

---

**ICANN Transcription**  
**Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement**  
**Wednesday, 12 January 2022 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/XoD3Cg>

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

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday the 12th of January 2022 at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you are only on the telephone, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Statements of interest must be up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please 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 multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Olga Cavalli. 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.*

---

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Devan. Welcome, everyone. Happy new year. I hope you had a nice holiday. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Thank you for joining after a while that we have not met.

What we have today is we will review a document with detailed information of what we have been talking about and commenting and making changes to previous documents, and new things that we have added, like surveys and other things about the working group self-assessment.

So what we have today is first we'll show you a slide which summarizes the contents of the document, which is somehow long. Not new for you, because we have been reviewing each part of it, but it's all together thanks to our dear staff members who made, as usual, a very good job. And then we will review the document in detail.

The document has redline included so you can check what has been changed and added, and we will have time to go into it closer and deeper revision, each of you, during the next days.

About our meetings, we agreed in the last call we had last year to meet every two weeks, biweekly, so we will have more time to review the document, which is, as I said, somehow long, but not new. And you can of course go into the Google doc and make your comments and suggested edits as you can review it.

So Marika or ladies, would you be so kind to show the one slide that we prepared for a summary of—hi Berry, I didn't see you before. Welcome. Hello Thomas.

So this is a summary of what is the content of the document that we will review in a moment. It has several parts. Some of them are previous documents that were revised and commented, and as I said, in the Google doc, you can find the text with redline indications.

So it says GNSO operating procedures—Annex 1 of the GNSO working group guidelines, section 6.2, working group charter template with redlines, section 7.0, working group self-assessment redline updates. Those are previous documents that were modified with comments made by yourselves.

And then standalone documents which were working group self-assessment and the working group charter template, and the new documents that we also have reviewed is the periodic survey and the technical survey requirements that some of you already indicated some changes that had to be made by the technical staff about the tool for the survey that will be used.

So this is a very high-level summary of the content of the document that we will show you right now. In the link that you have in the agenda, there is a link to a Google doc that you can review. We have two weeks to review it and all agree or change whatever or edit whatever you think that has to be changed.

The document, as you can see in a moment, it has redline, so all the changes are indicated. Welcome, Philippe. Happy new year. So, any comments about this general overview of the document that we'll review in a moment? Thank you, Marika, for sharing the link.

---

---

I see no hands and no comments. So Marika, would you be so kind to show us the document? And maybe you can help us go through it. And you will see the document, it looks long because it has all the content inside in one document, but it's the same parts of it we have been reviewing by sections. And it has also the redline including all the changes that have been suggested by you. Marika, over to you.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thank you, Olga. Hello everyone and best wishes for the new year. What you see on the screen is also the link I posted in the chat, is a document that we shared with you last week. And as Olga just shared on the slide that we had prepared, it contains a number of different elements that aim to reflect the conversation that the group has had to date in relation to the working group self-assessment.

And as you may recall, we went through a number of preliminary responses to some of the high-level questions that needed to be answered. A number of you took the test survey and provided feedback on possible enhancements or changes. We also had some comments on the more technical features of that. And that's all kind of captured in the document that you see here on the screen, which consists of a number of different elements.

As Olga already explained as well, there are a number of aspects where redline changes are being proposed to reflect your changes to existing language, either in operating procedures or other documents. And there are a couple of new documents that

---

currently do not exist yet, or is not based anywhere at the moment.

So the idea would be indeed that today we do a high level run through of what is in this document. As you may have seen as well, there are already a couple of questions that we've identified that will require further input from the group. But of course, anything else in here that either you think is not accurately reflecting what has been discussed so far, if there's anything that we've missed, please feel free to use the comment function in the Google doc to make those points. And we hope that everyone is able to do so in advance of the next meeting, which is scheduled in two weeks' time so we can use that input then to have kind of the follow-up conversation and kind of work through any kind of comments or concerns or suggestions that you may have.

The idea is that eventually this document will be in a kind of final state where this group agrees on what it contains. And that would then get submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration and review.

So having said that, I think it's probably worth just diving in there. If there any questions or any comments, of course do feel free to raise your hands and we'll pause as needed.

So on the first page is just basic recap I think of what Olga already explained, that there are a number of aspects that have been covered in this document. There are a number of sections in the GNSO operating procedures that relate to working group self-assessment. The working group charter template is another document that contains relevant links or relevant language on

---

working group self-assessment requirements. And there's of course on the working group self-assessment itself as existing documents.

So the first section in this document is basically focusing on what is currently Section 7 of the working group guidelines, which is Annex 1 of the GNSO operating procedures, which is a section that basically outlines at a high level what the working group self-assessment is all about and what it's intended to do.

You see here quite a number of redlines, but these are mainly focused on reflecting that in addition to the end-of-life survey which already existed, there is now a recommendation to also have periodic survey conducted and explaining that this is really intended to help the Council in its oversight of the working group and be able to identify or recognize in a timely manner if there are any issues that may require course correcting, which of course, based on the survey that's done at the end of the process is not easy or not possible. That's more of a forward-looking approach.

What it does here as well is to explain that the charter is the place where the details are expected to be included on when such a survey is expected to take place. And we have standard language, as it appears in the template for a variety of sections, but it's really up to the chartering organizations to adjust that as they see fit for that particular effort. And again, I think this is to recognize the overall desire to maintain and level of flexibility to allow for the chartering organization to adjust as they see best fit for this specific effort that's under way.

---

---

It also notes here the requirement for the chartering organization then to review survey results and discuss immediate improvements. And also, again, reflecting kind of the flexibility that has been discussed, to also as part of that process involve others that they may believe can help here, for example, the working group leadership, Council liaison to the effort, in staff support. And we've also included here a reference to the ombudsman, because I think that was also mentioned by some of you as a potential resource. And I'm assuming, especially when issues are identified to be able to assist.

So again, this is a fairly general section that just tries to convey the intent behind both the periodic and the end-of-life survey, but also kind of emphasize that there is flexibility here, it's not a one size fits all, it's really for the chartering organization to consider and determine what it thinks is most appropriate for the specific effort underway and at what time in its lifecycle the group is expected to undertake, especially for the periodic survey.

Moving on to the next section, which is also part of the GNSO operating procedures, which is section 6.2, which specifically talks about the working group charter template. Obviously, that's a longer section that covers all the different elements of the charter template, but it also has a specific section that relates to—previously called closure and working group self-assessment. Previously, the self-assessment was only conducted at the end. But here, updates have been made to reflect that there would also be periodic assessments in addition to the closure. So I think these are basically minor changes.

---

---

Of course, linked to that, there's the actual working group template, we've included that here in the same section. But the charter template itself is not part of the operating procedures, it's a standalone document that is of course used whenever the GNSO Council charters an effort, it's either a drafting team or the Council itself that may be responsible for completing or using the template and developing the charter. And as I mentioned before, for most of the section, it contains kind of template language to help as a first basis to fill out the template. But it's really up to the drafting team or to Council to update or change that language as it sees fit.

So again, here, the current language here basically reflects that, at the latest following the publication of the initial report, a periodic self-assessment is expected to be conducted. Again, if that timing does not seem appropriate for the effort at hand, it's up to the Council to change or modify that. And similarly, also reflecting that following the delivery of the report, there's the expectation that the closure self-assessment will be conducted.

Of course, if the Council believes that for the specific effort on the way there is no need to do this or it's not a tool that is expected to be necessary or helpful, this is not a required section as such, but I think it's probably something where hopefully in the future, useful information can be derived from such assessments, both on a periodic as well as an end-of-life kind of [inaudible].

Moving on to the next section in this document, which is the working group self-assessment itself, this is basically the end-of-life or the closure survey as it's being referred to as well. As you may recall, this is a survey that I think most of you took as a kind

---

of test, and we got already a bit of feedback on potential improvements to this that you'll see reflected in here.

And this is also where you already see a first question identified, which I don't think probably we need to discuss that now. But it's something to already start thinking about. And hopefully, by the next meeting, we can have a further discussion around that. And it's something that, of course, has come up in the deliberations as well, in relation to with whom should survey results, both raw as well as summary results, be shared. And there's of course, a current practice, as I think Emily has explained how it currently works. But of course, there may be a need to change that or have a different approach when it comes to the periodic survey versus the end-of-life survey.

The language that you see reflected here now, that's how it currently reads in the working group self-assessment, but as I said, it's really up to the group to discuss what you think is most appropriate in this regard.

So then just scrolling through again, here's another reference to kind of the confidentiality. Another thing that we will need to potentially review if there is a need for changes.

So the first redline change that you see here is I think what a number of you notice, that there currently is no ability for Nominating Committee appointees to identify themselves. So we've suggested adding this. So there are basically two categories, one where you can specify that it concerns a Nominating Committee appointee that's appointed to the GNSO

---

and another category for a Nominating Committee appointee that's non GNSO-specific.

There are a couple of minor changes here. Here, you see we removed here the reference to liaisons as it didn't seem to appropriately fit here, because it really is talking about external resources. And I think liaisons have taken on a bit of a different meaning compared to when this survey was originally developed and how liaisons are used at the moment. So we've actually created a new question further below that asks about liaisons and their functioning within the group.

One other update that we made here as well, and there was also, I think, a comment from some of you that there is that there should be specific questions as well about your staff support and their performance. And we actually believe that this section was intended to cover that aspect, but it was labeled administrative resources. So we've actually just changed the wording and made more specific as well that, of course, the staff also provides meeting support, drafting support, or the various aspects to the support that staff provides. But of course, it's also welcome to have input on that. And if there are improvements to be made, we'd definitely like to hear those as well. So again, we hope that this addresses the suggestion that was made on having a more specific category to reflect on the staff support provided.

And then we added as well, based on—and we'll get to that next, the periodic survey that also focuses on leadership as well as liaison contributions to the effort. We thought it might be helpful as well to provide that also as part of the end-of-life survey, again, as a way for the Council to have feedback. And especially, of course,

---

if there's a comparison that could be done with a periodic survey, and especially in cases where changes or corrections are made to address certain issues. This is, of course, also a way to kind of review, did the effectiveness change based on what was done or did the same issues remain? What triggered that change in the potential response? So again, it's just to kind of inform and determine whether or not there's a trend that can be established that covers both working group leadership as well as the Council liaison to the working group.

And I think that's it for this survey, apart from updates to the numbering. The one other change that we made here—and again, there was also a suggestion I think that was made by the group to also be specific about kind of asking in a general kind of comment feature whether there are any specific improvements that should be considered. Previously, there was more of a kind of, “Is there anything else you want to share?” But I think someone suggested it would be good to ask specifically if there are suggestions that come from working group members that may help inform the Council's consideration of the feedback provided and may trigger further improvements to do these efforts.

The next section covers the periodic survey. And you don't see redlines here because this is basically new. This is not an existing document that is already in place. So this is all new language. But again, similarly, of course, you're invited to comment on all aspects of this. We hope this does reflect what has been discussed today, of course. And as said, here's the same kind of question that we left in relation to the raw data, with whom is that shared, and as mentioned before, there may be a need to

---

---

differentiate between what is shared for the periodic survey versus the end-of-life survey. But again, I think it's something that the group may want to think about a bit and hopefully for the next call, make some suggestions or recommendations on what you think would be appropriate. And as well, what, for example, your expectations would be as a member participating in a working group effort. If you share your feedback and you want to be open and transparent about your experience, who do you expect to be able to see that information, or how would you expect it to be shared, under what conditions?

Here, for the first sections, we've basically copied and pasted a number of questions from the end-of-life survey, because they seem to be relevant as kind of questions that could be impacting the work of the working group at that moment. It's not so much questions that you want to ask when the group is done. So we tried to pick the most relevant questions there that seemed to be able to inform the Council if there would be issues or if there would be concerns. Again, if you think we've taken too much or taken too little, please indicate. As I said, these are all kind of copy paste from the end-of-life survey.

And then there's the kind of new section which is focused on leadership. And these are the questions that you've also reviewed that have come from the PDP 3.0 effort that already had conversations around this, what could those questions look like. And I think the feedback we got from the group I think was that you all thought this was very fit for purpose. So we haven't made any changes here and basically incorporated that wholesale into the document.

---

As said previously, I think the charter, as well as the GNSO operating language does make clear that there's flexibility here based on the needs or issues that may have been identified by leadership or by Council. There is the ability to modify the survey. This is not set in stone, this is intended to serve as kind of a basic survey, if you think something needs to be changed or updated based on specific circumstances, that is possible. It's definitely not prohibited, again, to provide the flexibility that may be necessary.

And then there's a last section in this document, as mentioned as well, as part of the conversations, there have been a number of mentions on expectations with regards to what a survey tool should be able to do or could be able to do. Our proposal is here to for you to review this, see if there are any other kind of requirements that you think are must haves or nice to haves. And maybe that's a conversation we need to have as well. Are there any must haves here or are all of these kind of nice to haves?

And our idea would then be once we have this finalized, and of course, assuming as well that the Council is supportive of those. that we'll basically use those and take them to our technical support people to have a look at, do we have a survey tool that meets all these criteria at the moment? Is there a survey tool that exists that meets all those requirements or not? And kind of see what are the options here and what is the kind of tool that's best fit for purpose and hopefully meets most, if not all, of the requirements that this group has identified as being helpful or even necessary to make this a functional exercise for working group members.

---

So that's what's contained in the document. From our perspective, this covers kind of all the aspects of the working group assessment and what's related to it. One thing I did want to note is that in relation to the changes to the operating procedures—and as you may recall, there are two sections in the GNSO operating procedures that reference the working group self-assessment. Before these changes take effect, they would need to go out for public comment.

I think that has been done in different ways. I think in certain efforts, especially where changes were deemed to be kind of maybe more far reaching or potentially controversial. I think that the working group or whoever was tasked with developing those changes would already put out those proposed changes for public comments before taking it back to the Council.

But in this case, if the group feels fairly comfortable that the proposed changes are noncontroversial of nature, one approach that could also be considered is to submit these proposed changes to the Council. And once the Council has had an opportunity to review this, to then put them out for public comment to see if there still anything that the group may have missed or that maybe proves to be more controversial than anyone thought. And then, of course, it can still come back to the Council or to this group to deal with, but if not, it would then basically be sent after that to the ICANN Board for its oversight. They don't have to approve any changes to the GNSO operating procedures, but they have an oversight role. So it basically means that they get sent to changes that are being proposed. And if they do see anything that's of concern, they will of course relay that to the Council.

---

---

So I think that's in a nutshell, what is here. I don't know if anyone has any questions at this stage. I don't know if anyone already had a chance to go through this and has any kind of initial comments or concerns that they may want to share. As said, we hope that this kind of run through helps you in thinking through potential comments or suggestions that you have so you can provide those in the Google doc head of next week's meeting. And I think that's basically it from my side. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. Any comments, reactions to this overview of the document? And before I give the floor if someone wants to say something, Marika—Thomas says that looks good. We'll go through the doc in detail. Thank you very much for that, Thomas. Marika, just to clarify the procedure, for me, sometimes I get confused with when public comments go into the process. So the document, once we agree, should go to the Council first, and then public comments, and then back to the Council? That would be the flow of activities?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olga. That would be my suggestion, assuming that this is not a kind of controversial topic. Another approach would be for the committee to put it out for public comment before it sends it to the Council. So once you kind of feel comfortable with this document, the other option is that it goes out to public comment and if there are any comments, it comes back then to the committee before it goes to the Council.

---

Again, I think from a timing perspective, it probably comes down to the same thing. Again, I think that's probably where we're counting on you as well to share this with your respective groups to kind of get an indication, is this something where you think there will be comments that need addressing or indeed, as this is more of an administrative nature, it's not making kind of very big changes to the current practices, adding more flexibility and adding more input for the Council? If that is the case, maybe it can be combined with submitting it to the council. But again, that's something I think the group can consider or decide what you think makes the most sense. Either way, at least from a staff perspective, seems to be a viable options.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika. So I suggest that you also, additional to reviewing the document, each of you consult with your own constituencies and interest group which procedure you want to follow, if we put this for public comments before sending it to the GNSO Council or go directly to the GNSO Council and then public comments and all of the following process. So that's something that we would welcome your feedback about once you have made your own consultations.

What I would like to stress is that working groups are very important for the whole ICANN community. So have in mind this idea of periodic surveys, have in mind this issue of confidentiality that could be perhaps controversial for some, this issue about surveying the leadership, and of course, the danger of sharing, to whom we share the documents and the information, the outcomes of the surveys, that it's not intimidating, that it should be a tool for

---

improving and not for making any kind of problem with participating freely or speaking freely, openly in any working group.

Any other comments, suggestions? Let me check the chat. Okay, no comments in the chat. So the next meeting is in two weeks. Marika, that is the 26th of January if I'm not mistaken, at the same time.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, that's correct.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Hello, Juan Manuel. Welcome. Happy new year to you. I didn't see you before. Okay, so I propose the following next steps. Let's please take time to review the document, make all the comments, changes, or just tell us that you agree with the document as it is. So all the suggested changes are indicated in redline. Desiree says that it looks good to her. Thank you, Desiree, for that. And also have in mind this procedure about going to public comments as a first step once we decide which is the final text or go to the Council. It's important also for knowing which are the next steps for the group. And have in mind this, who to share with the outcomes of the surveys, how the surveys are prepared. We can still change them. We've reviewed them. Some of you took the time to use the tool. Please take your time for that. Any other comments? Any other suggestions?

---

Sebastien says that it looks good, reflects everything that we discussed. Thank you very much, Sebastien. Desiree has her hand up.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: A brief question. Thank you, Marika, for taking us through. That was very helpful. My question is, since we're currently operating under the version 3.3, how many substantive changes there should be a document for the GNSO procedure to go to, I don't know, 3.4 or 4.0? Would this change be 3.4? Or let's assume that everything is accepted, and after public comments, that we adopt this new part of the operating procedure, would we renumber it?

OLGA CAVALLI: That's a good question, Desiree. Julie has her hand up. Julie. Go ahead, please.

JULIE HEDLUND: Hi. Thank you very much for your question. That's a good one. Generally, we have updated the version number of the GNSO operating procedures anytime we've made changes. And these changes, if these are accepted by this group and by the Council, do seem to be substantive enough to warrant a version renumbering. And also, what staff does is generally looks for other areas that may need to be updated at the same time. And I think staff has identified a few other updates that have just happened over time that will probably need to be incorporated into the procedures. So there'll be enough changes to warrant, I think, an updating of the version number. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Julie. Thank you, Desiree. Very good question about how to name all these changes. Any other comments, suggestions, hands up or comments? Okay, so now it's your turn to review all of this. We will share the recording of the call for those of you that could not join. It's very important that we have your feedback, especially collecting your comments from your constituencies and interest groups so we can reflect them in the document or that you agree with the document as it is. So, have that in mind.

You still have two weeks to review that and hopefully make changes or comments in the Google doc. If you have any problem in accessing documents, just let us know and we will help you. Any other comments from staff, any other comments from colleagues? I see none. So thank you very much, it was a very efficient call, and I wish you a good rest of the day. Stay safe. Bye all.

DEVAN REED:

Thank you all for joining. Once again, this meeting has been adjourned. I will end the recording and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great rest of the day.

---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**