

---

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 25<sup>th</sup> of September 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Prudence Malinki. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please speak now. All right. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. 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 please note all chat sessions are being archived. And as a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. Over to our chair, Manju Chen. Please begin, Manju.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Julie. So let's get started. I am planning and I'm hoping we can end the meeting, end this call, 10 minutes earlier than usual because we're having an informal meeting with the Board my next morning at 5:00 am so I'm hoping I can get some sleep in between. So let's get started. We will go for the announcements, work plan, and whatever.

So next week, we're still having a meeting at the same time on Wednesday, and then we are supposed to be reporting progress to the

---

*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.*

---

GNSO Council October. Then Berry has some updates from the CIP-CCG for all of us, so I'll hand the mic to Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. Just a point of clarification, we do not have a call next week, but I guess it depends on how close we are to nailing down the charter to warrant whether we need to try to have a call, if not next week, the following week before we meet with the Council on Thursday, October 17, where we've been forecasting to provide an update to the charter and the activities here. Thus, we're still on target to hopefully have the Council consider the charter in Istanbul for ICANN81. What I wanted to touch on here about the update on the 17 October meeting, none of this has been socialized with the Council chairs or the GNSO Policy Support Team, but I did propose that it's a combo update. One, it will be an update on where this group is at with its charter. The second is I'm proposing that there's also an update from the CIP-CCG as well. The reason for that is to help the Council understand what kind of some next steps are going to be between now and, really, the end of the year and starting over into next year.

In terms of an update for the charter, I think that's pretty straightforward. But what I wanted to focus on for this group and perhaps as part of the update for the Council is really looking ahead at the CIP assessment period, which is technically supposed to start at the beginning of next year. You'll notice that these assessment periods are set up to run over three years, so starting in January 2025 and concluding at December 2027. I think up until a couple of weeks ago, it wasn't very clear exactly what all we would be doing within this

---

assessment period. So what I do invite the representatives here on this group is to consult with your colleagues that are on the CCG representing your group and the construction of the CIP framework there. That group, the CIP-CCG is coalescing around defining the framework and preparing it for public comment, I believe, to start in November, roughly. Something kind of new to me is it is just a framework. It's not the entire Continuous Improvement Program. There are varying degrees of the groups represented there as to their progress for identifying the criteria and indicators by which each of the groups will start to assess themselves.

Now, from a GNSO perspective, thankfully for Damon and Manju and some of the socialization here, we have a good start about what criteria and indicators could be used in the context of the GNSO Council. But what the GNSO at large is missing is what are the criteria and indicators by which the GNSO as a Supporting Organization would assess itself. It's very likely that those criteria and indicators will have a lot of overlap, but it's very also likely there are some criteria and indicators or metrics that are applicable to the broader GNSO and not applicable to the GNSO. So in that context, it's very likely that the final form of the GNSO's criteria and indicators, there still needs to be some work done either between now in the end of the year or the early part of next year when this Standing Committee becomes formalized or set to become a permanent Standing Committee. I see your hand, Damon. Let me just conclude on this.

I don't believe all of you have access to the draft document, which is why I'm encouraging you to reach out to your representatives. But in the draft of the framework document that will be going out to public

---

---

comment, it lays out kind of the general outline of what these assessment periods are going to be. So without reading the text, generally speaking, the first year is the assessment and prioritization phase. So the community groups, in this case, the GNSO and the GNSO Council, will utilize their laid out criteria and indicators to perform a self-assessment on the different criteria and indicators. Based on that assessment, it's under the understanding there will be areas or opportunities by which to improve, which takes us into kind of the second year of the assessment period phase where some work is initiated and/or completed or worked on through the second and third year. But the third year is what's most important is that the conclusion of the three-year assessment period, each of the SOs and ACs will be producing a report outlining how they assessed themselves, what improvements they made, what improvements are still in flight, what improvements are in the backlog, and report on the overall progress and the assessment of the Continuous Improvement Program. All of that activity, this final report will go out for public comment. The respective SO or AC will make changes to their report, and then that report is then delivered to the future Holistic Review. So the takeaway here is exactly what this permanent Standing Committee is about, is this group will be one of the primary mechanisms or vehicles by which to conduct all of this assessment work, likely doing some of the improvement work, and eventually performing or constructing that final report. So I just wanted to give you a preview for that. And the final thing is, again, the GNSO is still on the hook to nail down its criteria and indicators so that we have a firm baseline by which to start this assessment period. Please go ahead, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:                   Actually, I inadvertently raised my hand. Manju and I had a discussion with Chris yesterday. Manju, do you want to go ahead and sort of fill others in on the discussions? We talked about Chris's group and our group. It'd be helpful just to expedite things along for today's call.

MANJU CHEN:                        Sure. I thought you're going to do that because you raised your hand. Okay, I can do it. We did have a 20-minute call with Chris Disspain from the Registry Stakeholder Group. I am sure you guys remember, we reviewed the criteria under the principle of the framework of the CIP thing with Damon's help, and that's when we thought we are putting the criteria for public comments. But there was a surprise to all of us, including Berry, that actually the framework is the only thing that's going to be put out for public comment. In the framework, we are only going to ask public comments for the principles. So it's five principles. And if you don't remember, I'm going to send out an e-mail from Chris about this group that we created amongst GNSO, like the SG and C representatives from the GNSO on the CIP-CCG, to kind of review this framework and principle together as GNSO as a whole, because we feel like there needs to be a framework for the GNSO to operate, to review and to execute or conduct continuous improvement in the future. Because, of course, individual SG and Cs continuous improvement is important. The overall GNSO improvement is also important, and that's what the CCOICI is set up to do too.

---

So what we discussed yesterday is basically that we will ask individual SG and Cs of their affirmation in a sense of this principle. And for me and Damon, we are, of course, responsible to go back to our team, which is the GNSO Council. In terms of GNSO Council, the CCOICI will be in charge of the continuous improvement. So you are the guys for us to ask whether we are okay with this principle. And if we are, we add our support to the whole group. And then as a whole GNSO thing, we will be agreeable to this principle. And then, after the public comments, we agree that CCOICI will be developing the criteria under these principles, and then do whatever continuous improvement thing the future CCOICI will have to do, and will be under the new structure, as we were discussing of the CCOICI too. So I guess that's my update. Damon, if I missed anything, please feel free to add.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

No, I don't think you missed anything at all. The thing is, with the criteria that you've been discussing, that's been circulated on this list. I think that's important that we still have that, even though it's not going to go out for comment. I would assume that there really wouldn't be additional thoughts on that by now because it's been out a few times. But if there are, let's get those in. Let's just wrap it up.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes. Thank you. So that was our collected update of the CIP-CCG. Okay. We can now go back to the charter draft.

So update from last week. I said I'm going to send out an e-mail about the proposal of NTA. Lawrence, thank you for your response. I don't

think a lot of people have read it, and sorry because I sent it a bit late. I only sent it yesterday. So I guess you can sit for still a while, while people read it and piling up their opinion. We don't have to decide on this meeting. But there's one thing we also discussed last week, because of the absence of the other two constituencies within the CSG, we didn't really get to discuss. Probably now is the chance because we have Damon and Lawrence here at the call.

I remember Susan raised some concerns about one Council member from each SG thing when we first saw this draft charter. I'm wondering if you have the same concerns or you guys are okay with one Council member per SG. Because just to note that we will have two members per each constituency since stakeholder group still on top of the councilors, so I didn't think it would be a problem to have just one Council member from each SG, but I'd like to hear what are your thoughts. So that's the cue for you, Lawrence and Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. My thoughts on the composition are, is that I think this sounds good, but again, I worry that the group is just too big. You know, 20 members, 2 liaisons, 10 observers for a group doing this, I don't think we're going to get full participation at that level. So I think if we want to try this, this is fine, but I am concerned about the size of this group.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS:

For me, I share a contrary view, Damon, in the sense that the task for the group is one of interest across community. And as it is, 20 persons having to actively deliberate to reach some kind of consensus or way

---

---

forward might be considered in some cases as not quite representative of all the views that might want to be captured. For me, the number is something I can live with to a larger extent. We're still going to be having participation from the SG and Cs. One Council member is at least a must-have. If we were to increase that, that could also bring in some additional value of views but it could also increase the number of participants within the group, which might increase the fears that Damon and others might have in terms of the size of the group. So there's no hard and fast rule for me as long as there is at least one councilor. There's a spread of where the participating Council members come from. That is a good balance. But if we have to have more than one of that, then we would also be careful in terms of the size of the group, most especially since we still have community members joining.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Lawrence. So just to clarify, I wasn't sure. You guys are okay with only one Council member from CSG. Is that correct?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I'm okay with one. I've not checked in with my group yet, but personally, I'm okay with one.

MANJU CHEN: Damon, is that the same for just—



---

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, that's fine. I'm not saying we should redo this or anything. I'm just saying, from a practical perspective, I think it's going to be difficult to get 20 active participants in this group. Let's try it. We don't need to overly debate the issue. I just think it's something we need to be cognizant of. Getting this many people actively involved is going to be hard.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Berry, I see your end.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Just to build on the previous interventions. Again, just to reinforce the original approach or the structure of the CCOICI is really based off of this old diagram, and it was foreseen that the CCOICI itself would really be using the term oversight and that's a part of the title that makes up the acronym that we have today. But what we've really learned is that the Council is making the decision to initiate improvement work, whether it be Council-related or GNSO-related or whatever, and it's the Council that will be making the decision to consider and adopt any work coming out of the Standing Committee and its task forces. But now that we have a little bit more clarity about what the Continuous Improvement Program is like, we're going to be very busy.

There's two different paths to get to Sunday. A, we bulk up with people here on the Standing Committee to do work or we keep it at a low number, but then we start forming a whole bunch of different task forces to do this work. Either way, we need resources to get this work

---

done. The other thing that we uncovered in analyzing, looking at the Council versus the work of or as compared to the pilot is that we were far too top heavy for all of the Council members of doing some of this work even in its oversight role and that we needed to push it out. But at the end of the day, I think, Damon, I like your approach. Let's try moving forward with this. We outline the exact rationale why we came up with it, and nothing prevents us from changing. Damon, I think your point is very valid. It's going to be hard to get a lot of these persons to fill these positions, but it's the work that's already in the backlog that concerns me most. And we already talked about the CIP and the assessment period. And again, I'm just trying to think about what other work can become in this way because I think we're about to get bombarded. Again, pretend for a moment that the Board Readiness Small Team with that work would be here. Any future work around Statements of Interest, that's kind of in the pipeline because that issue is not at rest, that's going to be coming here. Improvements from the Policy Status Report on the Policy and Implementation Working Group from a long time ago, there are recommendations in there that the Council will soon consider this is the vehicle to get that work done. January, the GNSO Council will be doing its Strategic Planning session. If the past is any indicator of the future, there's likely one or two items to be worked on that the Council will agree that this becomes a platform to do this work. So whether we bulk them up here in the Standing Committee and try to work two or three different topics in the same time or we go with the task force component, the more we split up in task forces, the more we increase our overhead of actually managing multiple groups. So I'll stop there. Thank you, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I see Jen's hand. Please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Berry. Thanks, Manju. Thank you, Berry, for that extra bit. Your last point was something that I neglected to think about over edges, and staff support if we split into too many. But I'm still of the mind that right now we have this built in. We have the possibility of a maximum of 14 members. I definitely agree with Damon's point. In any kind of working group or group situation, we're going to lose people. There's going to be attrition. The more we try to add to it, that core group is still going to be that size.

Now, a Standing Committee, at least in my understanding, isn't something that is gigantically big. It should be something of the size that is agile enough to be able to coordinate some work, and if we need to pull in more resourcing, as you said, it could be split into the task force or whatever it is that we decide is the correct vehicle to do that work. At this point, we've heard from Damon and Lawrence, I think we're okay, at least looking at this to keep it as such. Any larger, this group is going to be very unwieldy. I think I put it in the chat as well, if we keep on hand wringing about, "Oh, are we going to balance this? Is it going to be okay?" And I think we've spent quite a few calls talking about this, then we might as well have the full Council on and not have a standing group. That's my two cents on this. Thanks.

---

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you very much. I think we are having a rough agreement of the current structure, which is total of 20 members, 2 liaisons, and 10 observers. Just to, I guess, remind all of us again, the 10 observers, basically, they don't have to do anything. They are just in the mailing list. They just have access to whatever we put on to the mailing list. So that's what the observers are for.

I definitely see both sides of the argument. I personally don't think we are going to come up with 14 people either. But I also agree, there's a lot of work and we need resources. The problem is it's not like we're a company and we just have money to hire people, right? We are all volunteers, and we cannot control the volunteers. So as volunteers, we all know how we are very burnt out and we are very stretched. So I definitely understand our concerns, but I definitely also understand that there are a lot of work coming our way and we need people to do the work. Also, let's just see the language is a maximum of two members, so it's okay too if it's only one member from each constituency and stakeholder group, right? If they have more people, the more the merrier.

So I guess we can move on from this membership structure now because I think we are roughly agreeing with each other. So this is for the CCOICI structure. And leadership structure, I think this is a new one because the leadership team shall consist a total of three members, CCOICI chair, Council vice chairs from both houses. Is there anybody—Berry, I see your hand. Sorry, before you can speak, does anybody has any suggestions or opinion with this leadership structure? Berry, please.

---

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. The original rationale for separating this out, A, we typically have a section separate of the leadership structure because typically the criteria is a little different. Why this became an idea is when this pilot Standing Committee was first launched, at the time the Council leadership over, I think, two and a half, almost three years, were heavily involved in this particular group, and since we concluded the task force on the Statement of Interest stuff or even before that, the leadership attention to this is kind of waned. So the idea here is that the vice chairs from each house are involved in the leadership team so that they can be informed enough to help keep the GNSO Council chair informed of the activities going on here. Maybe this isn't as necessary if in fact we retain this particular part. It's kind of half of a dozen or six of a dozen of another because I'm not anticipating that these vice chairs would be heavy lifters on the work, but the idea is that they are involved in any decision-making to help support the chair and, of course, keep the Council leadership team informed.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. Something just happened. So I guess my question is does that mean they're going to be members too? Because then we're having more than the originally four members from the Council. Does that mean we will have six? Or we just ask those members to be vice chair, so we have four instead of we add two to the committee?

BERRY COBB:

The original intent was that they would be doing some work, but probably not near the level of the core committee, but that's something

---

we can probably need to hash out. The other part of the concern here is there is going to be a fair amount of workload on the committee and/or its task forces, and just having a solo chair in the leadership team could be an extra heavy lift, especially if the chair happens to come from the GNSO Council, which I believe we're considering.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I see your hand, Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG : Thanks, Berry. Thanks, Manju. I guess two separate things when I look at this. The first thing is we definitely need a vice chair for this group, CCOICI vice chair. So that's the first thing. The second thing is I don't know, looking at these bullet points, if that means that we will have the CCOICI chair, and then the vice chair roles will be played by the two vice chairs from the Council. So pause there.

Then also separately is that, because I'm not on the Council leadership, I'm assuming that the Council leadership already has a pretty full plate, and asking both of our Council vice chairs to also be on this is also a heavy ask. So, I had a question there. I had two comments. I don't know who wants to answer or comment on that.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jen. I read it as whoever drafted this is considered Council vice chair, as in their vice chairs in Council to also be vice chairs here, but definitely will advocate for just vice chairs, and they could be

---

anyone, but they could be one from Contracted Parties and one from Non-Contracted Parties. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I didn't read this as the vice chair for the Council stepping into this particular role. It is definitely going to be a lot of help for the chair to have advice. And my thinking was if the chair happens to be from the Non-Contracted Party, then we could just ensure that whoever is the vice comes from the Contracted Party House or if the chair is from the Contracted Party House, then it could help that the vice chair is from the Non-Contracted Party House. But then again, because I'm just looking at the group and having to have such that we are not so heavy at the top in terms of leadership, that is some concern for me, but if that isn't such a serious concern, then this could be a way to go. Otherwise, we could just restrict this to just having a chair and a vice chair and ensuring that both leaders are not from the same party house.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Lawrence. I feel like we are agreeing. And also, Berry, probably agreeing that we definitely need vice chairs, but they don't have to be at the same time the Council vice chairs. I hear you, Lawrence, about balancing Contracted Party House and the Non-Contracted Party House. I think for Council itself, which all of us are on, we do have a chair, and then we have five chairs from each house, and I think it works well. We haven't really experienced any problem with two out of the three leadership are from the same house so there's a power imbalance or anything like that. So I feel like the current

---

structure, which is one chair and one vice chair per house is still okay, because me as the chair now, I definitely will appreciate two vice chairs instead of one. As Berry mentioned too, in the future there are going to be a lot more work. So I definitely feel like two vice chairs will be better than one. But if everybody's okay with two vice chairs, I guess we keep this because I think it's been going well for Council too to have this kind of structure, and we balance it out with one house per vice chair. If everybody's okay, we probably can move on. If you have an urgent opposition, objection, please raise your hand now.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: The most important thing is put in the comments about your role, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: What? No way. I'm not hanging on one tree. Jen, I see your hand.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. Before we scroll away, I just want to get a sense that, are we keeping two vice chairs? Is that what it is? We'll still have three members in the leadership team of this particular one?

MANJU CHEN: Yes. I think that was my intention, to ask people if we are agreeing with what is on the screen now, which is one chair, two vice chairs, and they don't have to be Council vice chairs. They just will be selected from the committee, and they will be from each house per one.



JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks for that clarification. I'm not convinced we need two vice chairs, but I'm also not wedded to this point. I feel like we spent a lot of time looking at the balancing of the whole group. I mean, usually for me, at least my understanding, and please correct me if my understanding is wrong, a vice chair is usually a backup for the chair. It's fine to have two, even with processes that have many, many years in it. So I don't know of other groups, other than the Council, that we need two vice chairs. But anyway, like I said, I'll let us go further. If everybody agrees to have two vice chairs, I'm fine with it.

MANJU CHEN: I think, actually now everybody thinks one vice chair is enough. So probably what is written on the screen now, which will be we keep one chair, we keep one vice chair. And as said on the screen, the vice chair role should be filled by the other house. That would be great too. So, happily, we can move on to—

DAMON ASHCRAFT: ICANN staff will wordsmith this to make and do an edits on the fly, but trying to just put down the concept.

MANJU CHEN: Yes. It looks very nice. Let's move on to Task Force Membership. I believe it's about the same for a CCOICI. We already discussed how CCOICI are a bit too big, but now we're seeing the Task Force are actually quite big too. So I'm not sure anybody has any opinion on this.

---

---

I'll let Berry explain the design first before probably we start voicing our opinions. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. Again, I was reflecting back on previous work in the GNSO in this area and also in the previous work from like the Policy and Implementation Working Group a while ago, as well as our more represented models that we have for—

JULIE HEDLUND:

[Inaudible].

BERRY COBB:

Julie, you need to go on mute, please. So the idea here was, this is really more taken from the EPDP on IDNs charter with the exception of the label participants, but our typical working groups are balanced in this particular structure. The EPDPs had been this way before. Manju was correct in the observation that this is bigger than the Standing Committee. But I do want to highlight that in a ideal world, the task forces are an overflow mechanism. So let's take, for example, the January Council SPS determines that PDPs are not working very well. So the Council decides to launch a PDP 4.0 with a significant scope. The Standing Committee would, of course, be the first in line to do such work, but the scope is so large that it's going to be an 18-month endeavor. Because the Standing Committee is already going to have a fair amount of work on policy and implementation or the assessment periods and those kinds of things, the idea is that these dedicated task

---

forces act as a bailout or overflow mechanism for when the Standing Committee is too stacked with work, or if the entire GNSO as a whole is too stacked with work, then prioritization starts to get invoked. And the Council needs to be aware of this issue that should they decide to initiate a PDP 4.0 as an example here, when are we going to do it? If everybody's already over capacity but we recognize this work needs to be done, there's only two ways to go about it in a constrained resource environment. Either, A, you prioritize it to the top of the queue and stop doing other work, or B, you don't initiate the work to begin with, recognizing that we need to get the work off of our current plates before we start it. So kind of one of those two things is likely to happen. But in the aspect where maybe the resources aren't so constrained, you're still looking at a sizable chunk of work that would be coming through. And in some cases, it may not be appropriate to pile this on to the Standing Committee itself. So that was kind of the general idea, but the structure is based off of PDP charters, and again, trying to maintain that balance so that at some point in time when the consensus call needs to be made, that the chair has the balance to try to measure that consensus. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. So my question is actually if it's based on EPDP, I'm pretty sure it's not maximum of six from CSG, I'm pretty sure it's going to be, I don't know, three per constituency or two per constituency, so I'm not sure if CSG are okay with this composition. Do you want it to be listed out as constituencies instead of stakeholder group? As we know, we have very different kind of composition than the contracted parties. I think NCSG-wise, we're okay with staying as NCSG because that's how

---

we participate in Council, too, and we don't really usually distinguish the constituencies when we are participating in policy or whatsoever other stuff. But I'm not sure if CSG will be okay with this write-up. So I'm throwing the question to Lawrence and Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: From my perspective. I think this is fine.

MANJU CHEN: Okay then. But I'll definitely still ask you guys to bring this back to your constituencies to check, because sometimes we are fine, but our beloved members from our constituencies or SG are not as fine as us with something. So, Lawrence, if it's okay too, I'll definitely ask you to bring this back to your constituency to check.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: All right. I'll do that. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Okay. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Just one follow-up as well. Again, it's going to be the Council that ultimately decides to initiate this work. If it's clear up front that this is going to be a task force where this gets invoked, recognize that that work is significant enough that it's probably going to have its own charter, our only basis for even listing this here in the permanent

---

Standing Committee Charter is so that we can just lift clean in place into a new charter. We don't have to re-ask or re-determine what the structure is going to be. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry, for the clarification. Lawrence, please.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Sorry if this has been addressed previously, but just a quick talk came to mind now that looking at the Council practice of having small teams of councilors working to resolve certain issues. Is there a role for the task force that we're talking about right now to play around such topics that might be before the Council needing further work?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Lawrence. I think this is a different concept than small teams, because for us, task force is more like, as Berry has mentioned, the structure is based on working groups. So actually, there are more PDP working groups, it's just that they're not working on policy issues. It's overflow mechanisms when CCOICI has too much load. But then CCOICI also decides that even though whatever they're doing is important, another group of people who do this is also very important thing. That's when they will establish this task force. It's not going to be the same people from the CCOICI. It could be, but I think preferably not, because that's why they need another structure or mechanism to deal with this. So it's kind of different from Council and the small team because small teams are members from the Council. But this task force,

---

preferably, ideally, are going to be another group of people which will be more like Council initiating a PDP and fill in the working group with community members not on the Council. So I hope that explains. I think Berry probably will have to correct me at some point. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB:

Absolutely not going to correct you because your response was perfect and spot on. I just wanted to add—and maybe this is something we can add up above for the Standing Committee—but, Lawrence, you make a great point about the label of small teams. We’ve got plenty of those going on right now. Hopefully, when the Standing Committee is made permanent, some of the small teams that are being formed just off of the Council will slowly go away. Again, fast forward. Or if this was already a permanent Standing Committee, this committee would be working on the Board Readiness recommendations. But what we can add to this, again, the task force is a pretty heavy instrument to go do something, but at the Standing Committee level, there’s nothing that prevents the Standing Committee from creating little small subgroups to go tackle specific kind of shorter term type of ask. Just like any other PDP working groups, it’s at the chair’s discretion to be able to form these little subgroups to go focus on a specific task, bring it back to the full working group, or in this case, the committee for consideration and its work that they’re passing to the Council.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. I feel like of the whole charter of the old draft, the membership is really the part that requires our most attention. I did

---

quickly browse through the document after this, I didn't see I made any comments, and I didn't see any other people make any comments either. As I told you guys at the start of this call, I am hoping to wrap up this call a bit earlier than usual because I have to wake up at 5:00 am next morning for our informal call with the Board members. So if we're okay with what we're having now, I think we fixed some pretty important issues during this call with everybody's great input. And if you guys feel like reading the charter again and that comments, please do so. I haven't seen any other comments in mind. So if you are free, please go read it and please comment, because we still have a meeting, a call next week. I don't know if we have any outstanding issues that we need to discuss in the next call. Probably we will discuss within the leadership and decide whether we will have to call next week. Probably we will, but hopefully it's going to be a short and sweet one. Oh no, today is 25<sup>th</sup>. Oh yes. Sorry, Berry. I guess you're going to correct me that we're not going to have a call next week.

BERRY COBB:

Correct. I think we've addressed some of the big issues, so I don't see a need for it, but we'll send out the meeting minutes and an action item for the representatives here to really begin socializing this with your respective groups and kind of prepared for a mini discussion at the Council. And if there are any other concerns, please raise them over the list. And between now and the middle of October, if we need another call before then, we can schedule it. Thank you.

---

MANJU CHEN:

Oh, nice. Sorry, guys. Well, actually, congratulations, guys. We're not going to have a call next week because thanks all of you, all of your great input, we have fixed the most important issues during this call so we don't have any outstanding issue for next week to discuss. We will depend on staff to do to have feed lifting again, I guess, to kind of clean up the charter. And if we have any questions, we will post to the mailing list for you guys. Please go read that e-mail of the NCA thing, the NomCom appointee thing that I proposed to change. But I'm okay with not changing either. Just please read, and if your support or object, please reply. As promised, also I will send out the CIP-CCG thing to seek you guys support on the principle. I think we're all generally just agreeing to the principle, so it shouldn't be a big issue, but we still have to do it to just make sure that we know what the principles are and we are agreeing to it. If you have no strong opinions, probably we'll just leave it as it is for the current charter.

So that will be all for today. If anybody has any other urgent, have to say something before we end this call, please raise your hand now. If not, I will see you guys in several hours. I will be a zombie but I'll be there. Thank you all for the great inputs. I'll see you later. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**