, and Stephanie the same—maybe to focus a little bit on the specific questions that would need to be asked. I think it's something we flag here as well. What is the original objective of the SOI. And I think we've also seen, indeed, that SOIs have been used by many other groups outside of the GNSO.

And Stephanie made a very good point there. The task force may need to consider are there different purposes for SOIs. And I think at the same, of course, the task force may not be in a position to define the purpose for other groups and should really focus, of course, in the context of the GNSO and GNSO policy development process. But it needs to be very aware that if it makes changes to how the SOI is used

and the template that's currently part of the wiki, it may have implications outside of the GNSO world.

So I think that is probably an important factor that needs to be called out and guidance needs to be provided to the task force. They need to be aware of that, even though their remit is, of course, focused on what changes, if any, need to be made to the SOI from the perspective of the GNSO and the GNSO policy development process for which this is, indeed, a requirement to participate.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika, and thank you, Philippe for your comments in the chat. He was about to say, "A statement of interest is public information. We have to know what they are used for here or in the task force, like Marika says, basically." Thank you, Philippe. Sorry I didn't see your comments because of the noise. Flip, you're next. Welcome.

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Olga. I may be repeating what others have said but I think the points were quite important. Even if we raise issues like how deep should we dig into this on the substance, we should ask the question to ourselves whether that's our role. But maybe we should—definitely if we discuss topics like enforcement, I think it's worth mentioning them, raising them. And if it's not up to this group to actually go further, we should at least mention it to the GNSO Council.

I think, just to give you an example, everybody is sensitive towards what is actually the SOI? What is it for? I would like to remind everybody of the obligation to be transparent. It's a basic rule of the Bylaws, of the Articles of Incorporation, of the commitments, of the Expected Standards of Behavior that we are all reminded to by staff at the beginning of almost every call we have. And I think it's important that whatever initiative we take, such initiatives should be viewed in the framework of the existing rules and laws that actually govern what ICANN is doing, and what the working groups, and what the constituencies, and what the bodies of ICANN are doing or are expected to do.

So we shouldn't be afraid to raise these. I'm not sure we actually have the competence to solve points that we all may raise but we should raise them. They are very important. I don't think that the purpose is to have these task forces just do an exercise, just for the exercise of it. I think we want to do this because it's useful, I hope. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thank you, Flip. I think it's a good point. So maybe all the concerns should be raised and then it's the task force that will develop the work and see the outcome. More comments in the chat? No more comments in the chat. Thank you very much for that. Very constructive. And all these comments will be reflected in a new version.

About background information, I think it's very complete. I read it. Maybe those of you that are more into the history and background

documents of the GNSO could review it but I think it's okay. But if you find there is some document that could be added, let us know.

And about point three, yeah. It could be good if we can separate the questions. I think we have already talked about that. "Is the original objective of the statement of interest still valid? If not, why not and what should the current objective be?"

Two, "Based on the response to question one, is the request of information to be provided as part of the SOI still fit for purpose? If not, why not and what would need to be changed to make it fit for purpose? Based on the responses to questions one and two, what updates, if any, would need to be made to the GNSO Operating Procedures? And as part of its deliberations, task force should also consider how the statement of interest is used across the GNSO, as well as outside of the GNSO, as proposed changes could have a broader impact." They will have because you have to fill it for many purposes in ICANN.

"The task force should consider whether there's value in having different types of statements of interest—for example, one that is specific to policy development and others that may serve other purposes." That is an interesting thing to consider, depending upon what you're involved in, what kind of information you should be disclosing or not.

Should we think about other questions? I think it's quite clear and it explains the general purpose of the task force. I don't know if I added ... Staff observations. I think staff has a lot of experience about all this. So their observations could be very valuable. That's my comment here.

This is me. This is one of my e-mail accounts. I don't know why it was linked with this thing. Should we add any other questions or other explanations of this assignment questions to be addressed by the task force?

Of course, you can review this document in detail during the week. And I'll take silence as ... Oh. I have Flip. Sorry. I was focusing on the chat. Flip, go ahead, please. Oh. It's an old hand. Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Olga. Of course, we took notes of some of the input that has already been provided. So I think some of these questions, we may be able to fine tune even a bit more or have sub-questions that will help the task force thought process in getting to a response.

One thing to potentially add—and that's, again, providing some guidance and context—might be for the group to look at the previous conversation on this topic and maybe see, at the time, did the group look at our SOIs used in other contexts, maybe comparable to ICANN? Or maybe that's something that could be done now as well and see. Do other organizations have similar requirements? And if so, how do they apply them or how do they deal with making sure that people know what to fill in, that they kept up-to-date?

What happens, indeed, if someone says, "Hey. You've stated this but I know you are being paid by someone else to be here." Are there any processes in place? Again, maybe there is nothing that's comparable. But it might be worth to provide some guidance on that, saying, "Look.

If the group wants to look around or has experience from outside of ICANN that might be helpful to consider, it might be worth adding that.”

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. No comments in the chat. No new hands. Can we move up the document? Because we have other yellow parts. I have a comment about the membership composition because if I read it as an outsider, each task force, we have a minimum of two representatives from each constituency—as a maximum, sorry—a maximum of two representatives from each constituency or stakeholder group and up to two alternates. What’s the minimum? Do we have a minimum requirement? That’s a maximum? Should that be stated or considered, especially noting that there are so many different activities that the members of the community are involved in? Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Olga. I just wanted to provide a little bit of context around the original language in the framework document. As we explained as well, on the last call, in the framework document, there has been some default language that’s included in relation to membership composition, as well as decision-making. But it’s really up to the Council committee to either confirm whether it wants to use that default option or whether it wants to use something different. But if it does, it would need to provide a rationale for why a different approach is recommended.

I think the background here, between having a maximum is more around making sure that that group stays manageable and it is representative. So groups assign who they would like to participate in

this. A minimum, yes. I think, from our perspective, we always want to make sure that at least each group is represented at least with one person. But it's sometimes hard to force those that might not have an interest in the topic, although I think in this one, there might hopefully be a broad interest in discussing and reviewing that topic.

And then, there's also the Council Committee liaison. So someone from this group would also be part of the task force to provide that link between the task force and the Council Committee. To Juan Manuel's question, it's really up to the constituencies and stakeholder groups to decide who they assign. So they can pick new people, people that have been around for a long time. Even if Council Committee members would want to participant in the task force, that's not, I think, prevented either by the setup. So that's really a decision each constituency and stakeholder group would need to make.

The framework document also provides that the Council Committee may invite liaisons or subject matter experts to join the task force. For example, if indeed ... And I don't recall who was holding the pen at the time when the original SOI was developed. But if that person is still around and might have valuable information on how the discussions went at that time or some of their views on how, in the end, it was implemented, that might be helpful, or if someone from another organization that uses SOIs wants to speak. Again, there's flexibility here in who can participate in this conversation.

So I think the question is really, here, indeed, is that default composition sufficient for this purpose? Should something else be considered? And if so, what should that be. Olga already mentioned is there a minimum

that should be included as well, that at least indicates that at least each group—each GNSO stakeholder group and constituency—should appoint at least one person. Again, of course, it's not something that we can force. If no one's willing to raise a hand or step forward, it's more difficult.

I think, in this case, you may also want to ask the question. I think that also comes up in a later entry here on this topic. Is there a need to involve or reach out to other groups, either in the form of having them participate in the task force, or alternatively, through public comment or early engagement?

As said, there are others that use the SOI. Is it important for the task force to know that or be aware of that? In what level of detail? This could, of course, as well, be done at the outset of the task force work. They could reach out to all the SOs and ACs and say, "Hey. We're starting a review of the GNSO SOI. We are aware that some other groups are also using the format that's on the wiki. If you're using this, do let us know for what purpose you use it and any input you may have, based on your experience, that may help our work." That might also be, of course, a way of obtaining that input.

So again, I think this is really about what should the task force look like? As said, the composition proposed here is a representative model but in a way that it's a small, manageable group to move this work, hopefully, forward in a fairly short order.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika. Thank you very much. I have a comment from Stephanie in the chat, "One of the purposes of the statement of interest is surely to ensure that there is truly multistakeholder representation. In the case of large/dominant companies, it is possible to have a PDP with reps of the same company appearing in a variety of ICANN groups, resulting in over-representation of one organization. Unfortunately, customer relationships are also important in those relationship situations and that is a tough nut to crack." Thank you, Stephanie. No other comments in the chat. Any other comments about the composition of the task force?

Hearing none, let's move on into the document. I think we have more yellows. About the decision-making methodology, it's full consensus. Any comments about that? I think this is the way that most of the work and activities in the GNSO sphere happen. But do we have any comments about the decision-making methodology for the task force? Let's see the chat.

I think timeline is the last one. Oh, no. We have several. And timeline. "What is a reasonable timeframe in which the task force is expected to complete its assignment and answer the assignment questions?" We did review some expected timeline. "Please factor in that proposed changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures require public comment. Also, the assignment indicates that as part of its efforts, the task force should include soliciting input from the community on the current use and experience with the statement of interest, as well as suggestions for possible improvements."

Comments about timeline? We did review expected timeline at the beginning of the call and with this Smartsheet. That will be at least our desired timeline or expectation of timeline. Any comments about this? Nothing in the chat.

And then, consultation. “In addition to the input from the community, as well as suggestions for possible improvements, what other consultations should be done, apart from the community?” Nothing comes to my mind in this moment. Maybe we can all reflect about this document. Could be this week enough for us to review and perhaps have more questions, comments—comments to these questions that staff has suggested? Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Olga. So maybe, already, based on some of the input that we’ve received today, maybe staff can try to provide some language here for these different sections. Maybe that will make it easier for members of the committee to react and indicate whether or not they like something or whether anything further needs to be added. I think we can maybe do that over the next couple of days and flag that to the group so that, ahead of the next week’s meeting, hopefully everyone can then have a closer look at actual text for these different entries, and make suggestions, and provide ideas for what might be missing or what may need to be changed. Maybe that’s helpful.

As said, of course, if anyone here wants to pick up the pen and write some of these parts, that’s not an issue for us, either. But we thought it

might be helpful to, as a next step, move to some specific language that may make it easier for members to react to and provide their input on.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. This is much appreciated. But of course, if colleagues from the committee want to put their comments in the Google Doc, as I did—and I will change my name there. That’s the wrong thing—please do. That would help, of course, the work of Marika and staff. So that would be very helpful. Maybe you can reflect and think about what we talked, and some other ideas come to your mind, and you can reflect them in comments that could be incorporated into the document.

We are almost at the hour. Any other comments? Any other ideas, suggestions, questions? Okay. Hearing none, I think we have done this review of this document. Thank you, Marika and staffs for these questions. They were very useful. Thank you to all of you for your active participation. Please check the document once it has more new content and we will review it in the next call.

Are we okay having this call next Wednesday at the same time? It is September 22nd. It’s okay, the time, for all of you? I see Flip has his hand up. Flip, you want to comment? Flip?

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Olga. I see we are 11 people on the call. I frankly did not see who is there and who is not. I see at least four people from staff.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. We are not [inaudible].

FLIP PETILLION: What is the meaning of this? Maybe Philippe is the one to respond. Are we councilors expected to invest time and effort in this or is this on an interest base? What is the purpose, frankly? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's a good question? Any comments to that?

MARIKA KONINGS: Just for your information, I've just put on the screen the membership of this group. And as you may know, each stakeholder group and constituency was asked to assign one representative to this committee. We do have a couple of apologies for today's meeting.

I can maybe ask our secretariat colleagues to follow up with those that did not show up and did not send apologies to remind them gently that they were appointed to be here. Of course, it is important that we have input from everyone. But they are all part, of course, of the mailing list and will have an opportunity, as well, to contribute to the Google Doc and hopefully be able to participate in the next meeting that we have.

OLGA CAVALLI: About the NomCom appointee, Desiree is a member of the Council yes. I think that she was reached out by staff. But the idea is that she

participates. I can reach out to her. Stephanie makes a comment. Yeah, Marika. But she's willing to participate, about Desiree.

Stephanie said, "Funny you should mention that Philippe. I have been wondering if we should have some mechanism to shield information that might be required for some purposes." So she's talking about the document. Flip, I cannot answer that. Philippe, his hand is up. Maybe you can comment on Flip's suggestions.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I can try my audio. Can you hear me now? Is that slightly better?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. It's better.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. I don't know what didn't work. But basically, to Flip's question, there's nothing specific to this group. You were all appointed, or volunteered, or voluntold for that matter, by your constituency. So expected to channel or voice your inputs to this group. The question is more about the need for a weekly call on this. And that's probably a question. Do we need to have that or should we proceed by e-mail?

My impression—and that's just that—is that we're making good progress with our weekly call. I appreciate that maybe I haven't looked at the group but it may be a bit of a burden for some of us. I don't know. But if people would be fine with sticking to the timeslot, I think that would be a good thing. So there are two questions—the weekly calls

and the slate of members here. Hopefully, that addresses at least the first question.

As to the second, it's really up to you. My preference, for what it's worth, and it's only that, would be to have those calls. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Philippe. I have volunteered. I am available for chairing but I cannot force people to participate. Maybe we can insist a little bit more by e-mail. I honestly had a very busy week this week and I didn't do that. Usually, when I chair, I try to provoke things in the e-mail list during the week or during the time in between calls.

I think we did good progress. We could try, if you agree, with having a call next week in two weeks and then see how it evolves. But I'm available for everything that you decide. I'm in your hands. So we'll have the call next week. Is that okay or not?

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you very much. I'm not there to make decisions. If you want to review the weekly calls, happy to review it. Frankly, honestly, the fewer meetings we have, the better for me. As long as we have a clear focus and the opportunity to prepare, that's fine for me.

OLGA CAVALLI:

The thing is, we have to send a document to the GNSO for revision so we have to comply with our own task. So up to you guys or maybe so the group. I would suggest that we can have ... My suggestion would be

let's try next week. And let's try to be more active in the e-mail list—I promise to do that during the week—and see if we can have more active participation from all the members of the group. Is that a good suggestion? Are you okay with that? I see Flip nodding. I don't see anybody opposing. Okay. I'll take silence as a yes. Yes, yes, yes. Thank you very much, Philippe. Wisdom, thank you for that. Yes, Thomas.

Okay. So let's think about this document during this week. Let's plan for our next call on next Wednesday. And please review the inputs that—the supplemented document. Remember, it's a Google Doc. You can just go and add your comments or edit it. And let's see how we have improved for the next call. And I wish you a good rest of the week and a nice weekend. Chau. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, all.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes. Bye all.

OLGA CAVALLI: Bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]