DEVAN REED: For the recording, this is Devan Reed. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement Call, taking place on Wednesday, 7 August, 2024 at 13:00 UTC. We do have apologies from Juan Manuel Rojas and Thomas Rickert. 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 statement of interest, please email the GNSO Secretary. 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 back over to Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Devan. Welcome, everybody. I don't know if you guys watch Olympics. I don't watch, but I follow the news still. If you watch, I hope you enjoyed whatever games you watched. And that is my welcome. I guess we move on to the next agenda item, which is announcement work plan, and upcoming meeting schedule. So, I guess first thing to know is next week, we're going to start an hour earlier because of this community outreach thing that the board has started to discuss about the contention strings, something like that. And it's the same hours as ours, so I thought people might be interested in joining that.

So, we have to move a bit earlier and you can go pee when we finish and the board thing started for next week. So, that's our meeting next week. Last week, we asked you guys to kind of edit these inputs to the CIP-CCG framework. I kind of started editing and kind of added comments from what we discussed last week, but as you all know, I'm not a native English speaker. A lot of things I cannot provide proper English that sounds correct or accurate or precise. So, I would need you guys to help accurately reflect what we discussed and suggest wording because you guys speak better English than me.

So, that is that. And because the next CIP-CCG meeting, I think, is the week after next week. So, before that, we still have time to do this, but hopefully, you guys can provide input before the week before next week. Yes, today's CIP-CCG call was canceled. So, yes, please do. I've already added a lot of things. So, you can just build on what I did, but probably hopefully that will be easier. So, that's it. And we'll move on to the third agenda item, which is CCOICI charter dates. Are we reviewing the use cases first or should we look at the table first?

So, I think what we can do is, we can do this first. I know a lot of people haven't put in anything to this, which is fine. I know people might feel like I haven't had time to consult my CRO groups or constituencies. And I don't want to be, how do you say, I don't want to rush into putting something that my CRO groups won't agree, but what I think we can do today is we have a first round of personal initial reactions. And I think also, because if we put this to our CRO groups or constituencies, people don't really know how to react, in a sense. They're like, oh, okay, but what do you want me to say?

So, I think what we can do first is we kind of start the discussion by sharing our personal initial reactions. For example, I actually put in something in here, and it's all only me. I didn't really consult with NCSG before putting anything in it. I guess, to be perfectly honest, I put in things mostly as a person, as a chair, but there's no-- I forgot what it is again. Columns? Or rows? Columns for the chair. So, I just put in the NCSG, which is actually what I represent on CCOICI.

So, if it's okay with everyone, we can start the initial discussions where people just share your initial reactions to the questions. And also, probably my comments to this. I hope that's okay for everybody. I'm not seeing objections. So, probably, I guess, we can start with the questions. The first question is, do we need a cleaner delineation of mission and objectives versus scope of work? Actually, should I be the one doing this? Is it better if Berry, you kind of explain why you put in this question?

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Berry Cobb, for the record. So, I think from a staff perspective, this whole column B are extracts from the document that was the pilot charter. It was not in our standard charter format. And I believe that there was some urgency about launching this work, but when you take a look at the current statement, it seems to blend the mission and objectives of what the standing committee was about, and also tries to fold in what the scope of work or what are the guardrails about what this committee would do.

So, in line with kind of the first question is does this need to be dissected and made more-clear exactly what the objective and mission is of the standing committee versus a separate section, which is technically around the scope of work. Now, I could have easily copied the second sentence here that I'll highlight, where it says the scope of work would be limited, yada, yada, yada, and put it down here, but in the pilot charter, this was a single paragraph. So, I didn't feel empowered to dissect it and just immediately move it down. So, that's an example of the first question.

The second question is generally, is this objective statement fit for purpose for our standing committee charter, which is really what leads us into the following questions, which, at least for myself, is I'm tripping over a little bit specifically the key words here are overseeing and scoping and prioritization of project assignments, or is this something that the council should be prioritizing? Because the current definition seems to give some decision-making authority or empowerment to the standing committee to, "oversee, scope, and prioritize project assignments".

And keep in mind that the members of this standing committee are all from the council. If everybody was here, that's almost half of the council. So, that's something to keep in mind. And then the final part that's a little bit, I guess, not super clear, is the statement also seems to suggest that SG&C representatives outside of the standing committee can also be tapped or utilized to do this overseeing, scoping, and prioritization? And I think it's really some of these core questions that staff would like some clarity on because this sets the framework for how we're going to tee up the rest of the charter. And thus, I hope at least

for me, I'm not expecting answers from these questions today, but when we go through the use cases, I ask that this group be thinking about these types of questions as we review through the past work and possible future work through the use cases. I'll stop there. Manju, any reactions?

MANJU CHEN: Yes. I guess I'll start with my initial reactions that I put into this spreadsheet. First, I feel like it's not a right paragraph for the subject matter experts. Actually, I've expressed I guess my doubt of the subject matter experts because I feel like I don't know if there's really a need for this because if we're doing most of the assignments via task force, I think they'll perfectly fit into task force as they, as in the subject matter experts. So, I'm not sure when or where, like, where we will need the subject matter experts. And while if we really still think we need them, probably it's a better place that we put them in membership model and criteria.

And for the overseeing and prioritization, I feel like we are not scoping or oversee in the sense that, actually, we get assignments from council. And the overseeing, I guess it's overseeing the task force. So, again, probably it's better we put overseeing in the membership model or later when we're having working methods or whatsoever, because overseeing here is a bit confusing and I definitely agree with that. We have a role in prioritization, but I think in terms of scoping, I will prefer the council decides what's within scope of CCOICI, and then when we get assignments within scope that is assigned from the council, we can do the prioritization.

And of course, after we have this prioritization priority list, we'll go back to council and say, this is our, how we prioritize things, what do you think? And if we get permission, that's how we're going to work. And also, I feel this sentence on support and agreement from all SGCs to undertake projects that are SGC-specific. I don't feel comfortable having it within our charter because I seriously don't think CCOICI will be the right place to deal with any SGC-specific issues. So, that's my initial reactions. And I see Jen has her hand up too. Should we move on to Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Was that a question or are you asking me to speak, Manju? This is Jen for the record. Just some initial reactions and a question first. I think I do share some similar sentiments that Manju mentioned, but I want to kind of hone in on the scoping part. I'd like to know for previous standing committees, did the scoping happen at the council level or was that given to the specific standing committee?

BERRY COBB: That is exactly why we're going to have the use cases because it points exactly to that.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Oh, okay. Sorry for kind of jumping the gun here because that's something I had in mind. If it's something that is usually done or if it's not, that would kind of inform how I would see it and inform how I would talk to, I guess, the registries about it as well. I also want to

touch on a little bit about the clause about the participation of the SGs and Cs and subject matter experts. I think it is a bit confusing the way it is constructed in this first paragraph. If we are anticipating that that participation only happens in the task force, then we need to be a lot clearer how we have this sentence, and that would probably kind of answer some of the concerns that Manju has, and I actually am thinking about it right now as well. I think I'll stop here because I don't want to jump the gun if we're going to look at some use cases. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Any other reactions? It can be really just initial reactions because also I think, like I said, it's easier if we have some preliminary discussion and then we have something to bring back to our stakeholder groups for them to consider what to add on or what to oppose. So, if we are not discussing anything here, probably it's hard that we bring back to our stakeholder groups to encourage reactions or discussions, but it's okay if we don't have any other discussions because we will be reviewing the use cases anyways. So, should we move on to use cases now, or--? I guess we are moving to use cases. And for the explanations of use cases, I'll rely on Berry because he was the one who made these beautiful forms as always. And I'll give it to you, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Beautiful, I don't think is the term I would use for this work product, but I am known for beauty and other work products, so I'll still take the compliment. So, these use cases are really born from our original homework assignment. You'll recall that this particular tab

on the stress test page, I tried to list out all of the high-level items, work efforts, activities that were in the genre of continuous improvement and reviews leading us up to where we're at. And of course, where we may be heading. The use cases here are a different form of this. However, the scope of these use cases is strictly within the realm of the GNSO council. So, for the moment, let's pretend that the CIP framework and what the CCG is doing doesn't exist. Let's set aside what continuous improvement through the assessment periods may look like.

Let's just focus on what we've done in the past and what we may do in the future that is squarely within the GNSO's target area or footprint of trying to do improvements to things like PDPs and the like. And so, one of the first ones that we'll start off with here on page one is the policy and implementation working group. So, each table here is kind of structured the same way. The general structure is, what are the some of the key sections of what the charter of that effort would include? but it's very much trying to be condensed. It's not trying to replicate the charter itself, but we've got the title, the triggering event what initiated this type of work to begin.

There're typically things that occur in between from the moment the activity is hatched to the moment it's formally recognized as a project, where possible I put in the scope of work or the charter for the effort, start date and duration. And I think this is important because this really kind of speaks to the prioritization of concept within the charter because, what happens when work starts stacking up? What happens when some of these efforts last for two years?

And I'm reflecting back on this from my point I made just a minute ago. This standing committee is essentially half of the council. And based on my forecast, this is going to be a very busy standing committee when we think about the work that is in front of us and potentially could be headed our way. The membership model and criteria section, this is one of the aspects that we got feedback from the survey input about determining whether this should be converted to a standing committee.

Typically, the work assignments include something about the leadership, what their decision-making methods are, the responsibilities. This section's a little bit vague. Some charters have it, some don't. Don't pay a whole lot of attention. And then, of course, what was the final deliverables and outcomes? And as usual, I'm trying to ask some general questions about what this is like.

So, the policy and implementation working group and kind of, I guess, a little bit in the irony department, the three of our members here just got off a call about the board readiness, small team that was formed off of the council, which, by the way, is a use case we'll talk about a little bit later, but essentially the same triggering mechanism is happening because there's concerns that several of the SubPro recommendations weren't ultimately at least adopted by the board up front that led to several small teams, et cetera, and having to do the extra work to get them across the finish line.

Way back in the day, this was coming as a result of the 2012 gTLD round. There were discussions at the council level. Eventually what it meant is they tasked staff to create a paper around policy versus implementation. Then a few months later, the council decided to

EN

launch a charter drafting team. They created that charter in about two and a half months. The charter was adopted, and then they began their work July, 2013, lasting just shy of two years. 44 meetings at 60 minutes per meeting. There are a few in there that are canceled, but work typically still goes on.

This particular working group was way back in the day of our open model before we had the represented model that a lot of our efforts are today. And I'll also note that at this particular time, not only did we not have a standing committee on improvements for this work, but we also didn't have the strategic planning sessions either. So, this was probably more an ad hoc kind of council discussion that triggered this effort. It was classified as a non-PDP working group. It had 36 participants that was led by Chuck Gomes way back in the day. Actually, there were two co-chairs that were selected by the working group.

The council nominated a council liaison. It followed the standard working group guidelines and standard levels of consensus. Eventually it got to their final report. The board adopted the results of that, that involved amendments to the bylaws sections for the GNSO. And ultimately, this is what led to what we know today as the GIP, the GGP, the EPDPs, as well as the CPIF, which is the governing document for implementation. So, when we think about how this particular work item got started, the question I have is, had this standing committee existed, would this standing committee have any involvement in it getting initiated? If the standing committee was already working on something like statements of interest or something else, how would the standing committee inform the council about the prioritization of this work?

And really, this is an old version of what we're probably now going to be calling a task force. So, think about what that would look like if, and I'm not suggesting that another policy and implementation working group would be launched, but what if the GNSO council did determine that something like that needed to happen? Is this something that is squarely within the scope of this standing committee because it's specific about policy development and draw a bright line around it, or is it more appropriate that this is available to the wider GNSO community to participate in? And I'd note that this particular group had plenty of participants from At-Large and I think maybe even the GAC at one point in time. So, that's the overview of the structure and the substance about this particular use case. I'll stop if there are any questions. Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: So, I don't really have questions, but I'm considering your questions. And at first, I was like, of course, this is within the scope of CCOICI because it's about policy implementation and it's like the responsibility of GNSO. And like, for prioritization, I guess the problem will be, if SOI was dealt with by a task force. And what brings me to ask, well, actually, I have a question. Is it possible we have multiple task force at the same time? I guess this is what we will have to consider when we're drafting the charter. I mean, it is possible, but I think in theory it is, but is it possible in reality, as in we are all very thinly stretched and people have their own priorities, and are we able to have so many people to fill in so many task-force if we want to do something in parallel? Because we weren't even comfortable with starting any PDPs because we feel like too much work.

So, that is something definitely we have to consider when we're, I guess, discussing the charter questions. And also, I think, I guess, distinction between working group and task force here, I'm not sure because nowadays, we know how the At-Large and GAC are extremely interested in any kind of GNSO work. I think if this was discussed in council at this time, they will definitely be like, we want a part. And is the CCOICI's, I guess, authority or right to reject these kinds of requests, or are we going to allow them to kind of participate in any kind of specific CCOICI work? If we consider it's valid or if it's going to be helpful for the discussions, this is definitely something we will have to consider also, I guess, when we're reviewing the charter and updating the charter too. So, that's my initial reactions.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. I do see a question in the chat from Jennifer. So, does the council oversee implementation? I don't think oversee is quite the right word when it comes to the IRTs themselves, but of course, they are an informed and interested party, but technically, when the GNSO adopts a final report that is intended to be implemented, the GNSO is no longer the owner of that work. It gets sent to the board. The board owns that work. The board adopts it. And then it's sent to org that owns the implementation of that.

The IRTs are a community mechanism that allows community input and guidance in the implementation of that work to ensure that it's within the guidelines or the boundaries of what the consensus policy recommendations and their intent behind them. And only when issues pop up in implementation where there are disagreements either

amongst the stakeholders in the IRT or disagreements with the IRT and org, typically that's why we have the council liaison because they act as the go-between to help keep the council informed, not only on just the kind of the general progress of the implementation, but especially when issues crop up.

Okay. Let's kick over to the next use case because this starts to evolve a little bit for where we are going. And that's a very valid question, Manju. And that's why it's really one of the things that, I didn't put it down as a question, but it is in the back of my mind, should something this big-- we're really calling the same thing two different labels, a non-PDP working group and its structure back in the policy and implementation days versus the label of a task force, which in essence is really the same thing just being called different. And I guess the really question is, does it become an open model like the old school policy and implementation working group? Does it use a represented model? Some of those kinds of aspects. So, that's something to consider.

All right, PDP 3.0. I think generally, and I can't speak for everyone here, but in terms of really moving the needle on improvements of how the council and our PDPs operate, I believe this is viewed fairly successfully overall, but this is the first instance where I think if this wasn't our first strategic planning session, it was the second one, but during January, 2018, it was discussed at the SPS of, what are issues that we're seeing with the current PDPs? And at that particular time, we still had three in-flight PDPs.

One, interestingly enough, was the registration data PDP that eventually got closed down because of the temporary specification and then the

subsequent EPDPs, but there was also the RPMs phase one for the rights protection mechanisms associated with the next round of gTLDs, as well as the SubPro working group itself. Both of those efforts, their original timelines and commitments were extremely wrong.

Both groups had, I think, close to eight or nine, what we would have called project change requests, asking for additional time to deliver their recommendations. There was no true oversight or accountability at the council level overseeing the work and recognizing some of these issues is what led for the council to agree for staff to build a report. That report, we went through several council deliberations. There was a public session at ICANN61. We got input from the SGs and Cs. Staff developed the proposed improvements paper that was adopted by the council, that then initiated the work.

And technically the work was implementing 14 of the agreed improvements in that paper. And I guess there are probably questions about whether it should have been more open like a task force versus just councilors, but in the end, it lasted just over a year.

There were some 30, 60-minute meetings. It was a small team of the GNSO councilors, very much like how the standing committee is comprised today. When that was set up, there was no delineation of leadership or decision-making methodologies. I guess informally you could say, it was operating under full consensus, but they were specifically tasked to implement these 14 things as described in the report. Eventually it came to a final report and it updated the GNSO operating procedures and guidelines that you see on the procedures page.

So really kind of the same questions. Had this standing committee existed, would it have been tasked with implementing these 14 recommendations? Again, priority, if we're all sitting around twiddling our thumbs doing nothing, it would be easy to accept this work, but if we're working on statements of interest or continuous improvement, how would this get prioritized? And again, a question, is this strictly within the council's purview or should it have gone to a task force? And again, I'm asking these probing questions because these all target that top level section of what our new charter is going to look like. Questions or comments about this particular effort? Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: So, my question actually was more like, I wanted to know more about the history of this. I was seeing the members of the small teams. You were saying it's one pair of GNCs, but there were two from NCSG. Was it because they like one step down and one step up? Or, I'm guessing probably Rafik at that time could be the vice chair and he was actually a council liaison or a leadership liaison to the small team. And was there a chair in the small team or were they operating without a chair? Those kinds of technical details because I know we will have to consider in the future about chairing and composition, those kinds of things. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Great point, Manju. I'd have to dig through the archives, but I seem to recollect that Rafik was on the council leadership as a vice chair at the time. So, he was kind of tapped to help lead the work, but nothing I

found in the resolution that adopted it said, Rafik is ex-officio or vice chair or chair, but that is why there were two NCSG components because I do believe Rafik was really acting probably more ex-officio than two people from NCSG participating on this.

Okay, let's move on to the next one. We've got 21 minutes left. So, these should be, less surprising. The next three use cases are when the CCOICI pilot was set up. One of its first assignments, which does seem to be squarely in, just the GNSO council is, they were tasked to implement or review and analyze whether implementation was required or had already been implemented in the context of the workstream 2 from the CCWG accountability working group. I believe it was the board and or org that tasked the GNSO, and the GNSO council to implement these recommendations.

This work is distinct from the SGs and Cs implementing the recommendations from workstream two. So, this was specifically within the context of the GNSO council. They reviewed and assessed five of the workstream 2 recommendations that were specific to the council. Lasted about eight months roughly, 14 meetings, 60 minutes. This was extracted from the work, but not too much different than what we see here on this standing committee, basically one from each of the groups and NomCom.

In this instance, this was extracted from the pilot charter itself is that, the standing committee chair is acting as ex-officio and as well as the GNSO council liaison, which was Olga at the time, was for the workstream 2 work. And she was invited to participate in this effort. Essentially, they reviewed the work, basically declared that most of

those recommendations were already implemented and documented how they were implemented. And I believe there's one outstanding item with respect to the human rights impact assessment that's supposed to be a more-broad community type of effort whenever that spins up, but pretty straightforward, it was already within the context of this standing committee's remit and thus why they were tasked with it. Questions or comments about this one?

Oh, what I do want to highlight here is this first bullet. If you go to look at the resolution itself, there was a whereas clause that suggested or hinted that this work could be taken on at the particular time because the work or this committee had also concluded or approached a stopping point when they were-- Where's my cursor subject? Because the working group self-assessment, a lot of the heavy lifting had been done. Therefore, this committee was free to be able to turn its attention to the Workstream 2 effort, but the question does kind of, again, crop up. What if this committee wasn't done with the working group self-assessment? Would the Workstream 2 stuff had been thrown into the backlog or prioritized? Those kinds of things.

The last question about whether this should be a task force or not is probably not relevant. This was strictly around the standing committee, which kind of goes back to our concept is that, the CCO's ICI is really set up to handle improvements that are specific to the GNSO Council. Please go ahead, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: The one thing to note about this effort is also, I think this was the effort where we had, well, I wouldn't implement the concept, I guess, in a sense of the chart, in the charter, that we actually asked our representative to go back to our SG&C to find a subject matter expert to help us about this work, but then, to be honest, I think at least from my memories, those subject matter experts actually, I feel like we didn't really use them like thoroughly, or we searched for them and we asked them to be the subject matter expert, but then they didn't have much to help or we didn't really properly kind of consulted them or rely on their contributions to this.

That's why I've been kind of skeptical about the subject matter experts' things because sometimes I feel like we asked for them, but then we didn't really have tasks for them to do or have used them wisely in the sense that they are the subject matter experts, but they were not able to, share their expertise because we didn't really ask for them. So, that's one thing I want to note about this task. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. I didn't follow this particular effort too closely, so I'm not familiar with how well or not well the SME was, but I do believe that is a valid point. In a way, we've seen it in the transfer working group. We brought in a subject matter expert as part of the membership roster, but for the most part hasn't really participated fully in the overall working group effort. Okay, let's move on to the next one for sake of time.

The working group self-assessment. This one, again, is pretty straightforward. It was already identified in the pilot charter for this group. It seemed the nexus of this came out of the PDP 3.0 efforts, and I think one of the items to implement was, we already had a self-assessment survey at the conclusion of the PDP. The work that was being tasked is, was that survey still fit for purpose? And if not, revise it, and revise it in a way where we can also do an assessment during the middle or duration of a PDP working group.

So, those questions were sent, eventually designed a mock-up of the new working group self-assessment survey was constructed in Google Forms. This was a pretty light-touch effort. There were only six meetings. Then that was sent back to, essentially, the GNSO Council for adoption, and then the staff implementation of this, which is basically concluded. You'll probably recall, I sent an email several weeks ago that we have implemented the survey into our new tool, SurveyMonkey. It's set up as a template.

We've used it for the transfer working group, and here pretty shortly, we'll be forwarding that email to the GNSO Council to just get sign-off that, indeed, that this was implemented, but for the most part, I think really my only question here is, really back in the genre of prioritization if work starts to stack up, but it doesn't seem prudent that this would be a task force type of effort, that's open to the more-broad GNSO and not just the GNSO Council. Those kinds of things.

Questions or comments on this one? Yes, again, pretty straightforward. So, now the fun one. So, this one was the assignment number six for statements of interest. It was also originally identified as an issue in

PDP 3.0, but I believe the Council and staff recognized that this was something that did require input beyond just the Council because essentially, all GNSO members or GNSO community persons are impacted by this. Either they're required to fill out a statement of interest or GNSO community members are interested in viewing other person's statement of interest.

So, it was identified within the scope of work for the pilot of the CCOICI, and it was specifically chosen because it was task force worthy at the time at any rate. And it actually, there's kind of three paths. So, the total work was just a little bit shy of two years. This was the first three meetings of the CCOICI, but there were three meetings about spinning up the task force. Eventually the task force got launched. They held 21 meetings for 60-minute durations. As you'll know, the conclusion wasn't a full agreement. So, it came back here to the standing committee where this standing committee spent five meetings discussing it and eventually went back to the Council where ultimately it didn't get adopted.

Now, what is interesting about this is, in the task force assignment page, this assignment form, I'm not going to open it up, but feel free to check it out. It specifically dictated that there would be two reps from each S, G and C and up to two alternates. There would be the Council committee liaison, basically at the time was Manju, I believe. They're encouraged to appoint representatives and knowledge with the SOIs. All in all, though, we really only wound up with one from each of the groups. And when the task force was spun up because it was so small, nobody was willing to step in as chair because then they would not be able to put forward their group's position in respect to the statement of

interest. So, as it turned out, Marika actually wound up being de facto chair of the group.

Interestingly enough is, the decision-making methodology, and I had missed this on my original first pass, but we received specific input and this was cited as examples in the survey that this group was working under full consensus. Therefore, this is one of the contributing factors as to why it failed, but there was a breathing room in here for the chair to utilize the traditional levels of consensus, but of course, it was not entirely usable because really getting to true and accurate consensus, you need to have proper balance of the participants. So, just something to highlight there that this particular task force was not fully constrained by full consensus and there was a relief valve to get other forms of agreement.

Ultimately, like I said, they created the recommendations report, got sent to the council. So, same questions come up. What about prioritization? What if we already have one task force in flight? Would we be able to have the bandwidth or capacity to stand up another task force, especially if its original scoping looks like it's going to be around two years? And then secondarily, I think that there are some comments out there was, the statement of interest is a requirement for policy development. So, should this have only been within the standing committee to work it or should it really have been a task force model? Was it fit for purpose?

I think from a distance, it seems the task force model is the right model, but then how do we promote and engage and participation, especially when it's announced up front that there's room to participate, but

we've got minimal aspects. I talked about the lack of chair, which is, or as a question about the lack of the chair, which is connected to the representation. And then I think really kind of going back to this buzzword of oversee in the mission section of the pilot charter is, what oversight did the standing committee actually do over the task force other than participation by the standing committee chair and the ex officio representation.

And as a thought experiment, would changing the decision-making methodology to the 3.6 of the working group guidelines have affected this outcome? Would the continued deliberations at the standing committee have affected the outcome? And most importantly, would it have affected the outcome when it got to the GNSO council? Stop there for questions, and I see we have five minutes. Actually, if you don't mind, I'm going to go ahead and jump. We all know the battle scars around statements of interest, but I ask that you pay attention to this.

I want to conclude with this use case, and I think I included one down here about the policy and implementation work. It's not really fully done yet, but that is work that's potentially coming to the GNSO council's way here pretty soon. All right, board-ready recommendations. This is very much kind of like the PDP 3.0. It was identified at December's strategic planning session. In May, the council met and presented about SPS outcomes. June, the council talked about deliberations on the recommendations report, council liaisons, other topics. For July, Kaitlin produced the staff paper on board readiness, whereas as well, a presentation was given at the council by Kurt Pritz.

They're still trying to figure out what the exact scope of work is. We started talking about this at the SPS. It's unclear when this work may conclude, because I think they're still trying to figure out the scope. And what it wound up being is a small team that was formed, where one, two, three, four members of this standing committee signed up for the small team. So, really the same questions apply, what about the prioritization of this work? I mean, is it conceivable that if this standing committee were already permanent, they would be on the receiving end of doing this work? So, what does the prioritization look like in that particular context?

And then really from a process perspective, think about it coming from the strategic planning session, instead of just identifying the issue at the strategic planning session and making it an action item, should the action item be that it directly gets assigned to the standing committee for consideration whether additional work needs to be done to better inform the full council about the work and the scoping of it, but in the end, we have this competing small team that is doing improvement work where really this is what this standing committee is about and then just think about it if the standing committee is already doing work on statements of interest or the policy implementation paper or the assessment period, how does this work get done via the committee? Desiree, please go ahead.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Yes. Thank you, Berry, for reminding us of all of that. And I think the key thing you said to me, at least which resonates really well is that now we have a concept of small teams and there's a majority of the

councilors who really appreciate that format and that kind of toolbox. And so, we really need to perhaps go back. I don't need to go back to anybody but Paul and Anne and discuss this a little bit further with them, but to me, it feels like the small task team format has sailed and it has proven outcomes while we're still struggling with the CCOIC. And that brings into a question really the charter, what particular thing could or should the CCOIC be doing if we already have this speedy way of just setting up small teams where you don't need a pilot, where you don't need a charter and so on.

So, from the process point of view, they seem to be working better if the task is a smaller and more precise, but there's still a vacuum that the CCOIC needs to fill in. And whether we connected with the SPS event, the strategic planning session, that's a question for which I need more thinking.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Desiree. And just a quick reaction and I see we're already at top of the hour, but my concern about all of these small teams is they're thinly scoped. We don't understand the duration and capacity of the council to participate on this. And as a principal here, we need to be more regimented about the work that we're launching because this starts to suck up a lot of time from staff and the council when we start launching several small teams that are going to exceed four months, they aren't formally scoped and those kinds of things. And I think while you're right, small teams have been a successful instrument to get work done. We can't have endless small teams either.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: I hear you. Good point too. Yes. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: All right. Back to you, Manju, to close this out.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I see Jen had her hand up, but I also know that you have a meeting right after this. So, probably we can follow up on the mailing list of whatever, because we appreciate everybody's precious opinions and input. And just a reminder to finish your homework, you can, I guess, if you don't feel comfortable to fill in the spreadsheet with what you feel, you haven't consulted your Seattle groups, you can put your names so we know it's your personal reactions and we can start from that.

It's okay that you don't get much input from your group and also the CIG document. Please find time to kind of look at it and add things because we had a very nice, fruitful discussion last week. I would definitely want we keep that and put it into these criteria. And for next meeting next week it's going to be an hour early, so don't forget and that will be all. Thank you and sorry for two minutes run over. Thank you.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]