

---

## ICANN Transcription

### Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

**Wednesday, 30 March 2022 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/v4FZCw>

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

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday 30th of March 2022. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. We'll take attendance via the Zoom Room only. I don't see anyone connected via the telephone. We received apologies from Desiree Miloshevic.

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

All documentation information can be found on the wiki space and recordings will be posted there shortly after the end of the call. Please do remember to state your names before speaking. And as

---

*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.*

---

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

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Natalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, wherever you are, I hope that you're doing well. And welcome back to our CCOICI meetings. Wednesday morning for me, Wednesdays, for all of you.

As you may recall, we have an assignment from the Council about Work Stream 2 activities and information provided by that part of the IANA transition process, and this is additional to the activities that we already did about the Statement of Interest and other things that we have been doing.

So this is the idea of reviewing what we have to do, how can we face this new assignment that we have? And how can we solve all that has been requested?

So many thanks, as usual, to our fantastic staff, they have prepared a background document about Work Stream 2 where they have also highlighted the activities that we may face in relation with what we have to do about Work Stream 2.

And so we have a document that we will review in a moment with you. Maybe you have time to take a look at it. If not, we will have time after the call until the next meeting. And after that we may discuss if we think that it's okay or we have to change it and we can consider how to approach this assignment. When can we meet, if we meet every week or biweekly? And how can we move

---

forward? Any comments about the agenda, reactions, additions?  
Welcome, Thomas.

Okay, I see no hands. Hi Thomas. A great expert about Work Stream 2. We had an interesting time those years

THOMAS RICKERT: We want to reopen the trauma.

OLGA CAVALLI: That was really trauma. Now that I look at it from the distance, it's interesting, but at the time I suppose quite dramatic. But I'm glad I was part of it. It was very interesting. And you were a great chair. Okay, any comments on the agenda? I see no hands, no comments in the chat.

Hi Philippe. Marika, or Ariel, would you help us going through the background briefing document if you can, please?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, Olga, thanks. So hi, everyone, and welcome back indeed. And I'll kick things off and then I'll hand it over to Ariel, who's our staff expert on Work Stream 2 items to walk you through some of the aspects that are in the document. And we understand that there's a lot of information obviously to digest but we hope you at least had an opportunity to kind of scroll through it and get a feel for what is in there and the topics this group is expected to address.

---

I'll first very briefly touch upon near the Council direction here because, as you hopefully all know, this work started out, CCOICI started out as a pilot with two specific items, the working group self-assessments part and the GNSO Statement of Interest review, which is ongoing and the work is being undertaken by a task force.

But as the committee already finished its work on the working group self-assessment, or at least finished its initial work, there's, of course, a part that needs to be done. But that's pending public comments on the operating procedures, and Council leadership realized that there are a number of items that are pending in relation to Work Stream 2. I think, as you may recall, staff team provided an update on the status of the different recommendations during your recent Council meeting. There are a number of those that are dealt with by the community Coordination Group, which is in the process of being established.

But there are also a number of specific recommendations that require the Council to review those and where appropriate, designate the appropriate status to those and or implement recommendations that have not been implemented yet or that are not deemed complete. So basically, the Council agreed to extend the pilot for the framework for continuous improvement by directing the Council committee to take a specific look at a number of Work Stream 2 items that are listed here. And that will form the focus of the group's work.

And for each of those, the Council has also specifically indicated what the expectation is. So again, for some, it's about reviewing the current status and the staff assessment that have been made

---

---

on the status of those recommendations and either confirming that the status is accurate, or if not, indicating what the status should be and why it was correctly marked.

For some others, it's about revisiting priority levels that were assigned previously by Council, a small team that looked at these recommendations a while back. And for some others, there might be some specific implementation work that needs to be undertaken.

There's also an opportunity here for the committee to invite experts from your respective groups to either advise the CCOICI depending on the topics it's discussing or of course, you can also consult with those as part of the work of this group. And we did send out a notice to the group basically encouraging you to check if there's anyone who's willing and interested to join these conversations. I don't think we've seen any reaction so far. But I said it's, of course, something as well, as you go through these discussions.

I think we're very fortunate to have of course some experts already as part of this group, but if for any of these recommendations, the group feels that there's a need to dig a little bit deeper or have a bit of a better understanding of what the original intent behind the recommendations is, there may always be an opportunity to kind of reach out to those members that participated in these conversations and help kind of fill some of the blanks. Thank you, Manu, I see that Rafik has agreed to be that expert.

---

So you can of course let us know as well if Rafik for example wants to be subscribed to the mailing list or invited to the calls. And that is, of course all possible. Or he can of course as well relate with you directly on any questions or comments. But again, I think there's a lot of flexibility here for the committee to determine what works best and what expertise or input is needed to help you move forward on your deliberations.

And as you'll note here, as well, there was a request for staff to prepare a background briefing, and that's what we did, and Ariel will touch on that in a second. But as you may have seen as well, we actually extended it into a bit more than just a background briefing. There is obviously a lot of background information in there. But we also hope that this document can serve as a working document for the group to document and your conversations and your findings. And eventually as well, your responses to the different assignments.

And as I mentioned as well, there is a community coordination group that's in the process of being set up and I think we're very fortunate that Olga is serving on that group as the Council's representative. So that will also allow for information flowing back and forth in relation to what Coordination Group is focusing on. And there's also a specific ask under item E here for this group to provide feedback to the coordination group. So we hope at least with Olga being in both places, to have that direct linkage.

And so having said that, I think that's really specifically the Council's ask. The instructions are quite straightforward and a set of goals were documented in the background briefing. And so with that, I'm going to turn it over to Ariel so she can take over and take

---

---

you through the background document and kind of our thinking behind it and how it's structured. So that will hopefully help the conversation.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks very much, Marika, this is Ariel. Hello, everyone. And thanks for having me in the CCOICI meeting. So let me share my screen quickly. And just make sure I've got the right document. Okay. So this is a quick overview of this document. And hopefully we can help you navigate through it in a clear manner. And then just a quick tip that on the left, there's this summary menu, and you can jump to each section quickly by clicking the shortcuts on the left. So a quick kind of tip for navigating this long document.

So this page is what Marika just talked about. It's the Council direction. And I won't mention more about this. And then quickly jump to the next section about Work Stream 2. So this section provides the general background information of Work Stream 2 such as its purpose, the categorization of its final recommendations, how long the Work Stream 2 is expected to be an implementation effort in ICANN and then also a key point about not all Work Stream 2 recommendations are directed to the ICANN community and not all of them are mandatory.

So then that segues to the next section about what's the role of the community and the next steps regarding Work Stream 2. So for those on the Council call, I think in February, you probably have seen this slide before, it's an illustration of a which recommendations from Work Stream 2 are directed at the community. The upper section is about the ones that can be

implemented independently by each community group. And then for the second section is about the recommendations that the community Coordination Group has a role to play to coordinate implementation across different groups. So then this mapping inventory basically talks about the staff assessment of the recommendations that can be independently implemented by each group. And this provides an overview of that.

One key takeaway is that we need to make sure to do assessment of each recommendation and tag them with these lists of status here. So completed, action or decision required, etc. And then this you can see being reflected in the later part of this document.

And the following section about background talks about the Community Coordination Group. So this highlights these three recommendations that need some level of coordination or communication across the group. The bulk of the work still needs to be implemented by each individual groups, but there is a level of basically talking about the best practices and information sharing and then that will elaborate more in the later part of this document.

And then the end is some helpful links to the Work Stream 2 recommendation report and the various resolutions and ICANN Board directions and other documents related to this effort.

So that brings us to the next section of this document is basically the staff assessment of Recommendation 2 of Work Stream 2 final report. So it's mainly focused on 2.1 and 2.2 because these two recommendations can be implemented independently by each group and they're also mandatory. So the Council's request for

---

---

CCOICI is to review the staff assessments of these two recommendations and determine whether we did the right conclusion or there's something that wasn't correctly assessed and needs to be reevaluated.

So now, you will see the main bulk of the content under this section is basically, we highlight each of these sub recommendation under 2.1 and 2.2 in this rectangular box here, and then we write down what the staff assessment is. So for example, 2.1.1 is completed. And we also provided the rationale, why we believe it's completed. And you can read the detail in this document here.

And so maybe I should step back for a second. So basically, Recommendation 2 is about guidelines for Board director removal. And that's related to one of the powers of the Empowered Community and for decisional participant, they have that ability to basically start a Board director removal process. And then for the GNSO Council, there has been a guideline established to guide the process. So this 2.1, and 2.2 is related to that particular effort, and then based on the staff assessment, most of the sub recommendations under these two have been completed and there's the only one that we assess as implementation planned, it's a 2.1.2, and you can read more detail in the document here. And also, we have provided some staff suggestion for completing this recommendation. So that's something the CCOICI group can discuss in one of the sessions later on.

So I will scroll to the bottom of this section here, this is an important part I like to highlight is that basically, we tried to spell out exactly what CCOICI needs to do or consider in terms of this

---

---

recommendation. So these are some questions and for the group to answer is one, is the staff assessment for each sub recommendation correct? If not, why not? And then in particular, for recommendation 2.1.2, what's your consideration in terms of the staff suggestion for completing the implementation of that recommendation? So we put forward two options for consideration. So these are basically the task for CCOICI to focus on with regard to Recommendation 2.

And similarly, Recommendation 6, that's accountability related mechanism for each group to implement. And this is not a mandatory recommendation Work Stream 2, it's mainly related to like best practices, things like that. So the structure of this section is very much similar to the previous one for Recommendation 2, we basically first copy paste the language from the report in the first part of the section, spell out what's the ask from the Council, is basically to review the staff assessment of the implementation status. And then for the later parts, we provided the detailed rationale for the staff assessment for each of the sub recommendations. So you can see we repeated the recommendation language in the rectangular box, we put the staff assessment and highlight what we believe the status is and then the rationale right following that.

So, again, I think this recommendation, most of the sub recommendations are either completed or not applicable for action, and there's only one recommendation, 6.1.5 that may require action or decision from the Council. But again, this is not a mandatory recommendation, like the previous my Recommendation 2 so basically the CCOICI could advise the

---

Council whether you think it's necessary to implement or not, and if it is necessary, then staff have some suggestions in terms of how to complete the implementation of 6.1.5. And this group can discuss further about that.

So, I will just quickly scroll down to the bottom of this section and you can see this structure is repeated for each of the sub recommendation. And then at the end, this is the exact assignment for CCOICI to consider and complete to answer these three questions, is the assessment correct? If not, why not? And if 6.1.5 Is deemed necessary to be completed, what needs to be done to consider it completed? And we have further detail in the later part of this document here.

So this is a new section about Recommendation 1 diversity, it is a mandatory recommendation from Work Stream 2. So as Marika mentioned earlier, the Council had a small team to assess the priority level of each Work Stream 2 recommendation. And in that previous exercise, the Council small team believe that this recommendation is not applicable to the Council, but it is applicable to the GNSO community and the ICANN community in general.

However, as we mentioned earlier, this is a mandatory requirement. So if the CCOICI also believe it's not applicable to the Council, now we need to have a more detailed explanation of that by reviewing each of the sub recommendations and determine based on what rationale reason you believe it is not applicable. So we need to have more information to kind of justify why it's not applicable for the Council.

---

But then during your review, you may find that actually, some of the recommendation may be applicable to the Council and maybe it has been implemented to certain degree. We can provide that detail as well, to make sure they're accurately assessed. So that's why we have created this section, based on the Council's ask, is to revisit the Council's initial prioritization exercise for this recommendation, and then carry out implementation for applicable sub recommendations, if any.

So then we have also spelled out the exact assignment for the CCOICI to consider for completing this recommendation, is, does the group agree with the Council's initial prioritization that this is not applicable to the Council? And if not, why not? And what should be changed? And if yes, then we need to provide rationale for that assessment. So that's the exact ask from the Council that staff interpret it. And then that's something for the CCOICI to work on.

This is a separate section about Recommendation 3, human rights framework. This is also a mandatory recommendation. So what the Council asked is that CCOICI to carry out implementation from GNSO Council's perspective. So as you probably recall earlier, this is also a recommendation for the Community Coordination Group to work on. But also, as I mentioned previously, the bulk of the work needs to be carried out in each individual group and at CCG, different groups can exchange ideas and their best practices or ask questions so that there's a level of coordination. But the group can go ahead and work on their implementation individually.

---

So to assist the implementation of the Council we have included some relevant information about this particular recommendation. And we also noted that the PDP manual already contains different relevant provisions that may have taken into account the human rights framework. So basically, these are some relevant information for the group to digest. And then again, at the end of the section, we have spelled out the exact kind of questions for the group to consider in order to complete implementation of this recommendation. And also, I want to note that this working document is kind of being refreshed and updated as we go because as the staff work in the background, we may find additional information where we talk to our colleagues in the GAC, for example, and if they have started developing implementation for recommendation like this, and they have some important or helpful information that can be included in this working doc, then we will include that here. And then hopefully, that will be helpful for the deliberation by this group.

This is almost the end of the document. So this is recommendations 6.1.5, which I mentioned earlier is a non-mandatory recommendation, but it may require some action or decision by the Council. So this is regarding special report on accountability, transparency and participation. So the Council is asking CCOICI to consider whether it needs to be implemented, and if so, how to implement that.

And to assist your discussion of this recommendation we have included some relevant information for you to digest. And also as a heads up that from the policy staff team, there's a group that's focusing on Work Stream 2 implementation, and they already

developed some kind of template for this brief report. So if the CCOICI assess that it's necessary to implement this recommendation, then we can include that template report for you to review and consider whether that's applicable for the Council purpose. So at the end, we have also spelled out the request for CCOICI to consider for completing this recommendation that's highlighted in yellow here.

And this is the end of the document. So that's the final task for the group to do. But actually, it may be one of the first thing for the group to do, but we put it at the end. Anyway. So this is a ranking exercise for recommendation 1, 2.3, and 3. So basically, these three recommendations are going to be worked on by the Community Coordination Group.

And the group needs to have some sense of which one should be worked on first, and which one should be worked on last. And the request is for each group to rank the priority and think what's your preference in terms of the sequence of tackling these three recommendations. So basically, this is something for the group to do and then once there's a decision made, Olga can communicate that to the Community Coordination Group when it starts talking about the priority for these three recommendations. So the ask is to basically consider these recommendations and rank them in order of priority, and then help inform the prioritization by the CCG.

So yeah, that's all of the content in the report, and it's a lot to digest and appreciate it could be a little bit overwhelming. But please rest assured that when staff work with Olga to develop work plan, we'll make it digestible and cut up the work into bite-

---

---

sized pieces so that the group can work on each of these tasks in a rational and logical manner. So, I will stop here. And I see Thomas has his hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Ariel. Go ahead, Thomas. Yes.

THOMAS RICKERT: I have one question for you. First of all, thank you so much for this great overview. As you can see, the jurisdiction topic is not amongst the topics that we are supposed to take a look at. Yet when it comes to prioritization, I'm wondering whether this group is the right forum to actually have a quick discussion about the jurisdiction topic.

And that is because of the developments in Ukraine. There is, at least from my perception, but I think—I'm afraid I'm not alone in that perception. There's an increasing pressure at the UN level, at EU level, that the central coordination function shall be taken away from ICANN, because ICANN as a private organization based in California is subject to US sanctions, and that a treaty organization would not be subject to sanctions.

And whilst we can certainly not take away all concerns that might be from those who are afraid of fragmentation by sanctions regime, we have the topic of requesting ICANN Org to ask for a permit with OFAC as part of the deliberations of the jurisdiction team. I can't exactly remember what the language we came up with was, but at least I want to put it out there for discussion that this might be a good time for the community and the Org to react

---

and maybe try to work on a permit, if at all possible, or have some preliminary discussions with OFAC whether that's at all possible in order to alleviate some of the pressure that might come ICANN's way.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Thomas. Yeah, I agree with you. I was surprised that I didn't see jurisdiction because it was the hottest topic in the Work Stream 2 time. And very, very pertinent comment at this time of the Ukrainian crisis and war. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks, Olga. I just quickly looked up the Council's prioritization document. That work was undertaken a while back, I think in November and December of 2020. And actually, for that specific recommendation, it was really identified as an ICANN community and ICANN org responsibility. So not Council specific. So I'm wondering if that is more a conversation or a question for the Coordination Group. And I'm not sure, I see that it's here not listed as a community directed recommendation and also not as part of the Coordination Group recommendations. And I'm not closely enough involved to know why that is. But at least from the original assessments by that Council group, it was not identified as something for the Council only or Council specific.

Of course, having said that, if there is work for the community to do, the GNSO is a part of that with its sub parts. So it definitely would be involvement if that is indeed the direction it would go. But at least for now, this is not included as part of the work for this

---

group. But as said, if the questions around that, maybe it's something to raise with either the coordination group or even at Council level to have a conversation around whether or not it's appropriate to also direct work in relation to that recommendation to this specific committee.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. So the way to write this up would be at the Council level and the coordination group both. I see Philippe's hand is up, maybe he can give us some light on this question.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, I'm not going to be saying anything different from what Marika said, and actually, Thomas, because you all know that I share his concerns on this. And I think this is timely, that for those who would consider relevant within the GNSO to chime in at Council or as SGs or Cs in that broader debate. As you said, Marika, this is not under the remit of this group given the task that was given to it by Council. But it's certainly something that is worth raising for the reason that Thomas gave. I think it's totally timely. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Philippe. And I agree with your comments. Marika, the floor is yours.

---

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. I wanted to make another comment or different comment. As I put in the chat as well, we identified a number of questions here in the document for each of the assignments that we hope will help the group forward and kind of think through the questions you need to ask yourself to be able to give a final response or reaction to the Council's assignment. But if you believe that we haven't asked the right questions, or they should be phrased differently, please feel free to suggest that in the Google document.

As Ariel pointed out, as well, for one of the specific recommendations, we have also identified two potential options for how a recommendation and might be implemented. So that's another one where again, we're putting options on the table. That's not to say that there are not other options that you may want to consider or look at. So please feel free to kind of consider the Google document as a working document for all of you and to provide any further additions that you think will help this group forward.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Any other comments, questions? Let me check the chat. Thomas is asking for a link. That's the link. Thank you for that. Marika. And thank you very much, Ariel and Marika, for preparing the document. Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Olga. So from staff's side, I just want to answer what Thomas mentioned about the jurisdiction. I don't have all the

---

answers to the question. But I do understand that this particular recommendation is not currently directed at the community, but it's at the Org or Board level. And then there's some progress already in terms of how that jurisdiction-related recommendation has been implemented, what's the status with that.

And so if the group is interested to learn more, I'm happy to connect with the internal colleagues. So basically, there's a group in ICANN under Xavier's team. They're in charge of kind of managing the implementation of these particular recommendations, the non-community-directed ones. So I can find out more about the status of that and report back to the group if something interests the group and you want to discuss further.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Ariel. That would be very helpful. And at the same time, we can take this question to the Council and to the coordination group. Is the coordination group already established, or it's in the process? Marika, do you have information about that, or Philippe?

MARIKA KONINGS:

As far as I understand, I think it's established in the sense of that groups have appointed representatives, but I think they're still in the process of identifying first a time and date for that first meeting. That's at least as far as I understand where things stand.

---

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Thank you for that. So when the time comes, we can raise this up there. Okay. Any other comments about the document and general considerations?

Okay. So as far as I can see, the first activity for the CCOICI should be to prioritize how to start, where to start with all these recommendations. So I would encourage each of you—and for those of you that will hear the recording and are not in the call to think about it. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks Olga, and indeed, just switching back to the agenda. And indeed, we would like to or hope to get some input from the group on how to approach and how to organize the group's of work, I think both on a practical level, how much time are you willing and able to commit to this work, so to look at kind of the meeting schedule for the group.

I think originally, we started out on a weekly schedule when working on the working group self-assessment, but that turned out to be quite taxing, I think on everyone and we switched to meetings every two weeks. Is that something that that would be reasonable to expect? And also hoping or assuming that some work could be done in between calls.

And then, again, I think as Ariel suggested, we have tried to kind of have your carve out for each of these assignments, the questions that the group would need to work through. And at least from our side, think that there might be some ways in which we can do that in an interactive way, for example, by running through

---

these recommendations on calls and maybe using a polling format in Zoom to kind of get group people's assessment of is the status correct or not, if not, explain.

So again, we can work our way systematically through these assignments. And as we also noted, there are some like the human rights framework where we may benefit from some further information on what's happening at the Org level or within other communities before diving into that. So again, that might be one where we say, and maybe we leave that until—not as one of the first ones to tackle.

And then as Ariel also mentioned, the one that's last in the document is actually one that the group may want to tackle first, as it's input that is expected to be provided to the Coordination Group. And again, we could take a very straightforward approach and just send around a short survey to everyone in which we just ask you, please rank these three recommendations from your perspective of priority. So that again, Olga can take the results of that back to the coordination group.

So those are the questions we have. We can indeed as suggested or as we've done previously, start on schedule every two weeks and kind of maybe propose an order for the way we would go through these different assignments. And maybe from staff side, we could also make a bit of an indication or prediction of the time we think it may take it to do it for each of those assignments, because they're not all equal. And on the basis of that, build a bit of a timeline that will hopefully give a bit of an idea on when the group is expecting to finalize its work on these assignments. So I'll pause there and see if what I said makes sense, if people have

---

---

other ideas on how to best approach this, if there are other ways as well on working maybe between calls that may result in more progress. I think we're happy to hear any suggestions from the group.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much Marika. I think that working in between calls could be good. We may work on a shareable document or somehow to advance the activities, as there's a lot to digest. I have a question about timing. Is there a deadline for the work? Is the timeframe for delivering outputs? I don't have that in mind. Maybe it was shared. And I can't recall right now.

MARIKA KONINGS:

I can just share I think from the perspective of the Council, I think the Council didn't put a timeline on it. Maybe turning to Ariel, I don't know from kind of an overall ICANN Org and community perspective, is there any clock that is ticking?

I don't know, for example, that the coordination group—but as said, they haven't met yet. So probably it's a conversation they need to have as well. And of course, many of these recommendations have been outstanding for a while. So I think there is a desire to kind of move forward and complete the work.

But of course, if time is needed to do that and accomplish that, I don't think that there is a specific timeline really for the group to plan out its work and work towards that target.

---

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika, because this may have an impact on the frequency of the calls. If there's a certain time that we have to deliver the outputs, then maybe it's weekly or biweekly. Any comments or reactions about the frequency of meetings? Can we set up something at least preliminary now to communicate to colleagues in the output of the meeting just so they can plan their agendas? Any comments? Philippe says "This sounds reasonable to me, Marika." And Berry says, "I'm not aware of a clock we have to abide."

Thank you, Marika, for the comment. This day and time is okay for everyone. It's okay for me. And we have been having these meetings at this time. But we have new colleagues in the call. Sebastien says it's okay. Same for Thomas. "That's okay for me." Antonia says "That's okay." Okay. At first look, it seems that we are okay with this time and date. Manju, go ahead.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Olga. I think we had the meeting kind of a different time before. So it was 9:00 PM for me, but now it's 8:00 PM. Is it that we changed the time? Because I remember it was 9:00 PM for me. So it was like 13:00 UTC, but now it's 12:00 UTC. Are we going with 12:00 or 13:00? And if we're doing biweekly, are we doing the second week and fourth week of the month or the first week in the third week? Because if we're doing 12:00 UTC Wednesday, every first weekend and third week, then I have a problem with the first week, Wednesday 12:00 UTC. So if we are doing second week and fourth week, then it's perfect for me. I'm just wondering what time and day are we moving for? Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: I think you're right, Manju, the time was different before. I'm in several different meetings so I may not recall exactly. Maybe Marika can help us there remembering that. And this is a general comment. It's for us to decide. But if we can do work in-between calls, biweekly is okay. But sometimes if we don't have the calls, the pace of the work goes lower, and then we have to start again every two weeks. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. Just to confirm, we did adjust the time compared to previously, but I think it was mainly to accommodate daylight savings. And I know not everyone does daylight savings, but it was kind of to try and keep it at the same time for most. But apologies, Manju, for you, obviously, that wasn't the case.

I haven't looked far enough for kind of how the rotation works. But indeed, if we go to a meeting every two weeks, I think we can maybe do it in such a way that we try to avoid the standing conflict that you have, Manju. We're a relatively small group so hopefully it doesn't then create a conflict for someone else.

So I think if no one else has an issue with that, we can try to rotate it in such a way. I think you mentioned for you the problem is the first week of every month, right? That's the conflict you would have?

MANJU CHEN: Yes, every first Wednesday at 12:00 UTC I have a commitment.

---

MARIKA KONINGS: Okay, so we can from our side maybe have a look at how that works out if we start the meeting every two weeks from now on, if we kind of avoid that. And if not, we can see how we can adjust. I note as well that we of course are missing a couple of folks on the call. So I think it's also something that we'll kind of communicate out to the broader group and hopefully get an indication from those that are not on today whether it's because just today they couldn't make it or whether this is also a problematic time or day for them, in which case we may need to review. But as Olga noted, hopefully we can do some of the work as well in between calls or at least be able to allow people to provide input in advance of meetings in case they're not able to attend and/or be able to react to the conversations that have taken place so that everyone at least has an opportunity to weigh in before final decisions are made.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay, so we have been talking biweekly. Marika, if you can summarize this first week, second week, I didn't really take note about that. And the timing, so it's an hour later. Should we keep this one? Manju, is this timing okay, or was the previous one better? For me it's the same but just to make a proposal and outcomes of meetings. Our colleagues can say if they agree or not. [inaudible] Okay. So it's 12:00 UTC every two weeks, that's what I'm summarizing as a proposal. Any reactions, comments about that? And it could be great if we can work in between meetings so we can keep the pace of work.

---

Any other comments, reactions, hands up? I don't see any. Okay, what's left in the agenda? Next meeting would be—we will let you know in two weeks, I think. We still have five minutes. Any other comments?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, Olga, if I may. So if everyone is kind of okay with the suggestion that we made on making a bit of a plan to kind of I think map the assignments against the meetings that we have based on meeting every two weeks, and that in advance of the next meeting, if everyone's okay with us sending out a short survey where we basically just ask everyone to rank the three recommendations and then on the next meeting, and in two weeks' time, I think the group can like kind of review the results and kind of discuss whether everyone is comfortable with that order. There may be good arguments that people may make for potentially changes to the input that that was provided. So at least that first assignment can be completed fairly quickly. And it's input that Olga then can take back to the coordination group. So if that works, we'll proceed on that basis.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. Marika. Okay, any other final comments? Sebastien says that's okay. Manju also. Philippe says it's okay. Okay, if I don't see any other comments in the chat—Antonia says it's okay. Fantastic.

Okay, any final comments? We have like five minutes. Okay, if there aren't any other comments or hands up, I will give you five

---

minutes of your time more today. And thank you very much. See you in two weeks. And let's have all these things in mind and start reviewing the document and please reach out to your communities and check with them if all this is okay. And for those of you hearing the recording, please give us your feedback. And see you soon, somewhere in the virtual Internet. Thank you, Philippe. Thank you everyone. Bye. Have a nice day.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's call. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings. Take care, everybody.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**