
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement called Taking Place on Wednesday, 28 August 2024 at 12:00 UTC. We do have apologies from Jennifer Chung. 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 with 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 shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And please know all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you and back over to Manchu.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Devan. Welcome, everyone. Can we also try to pin those who are not here, just whoever has the time. Can I trouble you guys to send another notification or pin on WhatsApp to remind them to be on the call? Thank you. And that was my welcome. We will move on to announcements, work plan and upcoming meeting schedule. So we don't have a meeting next week because I will be in Wellington for APNIC conference. And I think we think that will be a good time for you guys to review the charter, the staff has helpfully drafted. We'll restart on 11th of September, same time. That's 13:00 UTC and we hopefully will be reporting progress to council on 17th of October. And then

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.

hopefully we can deliver the charter to council before the meeting in Istanbul and we can discuss in Istanbul face to face. So that's our work plan. Am I missing anything?

BERRY COBB:

Manju, just to add on to Istanbul. I mean, it's still early days for council leadership to figure out the agenda for the Sunday GNSO sessions. But I think there's a decent probability that this topic will be one of those on the agenda and hopefully at least a good 30 or 45 minutes on it. But for sure we'll be discussing it more than just at the council meeting.

MANJU CHEN:

Okay, thank you, Berry. So that was the update of work plan. We don't have a meeting tomorrow next week and we will catch up on the 11th of September. And then we will have a short update from Damon about the CIPCCG. Damon, I'll hand the floor to you as I know you will be rushing to your office to start your day. Thank you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. Well, hey, thank you very much, Manju. Yeah, so we had a meeting with the CIPCCG group and pretty much all the representatives from the different groups. The point of the meeting was to share the feedback on the different criteria that we discussed last time I was on this call. I went ahead and I had previously sent out a PowerPoint presentation with the different criteria that just had my notes from our last meeting. And I went through it at kind of high level and just sort of shared those notes. We didn't receive any other feedback in response

to my email as far as anything else that we should be any other specifics as far as updates to the criteria. I know that Manju, you had circulated a Google Doc and you had some comments in it as well. I just looked at that this morning. It doesn't look as if anybody else has had comments in that Google Doc as well. Other groups, frankly, didn't have nearly as much to say. Some of the groups, some of the representatives came back and they kind of questioned if we had the right criteria at all. And really, and I think to be fair to them, I think a lot of their criticism was along the same lines of ours is that they weren't quite sure it was applicable to their specific group. In any event, we actually provided more feedback than I would say 70% of the other groups.

Where we're at right now is we need to finalize our comments on the criteria. Manju, you've circulated that Google Doc. Still looks like it's just you that has gone ahead and made comments in that. And so what I'd like from this group would be just take a look at that webinar, or excuse me, take a look at that Google Doc. And if you have any comments, let's go ahead and let's get them made, I would say by the first part of next week. And then I need to turn that over to the CIP CCG. And that'll be your feedback. Does that make sense?

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, Damon, thank you very much. And please, guys, as I have repetitively pleaded, and as Damon has suggested, please comment on the Google Doc so we can hopefully have a finalized version of the criteria for GNSO Council. And if you guys don't have any other questions for Damon, I know he has to run for work. And we don't want

him to be late because of us. Not seeing any hands, not seeing any comments. I'll let Damon go to work.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Okay, well, thank you very much, Manju, for being so efficient with it. And yeah, let's just try to get our comments in. And I'll say if it is reasonable to this group to say, we could have all comments in by within one week of today? Does that work for everybody? And then I'll just sort of go on that. And what we've got at that point is what we have. Does that work?

MANJU CHEN: It works for me. I hope others will hopefully comment in the doc. Please do. And hopefully, we can finalize it up for Damon to bring back to CIP CCG. And thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Great. Thank you, everybody. Appreciate it.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, so we'll move on to the third item of today, which is the most important part of our discussion today. I will let Berry do this because he knows better than me what he written for the charter. And I'll hand the floor to Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. Berry Cobb for the record. And I don't know everything. In fact, I forget everything from yesterday. So everybody's starting on the same page today. So when we started off this project to update or upgrade the charter to make this a permanent standing committee, we've gone through kind of the past, the present and the possible future about the type of work that this particular standing committee would possibly be doing. And recognizing the amount of work in the past, present and possible future in combination with the activities going on with if the update that Damon just provided on the CIP framework, which we believe that this group will be on the receiving end in some form or another of those activities. You know, we've got the pilot holistic review. We've got the annual or every three year assessment periods that will be kicking off next year. And then of course, ATRT4 will be kicking off sometime next year and eventually some future holistic review for all of this, in addition to other improvements that the GNSO and GNSO council already have in the pipeline or potentially may come out of future strategic planning sessions.

So in this discovery or due diligence around all of this, and I think I've said it before staff could have put together a charter at the very beginning of this, but first we didn't really feel empowered to do so. But had we done it, my mental picture of what that charter would have looked like eight weeks ago is 180 degrees different than the draft that we have produced now. So I'm ecstatic about the research and homework that we've done to get to this point. And also recognizing that what we have in this particular draft is also kind of a significant departure from the structure of the CCOICI and its taskforces as

outlined in the pilot charter. So that's something that we'll want to work around, but I think that the takeaway from our previous call is that we're recognizing there's a significant amount of work that the standing committee in and of itself, it would be, as outlined in the pilot charter was essentially almost half of the Council, which is already a decent burden of workload from month to month as the Council operates, but that given the resource requirements around all of this work is we in effect need more persons to help do that work. So the concept was really to expand the committee after also reviewing what the ccNSO is doing with their guidelines review committee, to really expand the footprint of the standing committee that will enable to attract and utilize resources outside of the Council. So that's kind of the primary motivation for this initial draft. I would consider the draft itself in the very early, early stages. There's a lot of sanding and polishing and primer layer, then we need to paint it, apply coats of wax and buff it. So there's going to be several adjustments to it as we move along.

So let's go ahead and kick on over to what the draft is at. And I'm posting a link here in the Zoom room for you. And not to try to be repetitive, but my approach in trying to build this charter out was less of a focus around governance of the committee itself but the recognition of the amount of work that's coming and the amount of resources that would be required. So kind of keep that framing in your mind. And I'd also ask for the purposes of today, we're mostly going to focus on the membership structure, which was one of the biggest issues identified from the survey that we conducted many months ago, as well as the decision making methodologies. Those were the two primary aspects. But for the purposes of today, we're really not going to worry about

wordsmithing any of the specific text, but mostly spend time around the membership structure itself.

So I believe everybody is familiar. You've probably seen as many charters as I have over the time. We're using the standard GNSO charter template structure that's pretty much consistently organized in the same way. First page is just essentially metadata about the standing committee itself, the decision to initiate it, so on and so forth. We have section two, which is the mission, objectives and deliverable. So we felt it was important to include background as to how the standing committee is becoming a permanent standing committee. We get into a mission statement. We start talking about what the scope of this committee and its task forces are to be doing. And with the recognition that the pilot charter contained an inventory of all kinds of possible improvement work. That was useful then, because we were understaffed by the pace and ability for the GNSO community to work those items. But now that this is going to be a permanent standing committee, we want to avoid being prescriptive about the exact projects that this committee would be taking on. But we still need to provide some guardrails about what is in scope versus what is not in scope of this particular committee. And what's kind of important about this is all of those items of work that are in that pilot charter as well as some other sources, we're going to be creating a, it's a temporary parking lot for now, but you'll see a link. And I'm really just trying to deposit all of the work from the various sources. We'll have a future task when we get closer to finalizing the charter of identifying what work has been done, what work is still pending, analyze that with work that's recently or about to come our way, and be able to build kind of a

work log or a backlog of these open and remaining items. And once we've completed that inventory, then we'll be in a position to prioritize that work and help inform the council to make a decision about next steps and those kinds of things. So this document is very much just a parking lot kind of document. This is just temporary. But the end state goal is once we've completed that inventory and some initial prioritization, all of the work of the CCOICI and its task forces will be complemented within the GNSO's program management tool suites and the ability to provide status and updates through the project list and those kinds of things.

The second part of the scope that I think is important here is recognizing up front that the work that this particular committee will be responsible for is in recognition of the implementation of ATRT 3 and the continuous improvement framework. As you'll recall, the concept here is this continuous improvement framework, this committee is supposed to also have the ability to take on the types of work that we would normally identify in organizational reviews which are born in Article 4.4 of the ICANN bylaws. For now, I just felt it was important to paste this particular bylaws text into the charter with the recognition that this might slightly be updated in the future based on the results of the pilot holistic review and other board decisions, but it helps set the framing about what this group could potentially be tasked with in the realm of organizational reviews.

The other key highlight here, because the scope is not trying to be prescriptive of the work it's going to be doing, unlike our PDP charters that have very specific charter questions, very specific deliverables with a specific outcome, it's hard to write a general scope statement to

provide some of these guardrails. So I came up with the idea of trying to use as references to past, current and future work. I don't know how fit for purpose this is, but it at least kind of acts as examples if there are questions in the future about a particular assignment and whether that work will be within the scope of this group or not. But we can wordsmith that a little bit later.

Objectives and goals, basically a generic statement about what we want this group to accomplish. I see this almost as a factory that takes in inputs, builds things and produces outputs and rinse and repeat as each new particular assignment comes through the front end. But at a minimum, there will be requirements around charters for that specific type of work and/or work assignments that more specifically define what that particular project and what its outcomes are supposed to be. And this is just basically trying to describe that no matter what the assignment is, it will have a specific scope, it will have a specific requirement to deliver a report, and it basically will be held to account on completing that work by certain dates and providing updates as necessary along the way.

Section three is about the formation, membership and staffing. And as I noted, we'll specifically be spending most of the remaining time today talking through the CCOICI membership structure. But I'm going to come back to this just to kind of complete the overview. But in general, we're trying to outline what is the structure of the committee versus the task forces, and what are the criteria to be members of this committee or task forces, as well as the leadership teams that will provide the oversight for it. So we'll come back to that. But essentially, they're, they're almost mirror examples of between the CCOICI versus the task

force. But the structure is slightly different. And we'll get into those details here in a little bit.

Moving down is more kind of standard content that we typically include in our charters, just trying to understand what are the committee and staff roles, what are the duties, as well as something probably new, I think we have maybe in a few of our charters. But now that this is a standing committee the general idea is that it's going to exist until such point in time the council were to make a decision to dissolve it, which we don't foresee happening for a very long time, if ever. But in that light, what I think is important is we can't just not continuously improve our own continuous improvement committee. So the idea here is to try to do an assessment of the standing committee charter, make sure that it's still fit for purpose, that it's working as designed, and if not, identify those issues and course correct appropriately.

Also, pretty much standard template content, rules of engagement we have the statement of interest requirements. Most of our groups now are utilizing this statement of participation, which I believe most of you are familiar with. We won't go through the details of it. There's the transparency component that we operate openly and transparent. Our archive list will be public. There will be recordings to the calls. There is a little carve out that if for any reason some of those deliberations need to be closed door, there is the mechanism to do that, but it also requires rationale for why it's done and that it be communicated. Now that the GNSO operates much more in a project management framework, when work is assigned, as I mentioned earlier, each assignment will have a start date and an end date and various types of milestones in between the two. If for any reason, that work starts to get into at risk or in

trouble from a timeline perspective or any other kind of issue that may hamper the assignment from being completed on its commitment date, just like for our working groups, we would collaborate with the council leadership as well as maybe the full council to determine how we can right the ship and return the project back to a normal or green condition. Not that it happens very often, but it does happen. Sometimes there are problems or issues that require escalation. This is wrapped around the ICANN's expected standards of behavior as well as embedded into our GNSO working group guidelines. And while this is not a technical working group that's usually associated with PDPs, it of course does operate very much the same way, and further there is a complaint process that mirrors what our PDPs are doing.

Section five is the decision-making methodology, which was probably I think even the bigger issue than the composition of our groups, but operating under the full consensus model was not likened very much, and generally speaking, it seemed that the members of this committee thought that under no circumstances should we be operating under any other model except our standard methodology for making decisions. So generally speaking, the standing committee as well as any future task force will operate under the consensus model described in our PDP charters, and why this is important is because it's directly connected to what the composition of the group will be, which typically now that we're operating in a more represented model needs to also provide balance to help determine what those levels of consensus are, but this is pulled from the GNSO working group guidelines. We typically embed these in all of our particular charters only with edits to call out the particular name of the group, but everything else is very much

template-based. And then finally, the charter document history, just breadcrumbs of the past. So before I stop there, any general questions before we dive a little bit deeper into the membership structure? Hearing and seeing none.

Okay, so I don't want to read through this in detail, and I'm going to use a different tool than for us to read through the text here to try to help understand the draft that we've come up with thus far. But generally speaking, the standing committee as well as the task force will operate as a representative model. The members will be responsible for consulting with their respective groups to bring their groups' positions back to the various topics that are being worked on.

This section is a textual outline of the different members and observers that would consist or constitute of what the standing committee is. And again, I'm going to show you a tool that I use to try to help come up with this particular framing. The membership criteria is pretty much, I think kind of obvious. The types of improvements that this group will be working on is essentially everything that is not consensus policy. So standard GNSO operating procedures, changes to the policy development process. Take, for example, the work that was done in the policy and implementation working group back in 2015. You know, the outcome of that group, which would really be a task force under our framing today, those changes there impacted the working group guidelines and eventually required an update to the ICANN bylaws because several of the recommendations that came out of that led to things like EPDPs, the GIP, so on and so forth.

So the general idea here is that the resources that we need from the GNSO community, they should be very well versed in how PDPs operate, the governance structure behind them understand what it's like building consensus around consensus recommendations, understand the working group guidelines, the ICANN bylaws, the organizational structure of the bicameral nature of the GNSO. So what we don't want, for example, is transfer policy experts trying to contribute transfer policy stuff when we're talking about improvements to the operations and activities of the GNSO.

And then the last section is the leadership structure and some leadership criteria. So before we continue any more further, what I want to show you now is, I'm a data guy, and I needed a structured way to analyze what the composition would look like. And in that is how I came up with this particular tool. And here's the link in the chat. So everybody has access to this sheet, just as a reminder, this is a lot of the background work that we relied on to help get us to where we're at, all the things that have been worked in the past, present and future. We've talked about the different, trying to compare and contrast the pilot charter with principles and questions that we needed to consider for the primary sections of a future charter. We've made reference to this graphic that was created under the pilot. I think conceptually, even with the draft charter that we have today, this is still more fit for purpose, but of course it's the composition of the standing committee and its task forces that are slightly changed, but operationally and conceptually, it's still the same. The council is providing the oversight of the committee. It will approve what work should be initiated and eventually consider and or adopt or reject any work that flows out of

the committee and its task forces. The TLDR here, the GNSO council is the decision-making body to launch and to approve work.

So now we get into the structure. So, like I said, the decision-making methods of using the consensus model is kind of what is attached at the hip with the structure of the groups. And when I approach problems, I really try to think about, well, what is our current state? And then what is our desired state? Understand the gaps or the delta between the two and figure out what we need to do to get to a desired state. Now I'm using the term future here, but generally speaking, this isn't written in stone and hopefully this is a tool that will help us figure out what the end state structure would be. And what we'll be discussing over this call and probably the next few calls is what are those adjustments that we need to get to a desired state of the standing committee as well as the task forces that everybody can agree on.

So there's two primary sections to this. So the top rows here are the composition and structure of the GNSO council. And I know some of these breakouts may seem a little funny. I'll explain those in a minute. But what I was really trying to look at is what are the persons that actually sit on the council versus how the council actually votes on different resolutions. And then also compare that with the structure of the CCOICI and its task forces in the pilot. And then moving over to the right, well, what does that mean from a resource perspective for the future standing committee as well as its task forces? And then the second primary section here is about non-councilors that also are in the GNSO that we also want participating on the standing committee and its task forces.

So the first two columns are just the GNSO council by itself. You know, everybody should be well versed in this. You know, we have three registrars, three registries. There's a NomCom appointee for the contracted party house. And per the operating procedures, there's one vice chair that's elected by each house. For the non-contracted party house this gets a little bit more complicated. From a structured data perspective, this is why this looks a little bit funny. But within the non-contracted party house, we have different stakeholder groups. Everybody's aware that the BC, IPC and ISPCP have two members, whereas the NCSG has six seats on the GNSO council. But very much like the contracted party house, there's a NomCom appointee for the non-contracted party house, as well as a vice chair nominated by the NCPH. And then we have a string of liaisons, as well as the role of the council chair, which generally is filled by one of the members up above.

And then when we think about how the council votes to make its decisions, we of course have this delineation between those that have voting rights versus our non-voting members. So the end result is there are technically 24 members of the GNSO council, and there are 20 members that have voting rights on the resolutions. And we're breaking it out that three members, not including staff, make up the GNSO council leadership team, the chair, the vice, and two vice chairs. And we get to our grand totals, 27 and 20 respectively.

So now looking at the current state for what our pilot charter was about, the composition was typically one representative from each group. It's almost impossible to try to say this, and even a little bit challenging to even read it. But at the end of the day, there's essentially one from each group with the caveat that if your stakeholder, if your

constituent part, well I'll just read the—yes. So for clarity, a stakeholder group may decide to assign a representative at the stakeholder group level or at the constituency level, if applicable, but not both. So what we're dealing with here in the case of the NCSG is essentially they're seen as three different groups, and it's up to them how they want to appoint the three members that would participate on the standing committee. And then of course, under this pilot framework, there would be a chair, which our lovely Manju is performing right now. And what we get to is a total of nine total members, one of which is really the leadership, which is the committee chair.

And then to contrast that with the task forces, and what you can start to immediately see from the pilot charter is that the general idea was that the standing committee would be doing very little work at all, and we would be launching several task forces, multiple groups at any one time, none of which are necessarily filled by anybody from the council with the exception of a liaison to each of those task forces. But the heavy lifting of the task forces is done by non-councilors across the GNSO. And what is different in the pilot setup, is that there's two primaries and two alternates. So that's why I have this second column here to be able to quantify the alternates.

Now, we only used a task force once, which was for the topic around statements of interest, and I think what is kind of a concern wearing my project manager hat is for me to get work done, I need resources to get done. And when we think about the task force and who participated on that, we didn't even hit 33% of eligible people to participate on it. So that was kind of, in my opinion, at least one factor for partially why we got to the outcome that we did.

Setting opinions aside, the ultimate count is that there are 15 members with 14 alternates for a total of 29. And basically, we still have just the chair of the group acting as a leadership total. I believe there was some language about depending on the task force assignment, there could be vice chairs assigned to this. Typically, we try to strive just for a single chair, but sometimes it does warrant having vice chairs. And I put some footnotes down here. These aren't anything formal. They were really just kind of key components to help describe the current state structure.

So, now let's finally kick over to the future or desired state. Column J here is what the standing committee would look like. And again, very much proposed, very much drafted in draft form. No decisions have been made or anything like this. But the idea is to compare and contrast the future standing committee with the future task forces and how they would be structured. And kind of the immediate takeaway that you can see here is that we're really trying to rely on the heavy lifting of the standing committee and its task forces to be the resources to come from the more broad GNSO, not just the GNSO council. But you will notice there still are tick marks here for existing councilors. And I felt it was important to still include them as members of this effort because not only does the council have this oversight mechanism, but I felt it was important that representatives at a higher level need to be in the know at a council level of what the work of the standing committee is doing. Because at the end of the day, as we noted back on our diagram, any outputs that come from the committee or its task forces will be sent back to the council.

So there's a legend here that I should have probably mentioned. Basically one is a classification of a member and the rest are pretty much roles. So we have C that equals the chair, BC vice chair, LT means that they're on the leadership team, ex officio. So I've only got it listed once. We may change some of these to that particular label. And then also the observer guest. And I'm going to talk about the observer guest concept here before getting into the trying to outline the balance of this. And I will let you know that I'm going to need to drop in about five minutes to prepare for the next call. Again, this is just a quick overview and we can pick up on discussions at our next session.

But what we learned from the GRC, the guideline review committee under the ccNSO is that their board seat was also an observer on their work. And that makes total sense because there are improvement types of activities and discussions going on at the board level that have a downstream effect or impact on our SOs and ACs. And so the idea here is that it's twofold. One, what you're going to see is that our board chairs are also observers. And maybe guests in the future, depending on the topic and the meeting schedule, maybe they have insights of what's going on at the board level in the realm of continuous improvement. Maybe they're just interested in the topic and just want to show up. You know, we can work through the particulars of it, but I felt it's important that they start to have more of a presence here.

And then secondarily, you're also going to see the chairs of all of our stakeholder groups and constituencies also being listed as observers. What I feel is very, very important here is that the leadership teams of all of the SGs and Cs need to be 100% in the know of these changes that are going on. They don't need to be a resource for us to do the work,

but they need to be cognitive of everything going on. And we can't always rely just on a representative trying to communicate the work back. So that's the primary rationale for having all of these observers because they need to be in the know. And in certain circumstances, they need to be informed of the changes that are going on or possibly have contributions to the topic.

Finally, what I'll state here is I tried to, again, create balance. You know, when we're talking about balance of membership on our PDPs, such as EPDP phase one, or the conversations that made the standing committee actually start out in a pilot is the structure and composition of these groups is often a sensitive topic. And there's typically horse trading that's trying to go on to ensure that there is balanced participation. And that's what I'm essentially trying to do here. So generally, there's two from the registrars, two from the registries, typical two from each of the BC, IPC and ISPCP, a total of four for the NCSG. You know, these are GNSO members that are supposed to be doing a fair amount of the work, but you're also seeing that we're relying on some of the councilors up here to be the work, such as the NomCom appointees, the vice chairs of the CPH, of each houses need to be fully aware of the work that's going on, as well as the schedule and the oversight. But I'm trying to spread the love across all of this. And I see your hand Desiree, let me just conclude real quickly.

And the task force is here kind of more or less the same, but what you're going to notice, this column K minus the observers is almost a carbon copy of the distribution of how we have our GNSO councilor. But at the end of the day, what we'd be talking about are 20 total members for the standing committee, three of which are on the leadership team.

So that would be the CCOICI chair, as well as the two vice chairs from each house on the council. We have 12 observers versus task forces here. There's a total of 46 members, six of which would be alternates, still three on the leadership team and 14 observers.

And the final comment about thinking about all of this, the task forces are really starting to feel like an overflow mechanism. When the standing committee has a backlog of work or the next policy and implementation working group comes along where it may take 18 months of effort to get to an outcome, that's where we really start to rely on the task forces. So with that, that's going to be my parting comment. I'll stay on to maybe answer Desiree's question, but I turn the floor back over to Manju. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. And Desiree, please.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC:

Yes. So thank you, Berry, for the document. Yeah, it's clear a lot of thinking has gone in. Some of it we discussed when we compared the ccNSO structure of their group. I would just like to somehow make a differentiation when the representatives from the constituencies or different houses, whether they are currently sitting on the council or not. I think what we're trying to achieve is not to involve councilors that are already busy with other work. So I wonder if in your legend, one could be even more precise to say that these are representatives and not necessarily the councilors, apart from the chair, which should be on the GNSO. Thanks.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Desiree. Yeah, I think that's, I toyed with it. For now, I feel my original thinking here is by making a few of these councilors that are that are at a higher level—for example, it's the CSG that is putting forward one person to represent the CSG to do some work here. So that's really one of six people that would be playing this role. The same for the non-contracted party house or the NCSG. One from the NCSG NPOC or NCUC would be playing that role. So that's one of six. And of course I think it's very important that the vice chairs are fully connected to this, I'm sorry, from a leadership team perspective. But it also seemed like it's possible that the NomCom appointees for the houses are also playing a critical role here, and especially when we're thinking about it in the context of trying to improve upon ...

And so I'll just leave with this, and I definitely need to go, is that we can turn these on or off, we can play around with different versions until we get to some level of agreement on what the structure is. If the group really thinks that this is too much of a burden at the council level, we can certainly downgrade them because the intent is that the heavier workload occurs here, but we still need to be thinking about this oversight function from the council perspective, mostly from a workload prioritization perspective. So please go ahead, Manju, and I'm sorry, I do need to drop. And if maybe, Saewon, you can share your screen with these particular works. Apologies for dropping early. I'll see you on list. Thank you.

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

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks, Manju. I've missed a call or two, so maybe it's been discussed before, but I don't quite understand why it's so prescriptive in terms of the membership. I mean, does it really matter if it's like one council member from the CSG or three? Isn't that really up to the groups themselves, whether they want to put a councilor on or someone else? As long as across the group as a whole, there are some councilors, isn't that really what's important? It just seems awfully prescriptive.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. I think what we discussed was that CCOICI is going to be a long-term thing, and it's not going to end soon. And also, we envision a lot of work for the CCOICI to do. And that's why we sort of discussed how, if we're putting all the burden to councilors, because for now, CCOICI is only occupied by councilors, we are worrying that councilors, on top of all the other things they're doing, for example, council work, they probably represent their stakeholder groups in working groups, or they're probably doing liaison for council to other working group, and they're doing small teams, ad hoc things, it's going to be too much burden for a councilor if we only rely on councilors to occupy the CCOICI. That's why I kind of, at last call, we were like, it's better if we expand this and make more people than councilors to come into CCOICI. Also, especially because CCOICI is not only going to deal with work within council, it's GNSO-wide kind of issues. That's why we

were leaning towards having members, non-councilors to occupy CCOICI than only councilors. But of course, like Berry said, we can always discuss more and toy with the idea of who should we put on this committee. I hope that answers your question. And if you have more, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Well, yeah, it does answer it. But I think my point still stands. It's just not clear to me why we couldn't just say the registrar stakeholder group will have, what would it be, three people, and the registry stakeholder would have three people and the IPC would have whatever IPC would have, whatever many people it is. And why we wouldn't just leave it to them to decide who they want to put on there? You know, and they can choose if a councilor is who they select, then that's great. And if it's not a councilor, then that's great too. I just, I don't know. Maybe it doesn't matter. But I'm just thinking about the CSG because that's the group I'm in. And the moment you start saying one candidate for the whole of the CSG, we start getting into challenges about who that candidate is, given there are three completely disparate constituencies. It just starts to become a selection challenge that perhaps doesn't need to exist.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, definitely. I totally understand your concerns. As Berry just explained, this is just like the first ever very draft thing that can change over time and it changes upon our discussion. So this is, I think, a very good first step of discussion. So this is definitely something we'll note down and we probably can start this from this point to discuss in our

next meeting, which is the 11th of September. And I guess if we feel like kicking off the discussion during the week, like next week while we're not having a meeting, we can do that too on the mailing list. But yeah, I'll have to drop to attend another call for the continuous improvement too. But I think we should definitely note this down and we should definitely start from here in our next call when we discuss the membership. And please, guys, go to the document of the CIPCCG principle thing and please make comments so that we have something for Damon to bring back to the group. And we are at time. Remember, we don't have a call next week. We will pick up the week of 11th of September, same time, on Wednesday. I'll see you guys. Thank you guys for attending the call. Please, please go to Google Doc and edits and make comments. See you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]