DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Devan Reed for the recording. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday, 14 August, 2024 at 12:00 UTC. 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 your Statements of Interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in 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 CHEN: Thank you, Devan. Welcome, everyone. This is our 48th meeting, and I know because there's this Board Consultation Webinar thing right after this, so I guess we won't waste time. We'll just get started in case people are interested in attending the one right after this. That was my welcome, and so let's move on to the second item on the agenda. Yes, today we changed the time to 12:00 UTC, and next week we're not going to have a meeting. As you can see, next meeting is going to be on the 28th of August, because next week we're having APRIGF in Taipei, so a lot of folks will come to Taiwan, and we will be discussing Internet Governance things.

We will continue to review the draft charter. Oh, no, actually, we will start to review the draft charter on the meeting of 28th of August. I think our discussions from previous weeks has given staff enough confidence to start drafting the charter, which I thank you all, and thank staff for their continuous support, and then please remember to provide input to this document that we have reviewed the week before last week. As you can see on the screen, this is the document.

We had a very fruitful discussion regarding all the criterias per each principles, and I remember we actually had a few suggestions to edit, and I tried to catch all of them in my comments, but as I said before, I don't speak English growing up, so I won't be able to come up as beautiful and clean sentences as you guys, so please go check it and go suggest your edits, just because Damon has to bring this back to the CIP thing. As you have seen from this email, I forwarded from him to the list. So, please do that by next week, and then that, I think that concludes our second agenda item.

The third agenda item is Observations from ccNSO's Guidelines Review Committee, which Berry will be introducing this topic. He has done us a huge favor by talking to Bart, is it Bart, from ccNSO's supporting staff, and he will be introducing his observations of how they kind of conduct Continuous Improvement in ccNSO. Over to you, Berry. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Welcome, everyone. Berry Cobb, for the record. So, yeah, from a staff perspective, we're still a little bit hung up on basically two aspects of what the permanent charter may look like. The

first is in the realm of prioritization of the work, because I, at least from my perspective, we're forecasting that things are going to get busy in the realm of Continuous Improvement within the GNSO. And then, my second concern which is probably even more concerning than the prioritization, is the actual resourcing of this work.

The Standing Committee, when it is made a permanent Standing Committee, if you think about our current roster that we have right now, and assuming everybody that's a part of this current Standing Committee attended every meeting that this Standing Committee would have, we, when we look at this roster, it's almost half of the council. And one thing that is, I'm not sure what term to use, but when community members sign up to be councilors for their respective groups on the council, the primary job is all about representing their group for council matters.

When we make this a permanent Standing Committee, and under the current membership structure, we've now, or we're about to double the commitment of councilors going forward, or almost half of the council. And when I think about that on a monthly basis, for the GNSO chairs, they meet three to four times a month in addition to the single council meeting to prepare agendas, review through Action Items, review the agenda, review the minutes, and then start to set up for the next following council meeting.

The council as a whole typically only meets once a month. On occasion, there's extraordinary meetings. And then when we think about all of the Small Teams that have been launched in the recent past, several of which are in the genre of Continuous Improvements, my forecast is, this

particular Standing Committee will be meeting anywhere from one to five times a month over the course of any council year. And just on those back of the napkin kind of calculations, that sounds like a pretty heavy commitment. But when I try to look forward or ahead, again, from our last call where we talked about the Use Case of the current Small Team on the board readiness recommendations, assuming that that work continues forward as originally discussed, that work is expected to go through the end of the year.

Thinking about Statements of Interest 2.0, not knowing exactly what form the next element of work will look like, what we know is that this topic is of interest to groups outside of just the GNSO. For any next steps, there's a kind of a dependency to determine what those next steps are based on the delivery of the external ethics policy. So, it's very likely we don't know what form or what the scope will look like, but it's highly probable that the GNSO will be tasked to future work around Statements of Interest.

And then thirdly, in the short term, there was the Policy Status Report on Policy and Implementation that contained several recommendations, and that report is expected to be delivered back to the GNSO council a couple of months from now. I don't have a target date. But those three items are squarely within the proposed scope of this particular Standing Committee and it's not yet clear whether it would just be the Standing Committee doing the work or it would utilize the task forces where we need to reach out more broadly across the GNSO. But regardless, much of this Standing Committee is going to be busy doing much of that work.

So, that's the one thing that I really want this group here to understand about the resource requirements and commitments to do it. And if this group is already operating at 80 to 100% capacity, that's where the prioritization starts to come into play. And therefore, I think ultimately, through information supplied by the Standing Committee, ultimately the council will need to make decisions about the prioritization of that work. So, if we were mid-stride on board readiness recommendations, would this group be able to take on Statement of Interest 2.0, or the recommendations from the Policy Status Report on Policy and Implementation? And that starts to get busy, if not messy, when we think about that, especially depending on the timing.

So, that's one primary aspect that I wanted, want the group to think about. And in context of this, that's what made me reach out to Bart Boswinkel, that is the staff support for the ccNSO. If you're not aware, the ccNSO has really been ahead of the curve for a long time in a couple of areas. One, they have a Standing Committee around budget and operations. That group basically reviews any strategic plan materials of ICANN org, the annual budget and operations process. They formulate their comments and those kinds of things.

The GNSO used to have the SCBO, the Standing Committee on Budget and Operations. Unfortunately, over time, the participation on that group waned, and ultimately that Standing Committee was wound down. And it was replaced by kind of a more-broad GNSO town hall concept that really hasn't been utilized or leveraged. And so, when we look at it from the context of the budget and operations perspective, the GNSO, I guess ultimately has made the decision that any input that the GNSO would provide to those aspects are going to be done at the

stakeholder group and constituency level. And for the most part, unless something is oddly out of sync, it's still possible for the GNSO council to submit a comment on that. But likely, it would be some Small Team if the council figured some kind of comment was appropriate at that time.

And what the GNSO has had in the past was a Standing Committee on improvements, but that was eventually wound down as a result of implementing from the 2014 GNSO organizational review, where there didn't seem to be enough work in the pipeline to warrant maintaining the Standing Committee.

ATRT3 and the Implementation of Recommendation 3.6 to a Continuous Improvement framework has moved the goalpost. Really, it's shifted the whole stadium now. So, instead of these periodic organizational reviews, each of the SOs and ACs are supposed to be doing this Continuous Improvement. So, in that context is why I wanted to reach out to Bart to better understand what their guidelines review committee is about.

This is the ccNSO's version of their CCOICI. They call it the GRC. And a couple of interesting observations about this. So, this has really been, from the GRC or the ccNSO perspective, has been in operation since around 2014. So, almost a decade. They're essentially tasked to review the guidelines of the ccNSO. And ultimately, after any analysis or proposed changes, they send them back to the council for adoption. Really not too much different than what we're proposing here for this particular Standing Committee and its task forces. And this will be the vehicle for any future Continuous Improvement work.

They don't necessarily use "Continuous Improvement" when we're looking at their charter or their scope of activities. But it is within that genre. And the one thing that I want to point out about their homepage here is the roster of the group. What you'll notice specifically within the working group members, there are two current ccNSO councilors that are comprised of this group. Sean Copeland, that happens to be the chair of the GRC, as well as Stephen Deerhake, that's just a normal member, but has also been a longtime council member.

And then thirdly, kind of interest, is Katrina that is currently sitting on the ICANN board. And as well as the OEC, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, that basically provides oversight around all of the reviews stuff and the implementation of ATRT3, the Pilot Holistic Review, all of those kinds of things. And it's convenient for them because she's also on that committee. She can help inform the Working Group, the GRC, of any aspects related to Continuous Improvement to help keep this group informed. But the real takeaway here is of all of these members, really only two of them are on the council and they're relying on the more-broad ccNSO to do the work here.

Now granted, their scope and frequency of work may be less than what we need to deal with here in the GNSO. But again, it seems that they've made a conscious decision that they can't overburden their council with this work because they need to do council-related type of work, not necessarily focusing on improvements.

Second observation, just want to take a quick scan through their draft charter. You're going to see that the latest adoption date was February of 2022. And my limited understanding is that their charter was

updated based on recommendations that were identified from their previous organizational review. And they were tasked to make these particular updates to their charter, hence kind of a more recent publication date. Before we kind of get into the details of their charter, what I thought would be helpful is to review their background first.

So, the ccNSO, generally speaking, was a recognized body within ICANN in early to middle of 2004. Very much like the GNSO, they have their own operating procedures, their own working group guidelines, and those kinds of things. Basically, in June of 2008, they adopted their initial set of their guidelines and operating procedures, how they appoint NomCom appointees, interaction with the strategic plan, and, travel funding considerations from one ICANN meeting to the next. And then they decided to shut down that particular group when they had these particular guidelines set up.

But then they had their first organizational review, and not knowing all of the specifics, essentially, that's when they determined that the guidelines needed to be updated and to conclude better roles and responsibilities and be more concrete about updating the operating procedures or guidelines for the ccNSO, but it also established about reviewing what the overall ccNSO work plan is, as well as the standing up of what they call a triage committee that outlines kind of new work that has been identified or the pipeline of existing work that they want to accomplish. But ultimately, it was in 2014 that they decided to stand up the GRC and make it a permanent Standing Committee.

Going up to the top of their charter, and you can see a lot of similarities between the two. I've been doing a lot of work more broadly than just

the GNSO, and through that work, it's interesting to see how much, how similar all of our SOs and ACs operate, even though they are different. They do a lot of the high-level and similar types of activities and governance between the groups, and it's really only when you get down to the bottom layer or the minutia of how these groups operate is where you start to see some differences. But by and large, we actually are a lot more similar than we are different, which was an interesting operation or observation.

But nonetheless, they have what their purpose is, what their scope of activities and their working methods are going to be. They operate on an interval basis, just like any of our other groups, where they review Action Items and notes on improvements. They're monitoring for any other developments that may have an impact to any of their guidelines. They will seek out knowledge and information gathering as part of that monitoring. They have the ability to set up subgroups or what our term is, probably task forces, and they review their schedule and help prioritize what the work that they have to do. They also went as far as determining what was not in scope of the GRC.

So, if you're not aware, many ccTLDs provide voluntary financial contributions, and there's also an accountability framework that these two components are out of scope and are handled either by the council or another one of their Standing Committees. No surprise here, but where I believe we're going here in the GNSO is that, our Standing Committee as well as any task forces, we're moving towards the use of the standard working group decision-making methodology and the varying levels of consensus.

The chair typically decides, what the consensus level is, and they may use a variety of tools to get to that. They report on their activities back to the ccNSO council. I believe, generally, if there's not a lot of activity, they have standard updates at each of the ICANN meetings. If there is more frequent activity, then they will provide a status on that work on a monthly or every other monthly basis back to the ccNSO council. They have a section for membership and roles. So, generally, the membership is open to all of the ccNSO members, and they talk about, the same kind of governance aspects or leadership. There can be a chair or vice chair.

They note that if the chair or vice chair is not a ccNSO council member, then the ccNSO council will nominate or provide a liaison to the GRC. Then, generally, they have participants, experts, and observers to help inform the work that they're looking to improve on. In our realm, we're calling them subject matter experts. They do have the ability, as well, they form subgroups. Ours would be task forces and generally operate kind of the same manner as the GRC has the same decision-making methodology, the same roles of a leadership position and the like.

They're, of course, like any group, there's expected levels of attendance. They do have some criteria in here that if there is a lack of attendance, that the chair, along with guidance from the council, may address attendance issues. But I don't know that that's ever been evoked or not, but they did determine that they needed to have some kind of constraint mechanism to address that. There are no term limits, which is also an intriguing observation when we think about our council and this particular Standing Committee. Our councilors have the

opportunity to serve two consecutive terms, where each term is for two years.

So, that's a total four-year commitment, assuming they go through the life of their term. But eventually you term out, and where for our purposes, if the Standing Committee is constituted the way that we're going now, there is going to be a turnover rate that this particular Standing Committee will have to navigate around. Further, even as Manju, as chair, as an example, she will eventually term out and will also be looking to backfill or replace her role as chair. And so, we need to be conscious of what that might look like in 2025 at the annual general meeting, which I believe is when Manju terms out, at what point does this Standing Committee start to seek interest of a chair replacement? What does turnover look like or, a transfer of responsibilities? And we need to somehow maintain continuity.

It's conceivable that in October of 2025 that a third of this Standing Committee could potentially change as well as its leadership. So, we need to think about what are some issues that we may encounter when we have significant turnover on this particular Standing Committee. No surprise there, staff support for these things. They talk about standards of behavior, which we generally discuss and have everybody acknowledge at the start of each call, conflicts of interest, which is why we have Statements of Interest, and then some other miscellaneous type of components to their charter.

So, I'm going to stop there. I thought that it was an intriguing exercise to identify what they're doing and look for opportunities for us to not recreate the wheel. I think at the end of the day, we're again, very

EN

similar, even though there are subtle differences with where we're going. I think the one major difference though, again, comes back to the resourcing of the group, which is something that I think that our particular group needs to consider here. So, any questions, comments, or concerns before we kick over to the next part of the agenda? Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I guess just from what we heard, from your observations, I would definitely encourage everyone to think of whether we kind of change the structure of this committee to what the ccNSO is having now, right? Because I don't know the workload of ccNSO council, but from what I heard, definitely their load is not as heavy as GNSO council. As Berry has planned out for us, we have Small Teams, and a lot of us, I believe, we're either on working groups or we're on IRTs, we're all wearing, well, we're all like in multiple proceedings in a way.

So, I think definitely it's a good idea for us to consider whether we want this to become, a Standing Committee that's not filled up by councilors only. And also, then if we are open to this idea, I think we should definitely consider, like, is there a requirement of how many councilors at least we still need in this committee? And we can probably come up with a range of 1-3 or something like that. I guess that would be useful.

And I think definitely one thing we can learn is also we can definitely ask one of our board members to be an observer to our committee, because after all, as Berry has mentioned multiple times, this

Continuous Improvement work, it's not really each group doing their own thing. We really have to coordinate better and avoid silos.

So, I think to have more people or like, people from the board, as we always said, board readiness is always a good idea to have a board member on the committee. And I also very much like the idea of regular updates to council. I think we've not been really doing that. I think once every ICANN meeting makes sense. So, that's probably we can already draft into the charter. And when we're reviewing, we discuss further. That would be my suggestions if nobody objects. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: All right. Thank you, Manju. Any other comments? All right. So, the Past and Future Use Cases, I don't think we're going to spend a whole lot of time on these since we really kind of already covered them. But again, I think this is really more of a thought experiment for anything else.

For a few of you that may have missed the last call, we started way up at the top. We talked about the Policy and Implementation working group that was spun up. This was different than previous PDP improvement types of things because it was a discussion that was happening at the council, based on the issues that were uncovered from the 2012 gTLD program, especially a lot in the implementation side. But this particular group was pretty extensive. They had 44 meetings, they met over the course of two years. Very broad participation from the

GNSO community, typical working or leadership structure, typical decision-making methods. And that's what led to the GIP, GGP, EPDP.

Whereas PDP 3.0, this was, at the time of the Policy and Implementation working group, the strategic planning sessions did not exist at that time. In between those two major events, the strategic planning sessions did stand up, and that's where PDP 3.0 was hatched or born. Based off of those SPS discussions, staff was instructed to create a report. That report was subsequently adopted by the council, and then we formed a Small Team, which was called the PDP 3.0 team, to go implement those recommendations. That work took a little bit over a year, 30, 60-minute meetings that eventually led to a final report of implementation, and we updated the GNSO operating procedures and working group guidelines where necessary.

Then there were three Use Cases of the work that the Standing Committee was using. And we talked about the analysis of the Workstream 2 Implementation for the GNSO council, which is distinct from the Implementation of those Recommendations across the SGs and Cs. I think, generally speaking, this Small Team considered that most of the recommendations were already implemented and addressed, so it was a pretty smooth process. I think there was a lot of work done by staff to help guide that group to conclusion, but it still took them about nine months to get through the analysis and write its report back to the council. It took 14 meetings or so, and then, ultimately, the council signed off that they considered those recommendations implemented.

The working group self-assessment, which was an improvement item identified in the PDP 3.0, essentially the recommendation was, we need to expand the scope of the working group self-assessments. I think prior to this, they only occurred at the conclusion of a PDP. Now the concept was to also do one about, mid-stride of a PDP to do these self-assessments and the council leadership, eventually the council and the working group review those results from these surveys and take appropriate action if there are any negative types of responses or results. It's only been used a few times since this was enacted, and so I don't think we've encountered any kind of negative results from those surveys, but that was one of the mechanisms that this group updated the contents of the survey, reformatted how the input was obtained.

Eventually, the council signed off on it, and staff has implemented, the permanent survey in SurveyMonkey, and here pretty soon, I think either tomorrow, I'll be forwarding the note that I sent to the Standing Committee here that we'll be passing that over to the council to consider this particular item implemented and closed out. Every one of us, I believe, is familiar with the Statement of Interest Action, and for me, this is what raises alarm bells about prioritization and workload, because when we look back at this, there were several aspects where we received negative views around this particular task force that were based on around participation, decision-making methodologies, and those kinds of aspects, when in reality, it did account for it.

So, in particular, this group, its work assignment form allowed for two reps from each constituency and two alternates. There was a council committee late liaison, but what the actual membership wound up being is really not much different than this particular Standing

Committee. It was so small, nobody was willing to sacrifice their position to act in a neutral role as chair, and interestingly enough, the decision-making methodology, while was operating under those auspices of full consensus, there was a get-out-of-jail-free card, for lack of a better phrase, that could allow this group to also ascertain natural levels of consensus on the recommendations.

Whether any of that would change the outcome or not, I won't speculate, but some of these core components where we received input from the survey suggested changes were needed, but whether it changed the outcome or not is kind of beside the point. The point here, though, is that ultimately, this group did not get to, or any recommendations that were a result of this activity were not adopted by the council, and this is still an open issue. Thus, at some point in time, there's more than likely going to be an SOI 2.0, whatever that looks like, what are we going to do differently this next time around to make sure that to enable the GNSO community, enable the council to come up with meaningful changes that can help put some of the issues to rest here and move forward.

And so, again, this kind of gets into, is there adequate resources to do the work? What is the priority of such an assignment over other work? And thus, some of the staff concerns. Then the remaining ones are kind of a continuation of thought experiments. Again, the board ready recommendations Small Team, if we really think about it, the scope of this work really fits squarely into what this Standing Committee is all about. And I guess kind of an open question here is, if this Standing Committee were given this assigned work, which was identified by the SPS in December of 2023, how would it be constituted? Would it only

be a Small Team like, or just the participation limited to this Standing Committee? If the eventual permanent Standing Committee is still comprised of just GNSO councilors, again, we've got kind of half of the council that would be working on this. And you can see by kind of the signups that it's almost half of the council that chose to sign up for this work.

Three or four of which are on this Standing Committee. And, does it warrant this type of discussion to include others outside of the GNSO council? Or, put another way, if the Standing Committee composition is not half of the council like we currently have, and it goes to a more-broad open participation, what does that look like? What if other council members are interested in contributing to the work, but it's really in a task force mode? There's certainly for me, I think a lot more questions than answers when I think about this possible future work. And then the final one, again, is really just still under construction. But, at some point in time this year, we're going to get this Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report back.

There are probably going to be recommendations. It's most likely, I guess has potential to be discussed at the next council strategic planning session. But what other things will prop up at the strategic planning session that may be within scope of the work for what this Standing Committee is about? So, really repetitive from the last call about overview of these Use Cases, but I think they're a very useful instrument when we think about how we're trying to nail down this particular charter. Questions, comments?

No surprise there hearing, seeing none. So, getting to the last part of our agenda is looking at our Comparison Table. Just as a reminder, column B are content extracted from the Pilot Charter versus kind of an outline of principles, commentary, and open questions for each component of what the permanent charter would look like.

The first two rows are kind of the macro level aspects of the charter, whereas we're also making a distinction, what is the membership model, leadership, decision-making methodologies, and responsibilities of the Standing Committee versus its task forces. And then the structure concludes again with kind of macro level components of this permanent Standing Committee and its charter. Kind of less important stuff in the context of the core of what we need to figure out here. But the recent assignment was, given some of these questions that we have identified here for these first two rows in regards to the mission and objective and potential scope of work. What we asked for is input from the groups in regards to this.

The previous week, the NCSG or Manju provided some initial input here, and then I see we also have some initial comments from the registries. I don't think they differ too much, but instead of me trying to just read off, Jen, do you have any comments you would like to provide here from the registries' perspective in these two components of the charter? And for those that haven't provided comments here, please feel free to verbally state your position or your concerns or answers to some of these. Okay, Jennifer can't take the mic. So, just in general, I'll try. Okay, the registries are still commenting on it. But as I noted, I don't think that what has been listed here is all that different from what the NCSG has put down.

Generally speaking, there should be a clear delineation between the mission and objectives versus the scope of work. They basically, okay, these are Jen's personal thoughts and still need to be considered by the registry.

So, I'll just go ahead and quickly read this. Scope and prioritization after reviewing some of the Use Cases, it looks like the scoping part of the assignment does fall to the council to determine and is what is most appropriate in this way. So, I think put another way is the Standing Committee probably shouldn't be doing prioritization. That really is a task of the council. But certainly, the Standing Committee would inform or provide input to help the council in that prioritization process. And also, I think the second part of the comment here, is that in terms of the scope of the assignment would also generally fall at the council level. And that, if the official template for the work assignments also contains mission and objectives, or I'm sorry, the second little paragraph is about dissecting any scope statements and the mission objectives down to its own particular section.

One thing I want to remind people here, back to one of our principles, we can't be overly prescriptive about the exact work that the exact work items that the Standing Committee will be doing. But we'll probably kind of steal from how the GRC has put scope around their types of work, which is in this area. But it's generic in a way that it's trying to put guardrails around the scope of work without actually calling out exactly what that scope of work is.

So, the takeaway here is it's not trying to be overly prescriptive, because the more prescriptive we get, then the more prone our charter would

be for revision. And then finally, the registries put here, or I should say Jen, not the registries, as an initial comment, but to refer the pieces of the work directly to this Standing Committee. I guess this is really a question, would this still come from the council? And so that's about all we have for right now. Seeing that we only have about eight minutes left -- oh, Manju, please go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Oh no, please finish first and ask my question.

BERRY COBB: Well, what I was going to say is, I think from a staff perspective, we've exhausted what we can offer here in the thought experiment kind of elements of trying to envision what this charter might look like. As I noted before, well I'll go ahead and say it, we started a draft before the Standing Committee came up. We could have essentially, kind of lift cleaned and placed from the pilot into this particular charter. I didn't feel that we were really empowered to do that yet, but as I noted, my impression or my vision of what this charter would look like is completely different now than it was had we started out just working off of a draft that staff had formed.

For me, this was quite an educational exercise that has changed my view about what the charter might look like, its composition, some of its decision-making methodology. I don't know that I personally have answers to all of the questions that are still in my head, but I don't have any other ideas about trying to tease out from the group about what decisions we should be making here.

So, as we noted on our work plan, we're down for two weeks. We'll be reconvening on the 28th of August probably at the tail end of the previous week or the very beginning of that week. Staff will send out a draft version of this charter. You'll see that there's a whole bunch of red lines and stuff in here that's not really worth sharing yet, but we're going to take kind of some creative liberties to write proposed texts about the mission, the scope statement, the objectives, what the decision-making methodologies will be like, what it looks like between the Standing Committee versus the task forces.

We'll probably have some sidebar questions here for the group when you're reviewing through them, but now it's basically go-time, so we need to get content into this draft, start working the specific language of these, get to general agreements so that we can ultimately package this up and get it back to the GNSO council for their consideration. So, that's kind of the staff view about the next steps, and with that I'll turn it back to you, Manju, to kind of wrap this up so that you can head to the next call. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. So, one very quick question. So, I am assuming the draft charter is going to be a whole charter, so even including not only the mission and scope, but also membership and decision methods and all kinds of requirements. Is that correct?

BERRY COBB: That is correct.

MANJU CHEN: And I guess I try to be a bit bold here, I guess. So, throughout our discussions or what we heard from Berry about the observations from ccNSO, I think especially the membership part, I really resonate with how seeing our workload as councilors, it's better if we open the committee to non-councilors and it's actually best if it's formed by mostly non-councilors and we have a few councilors on the committee. I'm wondering if any of us are against this idea. If you're against it, please speak up now or raise your hand. And if not, oh, sorry, Desiree, please.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Hi, Manju. No, I'm supportive of that idea of actually looking at the membership and extending it out to others, because what we have here is a mini-council, and I agree with Berry as well that there's going to be a lot of duplication and the councilors are probably better off adhering to their work. Of course, we need to keep the structure, and I do support the change of the structure in a similar fashion of extending it to possibly board members that work on the organizational oversight or also other members. So, yes, I think we need to think over the next few weeks how to best change the structure. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Desiree. So, I guess, at least for this part, I hope we are providing some of our instructions or advice to staff when they're drafting the charter, which is we think it's better if we change the structure of CCOICI to what's more similar to ccNSO's GRC. And I guess

that's at least one thing we can agree now. And I think Berry has already explained the next steps. We're taking a break for the next week while staff, unfortunately, not taking a break as we do, because they have to draft a charter first. Thank you very much for your hard work.

And so, please still remember this is very important to provide your input to the CIP-CCG framework. We really need your edits because you guys speak better English than me. Please provide edits so Damon can bring it back to the CIP-CCG meeting, which is going to happen next week. So, please do it. That will be your only, well, not only. If you have spare time, please also fill in the comparison table. As I've been saying multiple times, it doesn't have to be your stakeholder group's opinion. You can put in your name and say it's your personal opinion, and that will still be as valuable and as helpful for staff to draft the charter.

So, that's about it, I think. Thank you very much, Thomas. But still, you know how I struggle. Thank you very much, everyone. Have a good time next week, and we'll see you on the 29th of August. See you. Bye. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]