
**ICANN Transcription
CCOICI Team
Wednesday, 03 July 2024 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/gIDIF>

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

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday, the 3rd of July, 2024. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, open your mic and speak up now or raise your hand. All right.

All documentation and information can be found on the Wikis pace. Recordings will be posted to the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And 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, Manju Chen. Please begin, Manju.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you very much, Julie. Hi, everyone. I hope you had a great week after last week's meeting. And I hope you have time to do your home work. I know. I don't know why, but somehow this July, we are all very busy. We all have a lot of meetings. Almost every day of the week, we have different meetings. So I totally understand if you're too occupied to do more, but I definitely hope we have a kind of productive meeting for today. And I'd like to welcome Prudence, who will be replacing Antonia as the Registrar Stakeholder Group rep on the CCOICI. Since we all know Prudence, I don't think we will force her into a self-introduction one more time. And we'll just get started. And today, we will also rely on Berry to take us over to the most important part, which is the CCOICI charter updates. And if not anyone has any questions, I think we can go straight ahead. And I'll hand the floor to Berry. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you very much, Manju. Berry Cobb for the record. And Prudence, we'll have the staff team send you a link to this particular wiki page. And it might be useful for you to catch the recording of last week's call. And it will help set some of the framing for what we're discussing today, although I will be doing a quick drive-by on some of those topics. So the core of our agenda, we're just going to quickly review through some of the reminders in the work plan, kind of a quick recap from last week's call. We want to do a quick window shopping of what the current red line looks like of the pilot charter for this standing committee. But the bulk of our work will be around kind of the scope of work. And I'm using this label, stress test, which is probably a little too strong of

a word. But hopefully that'll make sense when we get into some of the details around it.

Before I get off of the agenda page, something in terms of doing the homework and diving a little bit deeper into the past, what I would like this group to pay attention to is the original name of this group. Most of you know I'm not super fond of at least the acronym for this name, but it is very telling about what this group is about, what the standing committee will be about. And two or three key words here, one is overseeing and implementing continuous improvement. And I really think that that title does help set up the framework for how we're trying to evolve this charter into a permanent standing committee.

I'm going to go through some of the quick slides. We're going to start off, again, from a timeline perspective. We kicked things off in May and June. We're here in the middle trying to revise or create a new charter to make this a standing committee. At some point at the end of the year, we want to be able to return this back to the council for their consideration and adoption. That's a high-level summary. We have our tactical work plan, and we'll keep updating this as we move from week to week in discussion to discussion. We are here for today.

And a couple of takeaways about this tactical work plan. One, we have a series of calls set up to discuss the issues that were found from the results of the survey about the standing committee and its task forces. And from a staff perspective, we'd really like to nail down some of those issues before we actually produce a first draft of the charter. But hopefully after a couple of discussions between now and the end of July, staff can get into that first draft, and then

we can start to revise and amend as appropriate through the discussions getting to our final deliverable.

One other side note, our third meeting, which I believe would technically be the 45th meeting of the standing committee, there is a doodle poll that has been sent out. We've only got about half of the group responding to it, but we're still trying to find a time for the week of the 15th. I believe July 17th is where we're targeting, but we don't have a specific time. I'd say 11:00 or 11:30 UTC is kind of where we're landing. So we do ask the group to go fill out that doodle poll if you haven't, so we can get that scheduled and on your calendars.

Of course, you know, just as a highlight, why are we so aggressive to getting this done by the end of the year? It's because there's larger forces in play. We've got the continuous improvement program or the CIPCCG that is working on the continuous improvement framework. That framework, this group, it's anticipated will be on the receiving end of doing these continuous improvement assessment periods and any other implementation. So our main goal here is to try to make the standing committee ready and fit for purpose for when this work starts to complete. And of course, finally, there's a lot larger forces in play of everything going on in the reviews department as well as the draft five-year strategic plan for FY26, some of which includes a lot of continuous improvement types of things and some of which will likely impact the GNSO one way or another. So we need to be aware of all of these other activities going on.

And then finally, in terms of the recap, there was also a slide here, which was kind of intended to be homework for the group. And if

you haven't reviewed through this homework from this particular slide, fear not because we've taken, we've gone down an extra level in terms of looking at all of the events. And that's really the core of today's meeting is looking at all the previous activities related to improvements specifically within the GNSO. But when you get a chance, you'll want to not necessarily use this slide, but it still sets some framing about the bylaws, specifically what the council was thinking at the time when we set up the pilot and some other little nuggets. So this slide will always be in this deck because I think it'll be an easy reference point for us to move back.

So in terms of the reminders, again, this particular pilot was initiated back in June. It concluded in May 2024 when we did the analysis of the survey results about how fit for purpose this framework is at a very high level. There were issues that need to be tackled with respect to the decision-making methodologies, either at the standing committee or at the task force level. We need to clarify the differences between both of them. And ultimately we need to get to this new charter. And kind of the three big areas that we're focusing on is, you know, what is the structure of the committee and possible task forces? What decision-making methodology will they be using? And then of course, a lot of that is framed by exactly what this group is anticipated to be doing.

And the final part of the recap is we're still working under our overarching principle that this framework that was established for the pilot is still fit for purpose. There is a scope of assignments that this actual standing committee would be responsible for. Generally speaking, that would be any improvements that the

council needs to implement with respect to its remit as managers of the policy development process. But at the same time, recognizing that there are other improvements that will need to be executed against for the larger GNSO. And this is where the concept of the task forces came into play, is because it's likely that some of these improvements will fall outside of policy development. And of course, from a participation perspective, we can't just keep it solely within the council. You know, we'll be wanting to have represented groups participate on these task forces for these non-policy types of improvements.

And the final thing that I'll say is Manju had a great idea when we met a week before last about how we get started on this, which initially we were taking the approach of starting to redline the pilot charter, which I'll show you here in a second. But staff didn't feel empowered to start a brand-new charter and not be perceived as trying to make particular decisions about the framing of this and these kinds of things. So Manju came up with the idea of trying to lay down some principles. Essentially, we've got them divided into three large buckets. None of these are written in stone. In fact, after doing some of my homework, I'm personally even thinking there's some adjustments to be made here, but they're really just trying to help us create some guardrails and framing around what the potential standing committee charter may look like.

You know, we talked mostly about composition principles from last week. We also talked about some of the decision-making principles and what the leadership would look like in this space. And then we kind of ran out of time, but we also talked about what is the scope of projects that are going to be, that possibly that the

standing committee and task forces will be responsible for executing against. And in particular, I think to keep in mind for today's discussion is according to the pilot framework, and we're assuming the principle will survive under this new charter, is that basically any project about improvements will need to be approved first by the GNSO council, or put another way, the standing committee or task forces don't have standing to create their own work. There will be this oversight mechanism. And the second part of it is practically any work that the standing committee or task forces will be doing, it's expected that this kind of work, they will be viewed as projects because there is a start date and an end date with an expected outcome. And typically, all of them are probably going to last longer than four months. And therefore, these specific areas of work will need some sort of charter and some sort of project schedule by which we can load into our project management tools and have a better understanding of the backlog.

And the other aspect, I think, which is what is most important, the current pilot charter also contained work that would be in scope for the pilot. And it also included a shopping cart of possible work that the standing committee or task forces could do in the future. And what we want to avoid for the purposes of creating this new permanent standing committee charter is we can't load in the actual projects or work that will be in this permanent charter. Otherwise, we would constantly needing to be revising this particular charter. So we can't be overly prescriptive about the exact work that the standing committee and task forces will be on, but we can manage that separately as kind of a backlog or a list of possible projects that this group may be able to take on.

Let me go ahead and kick over real quick from our agenda perspective here. Just want to give you a quick window shopping about the charter and where we're going. So in preparation, and I can send you this link here for you to browse and you get a kind of a sense, and I know that you're not going to be able to see, or this is going to be pretty small on your screen. We're not going to be going into the details of this red line, but really the takeaway here is staff first took an attempt at starting to redline the pilot charter. What contents can survive and be repurposed for a permanent standing committee versus those things that aren't applicable for our typical charters. But when you get into the objectives, the scope, the framework of the structure, which gets into the membership, the responsibilities, the setup of the task forces, decision-making methodologies, all of these components are going to be a part of our future permanent charter, of course, with revision based on this group's discussions. But then we get down into a lot of the stuff that typically you wouldn't find in a normal charter, at least for a particular standing committee. And this is the prescriptive listing of the possible work that the standing committee or task forces would be tasked to do. And so it's these kinds of things where we want to avoid being overly prescriptive and use a different vehicle to manage this actual work.

So the takeaway here, though, is that first, this pilot charter is not in a typical format of GNSO charters. So we need to go to a completely different vehicle. And it's also a takeaway that much of the substance within this pilot charter is going to change, or put more succinctly, this draft pilot or this pilot charter document is absolutely no longer fit for purpose because our final deliverable is going to start to look like this. So this is our standard template for

the GNSO and its charters. What I'm displaying here is the GNSO Council Standing Selection Committee charter. And you'll see that it's pretty brief in here. I think kind of the same general principle applies to them. They are tasked with acquiring expressions of interest for leadership types of positions across a variety of different groups. And they can't be very prescriptive about exactly what groups that they'll be looking to find and evaluate and ultimately select and pass candidates for consideration at the GNSO Council. So it's not prescriptive very much, but it operates completely different than what this standing committee will be. So this thin version of a standing committee charter is probably not going to be completely fit for purpose for what we need to do here. Whereas conversely, when we look at one of our EPDP charters, this particular one is for the EPDP on IDNs, it is much more descriptive about not only the scope of work that a particular PDP will get into, but what we're really interested in is to be able to leverage some of the concepts or aspects. Some of these aspects of our PDP charters, I think, will be useful for our permanent standing committee and task force charters, because we get into what are the work products that are going to be delivered from particular project to project? What is going to be the resourcing? What is going to be the staffing and formation and membership structure of our standing committee? As well as the task forces, when are they going to be applicable? When may they change? Maybe perhaps depending on the type of scope of work. What are the key roles? Do we have members, participants, those kinds of aspects? You know, what is going to be the distribution of membership across the stakeholder groups and constituencies?

Of course, this one is different for the EPDP, because more than likely, most of our task forces won't include other SO or AC members. But still, the concept here, in developing this type of charter, is trying to seek the appropriate balance by which to gain or determine consensus levels of the outputs from these particular groups. You know, things like membership criteria and another important aspect from our PDP charters, which seem to be coming out of the results from the survey of this group, is what is the decision-making methodology? Which ties back to one of the principles that we're operating under now, based on that feedback, is more than likely we'll be leveraging the 3.6 standard methodology for decision-making that outlines the different levels of consensus.

So I think the summary here is that the pilot charter is no longer fit for purpose. We need to get it into a GNSO-style type of template, and the likely deliverable here will be a blend between the standing committee charter that we've used for a different group, as well as a lot of the more robust components around group formation and decision-making methodologies that we get in our PDP types of working groups. I'm going to stop there. Any questions, comments, kind of about where we're at and where we think we're wanting to go before I get into the core of our discussions? Hearing and seeing none.

Okay, so the rest of our time here today is talking about the scope of work. Now it has no direct connection to the group structure or its decision-making methodology, but based on some of the results from the survey, there was some feedback that some of the task forces in particular weren't properly represented and that

couldn't operate under the paradigm of full consensus for anything to be delivered out of it. And I felt in terms of doing the homework before last week's call, as well as doing deeper homework for this week's call, it would be helpful to understand what are the continuous improvement types of things that have gone on over time and frame it in a way that these are the things that were worked on, thus their scope of work, but put into the context of what decision-making methodologies were used and what were the group structures like.

So that takes us to the stress test chart. And I'll zoom in here for a little bit, but I encourage you to follow along within the sheet on your own and we'll get into kind of some of the details. So before I zoom in, at a high level, column A are the different types of efforts that have gone on almost from the beginning. I wouldn't say that this is a comprehensive list of everything that occurred from an improvements or reviews perspective, but it is the big blockbuster items. And as we continue to do our homework, maybe we find other smaller efforts that may be relevant to this particular chart. But in general, column A is what is the effort that was being worked on.

Column B is an attempt as I'm using the label sponsor as what was the decision-making body that initiated this type of work or this particular project, and that will vary depending on the type of work. Column C is the group that actually did the work and made a particular deliverable. The date is an approximate end date of these activities or these efforts that occurred. This is nowhere near precise, but I just basically used it to try to put some kind of historical order into the different types of efforts. But more

importantly is what were the decision methods that were used for these groups when they created their deliverables and ultimately were passed back to the decision-making body that initiated the work.

And the column F or notable outcomes is definitely not a precise statement of outcomes. It's really more generalities of the high-level outcomes from these particular efforts, just to kind of start to delineate between things that were specific to policy development versus non-policy types of improvements that went on. And then finally, column G are just links to all of the various websites or wiki pages or decisions. Again, not fully comprehensive, but they are a key place to start should you want to drill down and better understand these things.

The last thing I'll say about the overview, which I had mentioned, is starting to think about where we need to go. I think there's a common phrase is you can't determine where you want to go until you know where you came from, or how can you enhance or evolve for the future if you don't know what happened in the past. So the first up to column 15 are basically all of the previous efforts that have occurred on at least on a time scale. Most have been completed. Some are still open when we get into some of the more minuscule tasks.

But then we get into rows 16 and 17, and I put a "you are here" kind of icon. And specifically what we're doing here today is row 17, modifying the standing committee pilot charter to become a permanent standing committee. And then I want us to think about what are some of the work, let's peer out into the future through our perfect crystal balls about what work could possibly be coming

the standing committee's way and/or its task forces, and to kind of game theory and stress test, again, for lack of a better word, what would be the group structure, what would be their decision-making methodology, and those kinds of things.

And then finally, these items that are in kind of a, I don't know, an off yellow, these were specific work items that were identified in our pilot charter here that this particular group has not worked on yet. But at some point in time, this group will want to analyze if these previous possible assignments are still fit for purpose. Things may have moved on since they were originally identified, and there's some other work going on that may keep them on our backlog list, or perhaps they've been accounted for through other work.

And finally, on row 28, I'm highlighting this in red because we're really kind of doing this right now, which is the assignment number two, where the council committee will develop a proposed approach for developing and implementing continuous improvement plans as outlined by ATRT3, specifically recommendation 3.6, that is the continuous improvement program that's going on now. So technically, we are kind of working on this one as part of us doing the pilot charter that we're converting the pilot charter to a permanent charter.

So a couple of observations when doing this. Most of the work that you see on the screen now here, when you try to look at the long arc of time of things that have gone on, my first observation is, well, gosh, we've actually been doing continuous improvement all this time. We've just done it, it was initiated in different ways or by different decision-making bodies. And there's some variance in the

groups' formations when they were tasked to do this stuff. And the decision-making methods are more or less consistent, but there are some slight variations.

But one common thread, when you start to go back and look at these very early types of organizational review types of context, is there's a common theme that has gone on from the very beginning to what we're even seeing now in the draft five-year strategic plan. And that's generally that PDPs are slow, they take too much time, they aren't fully representative and fully inclusive, and we need to look for better ways to make the PDPs function. And in some ways, it's kind of entertaining to see that thread transitioning all of this time. And so my conclusion is either A, we are actually continuously improving, even though we don't think we are, or B, we as ICANN at large aren't doing a good enough job improving the things or improving the problems that were originally identified in all of these. Personally, I think it's option A, that it is more along the continuous improvement timeline. But let's not make a mistake that when we see some of these inputs from this historical context, many of them were about PDPs, and we still see specifically extended durations of how long it takes policy to get done, get it agreed by the council, and of course, subsequently implemented. Those are one of the major problems that the GNSO community is still tackling with.

And the other thing, the second observation that I'll highlight here is when you look at these from row to row, with the exception of the GNSO 1 and GNSO 2 review, largely all of these other efforts were specifically targeted to improvements to the policy development process, whether that be charters, doing project

management stuff, moving or including a more represented model versus the open models, things about working group self-assessments, we've touched on statements of interest. All of those components about managing the policy development process and its lifecycle through to implementation.

But the reason why I included these first four rows is the future of this standing committee is also needing to account for the implementation of ATRT3 3.6, which is eventually that continuous improvement programs, these assessment periods that feed into the future holistic review, all of that is meant to replace what we commonly refer to as organizational reviews that have occurred in GNSO 1 and GNSO 2.

And if anything, I strongly encourage this group to go read through the original reports and their particular findings. It is very eye-opening as kind of a high level, what was tagged as GNSO 1 review, what first was interesting to me is the sponsor of this particular group was the board governance committee at the time. It was initiated by the ICANN board. The board governance committee formed a working group that conducted this review. I need to dig into the details a little bit more, but I believe that a consultant was brought on to help organize and manage the work. But what was important about this is this external board governance group through the bylaws conducted a review about the GNSO and its policy development process and structure, came up with the results, did consult and collaborate with the GNSO, but ultimately the board is the group that adopted the recommendations and then instructed the GNSO to go implement them. And at a very, very high level, this is what led to the

bicameral structure of the GNSO that we see today, and also modified the remit of the GNSO council to be managers of the PDP, as opposed to just creating and adopting policy at the council level, which at the time was very transformative. And that's almost about the time that my day one at ICANN came in, in early 2009, when that bicameral structure was stood up.

But then we kick over to the second GNSO review. And at the time, I believe there was still basically a five-year interval between the first report and when the second review is initiated, but it changed a little bit. You know, now the board structure had evolved. They have a specific committee, the OEC, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. The decision at the time was to utilize an independent examiner. That independent examiner consulted with the GNSO and the board to create its report.

What you'll find when you start to dig into the original scoping and framing of this effort is that the organizational structure, the bicameral structure of the GNSO was not a part of its scope. So the scope of the GNSO 2 review was much more on the policy development side of things, and I believe it also included updates to voting thresholds on the council, but the actual structure component of the GNSO was not part of the scope. But ultimately, it was kind of the same decision-making methods that happened. It's initiated by the board, brought in the independent examiner, consulted with the GNSO and the GNSO council, the independent examiner sent its report to the OEC that was ultimately adopted by the board, and then the GNSO council was instructed to go implement it, which is what set off a couple of things afterwards

and that I'll get into in a second. But by and large, we're talking about recommendations on improving participation and representation, continuous improvement development, recommendations around better transparency and alignment with ICANN's future, and again, a link to get to some of the details of that.

But that is partially what initiated a previous standing committee on improvements. Look how simple that acronym is, the Standing Committee on Improvements. But they were basically tasked from the GNSO council as part of implementing some of the items from the GNSO 2 review, but it also had a standing committee, which is, I think, almost identical to our current structure of this particular standing committee. It was essentially one representative from each group and one NOMCOM appointee. But then we start looking at what was their decision making methodology. And at that time, the SCI even operated under full consensus only. The items that were sent to the GNSO council were of course voted on. And I had to summarize it, I just included links about what the output of this particular group was.

Conversely, though, and independent of any kind of organizational review activities, we had the policy and implementation working group. Now this particular initiative was mostly initiated by the GNSO council based on feedback from the GNSO community. And I believe it had a lot to do with the implementation around the gTLD program that led up to the 2012 round.

So this was initiated, I believe, in 2012 or 2013-ish and took a couple of years. But this was what we label a non-PDP working group. They had a specific charter. It was a working group. It used

the standard decision-making methodology the standard levels of consensus from full consensus all the way down to divergence. But this is what led us to the new concepts of EPDPs, GGPs, the implementation, the CPIF framework, so on and so forth. And I think looking back, that particular group made some meaningful recommendations that have been implemented by which the GNSO operates today that just so happens to also fall in line with what is open for public comment right now. You'll recall seeing that the GDS implementation team, Karen's team, had sent a draft policy status report that is open for public comment. After that public comment proceeding closes, they will produce the report that already contains certain recommendation, draft recommendations. But ultimately, that draft report will modify their PSR document that will eventually be set to the GNSO council. And you know, kind of the question on the table is kind of working under the assumption that the council would consider and perhaps adopt some of those recommendations. It's conceivable that this standing committee and/or a task force would be tasked with implementing it and hence why it's listed here, but it does indeed have connective tissue or breadcrumbs back to these previous activities. Lawrence, I see your hand. Please go ahead. Lawrence, if you're speaking, we can't hear you, but I see your mic is unmuted. I see the hand is down. If you're having mic issues, do please feel free to type into the chat and I'll be able to answer your question there.

So I think the only other things that I want to highlight here, and you know, the intent wasn't really to go through all of this in detail by detail. This is really the homework that we should all be doing to help frame what the final permanent standing committee charter

will look like. But I do want to highlight some things to consider about what we're looking at into the future.

So I've already talked about this a lot, but we already have representatives from the GNSO that are participating on the CIP CCG. That work is scheduled to wrap up at the end of the year and the board make a decision or evaluate the outputs from that first quarter of next year, which is also the timeframe by which the continuous improvement assessment periods are supposed to kick in. And there's not 100% clarity about where what the vehicle will be for these assessment periods, but broadly speaking, it's conceived that there are principles, criteria, and indicators that three-tiered framework will be a somewhat standard template that can be reused across all of the SOs and ACs, but each individual SO or AC is empowered to build upon that framework. And the assessment periods themselves are really going to be up to their respective community group, but there does need to be a standardized vehicle by which to enter the assessments that is sounding like it's going to be the form of some kind of survey mechanism that will be deployed across all of the groups and the outputs of these assessment periods are what are going to feed into that future holistic review that will then, their mandate is basically to, is perceived to be per the ATRT3 recommendations that they will evaluate how all of the SOs and ACs are working together and independently and whether there are opportunities to make improvements on those particular structures.

What's not super clear to me is, does the holistic review also peer down into a particular community group's constituent parts? For example, how do the SGs and Cs work together within the

GNSO? My understanding is no, but I don't want to be quoted on that, but either way, it is this standing committee that would be empowered to consider those things as part of its assessment periods. Are our individual SGs and Cs being accountable and transparent and functioning efficiently and effectively per the guidelines, principles, and indicators established in the continuous improvement framework? So those are kinds of the things that we're needing to account for in the establishment of this as a permanent standing committee that is most likely going to be on the receiving end doing these analysis, looking for opportunities for improvement, and of course, implementing these types of improvements should they occur.

So I see we only have about 12 minutes left. I'm going to make one final highlight here, which is to think about, again, more in the future. So you know, this is January 2028 timeframe, but we should be thinking about what happens if the holistic reviews create recommendations that impact the GNSO one way or another. Ultimately, those recommendations are adopted by the board. They would instruct likely the GNSO council to implement those recommendations, and it's likely that this permanent standing committee would be the vehicle to implement those things. So that's something to kind of keep in mind about how we frame the charter to account for that work.

And then kind of some more tactical thought processes or thought exercises, game theory. Technically speaking, I put GNSO 3 review here because these organizational reviews, we're still on the hook for delivering them up until such time the bylaws have been amended. And we don't believe that the bylaws will be

amended per the ATRT recommendations until the continuous improvement program has gained traction and the board has considered the pilot holistic review, which is scheduled to kick off in September. So all of those events need to converge to meet the board's criteria and satisfaction about initiating those bylaw changes. So the takeaway is until such time, we're on the hook to do a GNSO 3 review. It's just a question, will it actually be initiated or will it eventually be sunset because the board is comfortable with the continuous improvement program and the holistic review.

And then finally, another thought exercise, PDP 4.0. So when we think about that, let's look back at PDP 3.0 and how it got initiated. So this summary here does not do justice of what actually occurred, but at a very high level, I believe it was the council's first SPS in 2018. I want to say either December 2018 or January 2019. I can't remember the exact time, but at that strategic planning session, it was understood that there were issues with our current PDPs. There were quite significant deliberations about it. I think maybe even some of the SG&C chairs were involved at the time. The action item that came out of that strategic planning session was staff to develop a report about possible improvements to PDPs. That report was reviewed by the GNSO council as well as the full GNSO. I want to say that it even went through a public comment period, but I can't remember exactly. At the end of the day, the GNSO council adopted the recommendations that were listed in the PDP 3.0, and that's where it initiated a GNSO council small team to go implement them. And up until February 2020 timeframe is when they implemented all of the outputs of those recommendations for 3.0.

But interestingly enough, it was just a GNSO council small team. It wasn't like what we're considering for a task force. That council small team, along with staff, implemented those recommendations that you can now see on the procedures page on the GNSO, and a lot of which is what is used today from all of the program project management stuff that we do for our working groups, our PDPs, clarity around participation and group participation and represented models, the working group self-assessments that occur at the middle and the end of PDPs and a bunch of various other activities.

So think about in the future, what would a PDP 4.0 look like? Would it still be a decision for the GNSO council? Or does it come from somewhere else, such as a board initiated type of effort as part of trying to implement against the new five-year strategic plan? What are some of those triggering events that a PDP 4.0 would get stood up? Who's the decision-making body that would be behind it? Most likely the GNSO council.

If it is specific to the PDP, is it something that just this particular standing committee should work on, or should it be a task force where we bring in more representatives from the GNSO? And of course, we don't know, we can't predict the exact future, but depending on what the group is that is executing against it, what kind of decision method would be appropriate? Would it be the standard methodology of the different consensus levels and those kinds of things?

And to end with, the little bit of not so good news is when we evaluate what I think caused a lot of some of the concerns about the items that we're having to deal with today, and that was the

single use of the task force around SOIs. That particular task force was initiated. It turned out to be really a GNSO small team. It wasn't only just the council, but I'm going to put air quotes around small because there were very little volunteers in that initial group, nor was there actually a chair. Staff actually wound up playing that role. But the TLDR is that there wasn't complete agreement in the task force. The work product came back up to the standing committee where there wasn't complete agreement. Ultimately, that report was still delivered to the GNSO council where it did not pass at the GNSO council, by which is still an outstanding issue with much broader visibility outside of the GNSO. So that's something to take into account.

So I'm going to stop there. I've talked far longer than I wanted to. We only have four minutes left. I think basically here between now and the next meeting, strongly encourage the groups to hear into the past, think about the present, and dream about the future and about how we can get to our ultimate deliverable. I'll turn it back to you, Manju. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. Does anyone have any questions or comments to make? So I think we were all trying to absorb everything throughout this 45 to 50 minutes. I definitely learned a lot. Again, I hope you guys all do too. I guess we will be deciding next steps. For last week, we were saying that we're going to start seeing the charter as staff has started drafting, but I think I was mistaken. Actually, we will start to look at the key issues as Berry has explained in the very first of his presentation, which is the key principles. Do we agree with the principles? If we agree, then the

staff, of course, they will feel empowered to start drafting according to the principles. So I think that will be our next step. So that means that's what we're going to discuss for the next meeting. And to have an efficient and substantial discussion of these key issues, according to these principles.

I guess what we did for this meeting or in the last meeting was we gave a lot of materials for us to do homework, because you have to understand the history to imagine a future. At least that's what I think we should do. And I hope you guys all think the same. We know where we came from, why we are here to better frame our future, to avoid past mistakes. So I urge definitely all of you to do your homework before our next meeting. We're not having a meeting next week because I have some other stuff next week to do. But this week, I think we haven't really finalized the time, right? We're not sure yet about time. This is a tentative time. It will be on Wednesday. Wait, I thought we moved IDN to that time.

BERRY COBB:

Don't pay attention to this particular time. The date and time is still up for discussion. But the point is we want to have a meeting this particular week, just date and time or TBD.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, yes. So please do your homework. And I know it's summer. And I know we have different styles probably to do homework when you're a student and it's summer. So even summer assignments or whatsoever, somebody, some people do it at the first week of the summer vacation so we can have fun for the rest

of the summer. Some people do it until the last days or somebody, some people are more organized. They do it gradually per week or per day or whatsoever. Whatever style you have, please do it according to your own style and finish them. As long as you finish them, it's good. So we're at the time and I hope if you have any questions, you're always welcome to throw it to the panelists and we, I mean, I say we, but mostly staff, right? Because they're always more intelligent than me. They will try to answer you and if it's something we need to discuss before answering, we'll do that too. But yes, please fill out the Doodle poll so we know when we will be meeting the week after next week. And I hope you do your homework, please, according to your own style, but just do it. I'll see you next-next week and have a nice summer, rest of your day, rest of your night, rest of your whatever time. If you're enjoying your national holiday tomorrow, happy holiday. If you're not, you can resent your work as I do, but still work. And if I am not seeing any other comments, we will wrap up the meeting now. Thank you very much for joining. Thank you. Bye. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]