JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call on Wednesday, the 11th of September 2024. We have apologies from Prudence Malinki today. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. All right. 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, and please note all 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 community anti-harassment policy. Thank you. And over to our chair, Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Julie. So I just messaged Desiree, and I think she says she is currently at the Serbian IGF, so probably she won't be able to join. She could try to join 15 minutes later if possible, but we can mark her as apologies, at least for the first 15 minutes. Yes. So welcome, everybody. Welcome to September. Welcome to a new semester for those who start your semester in September or your kids who start in September. We're hoping to finish the charter and for council to review in the November meeting in Istanbul. We really need to start substantially reviewing the charter. As you can see, we will have a meeting every week starting this week in September. We are planning to report progress to the GNSO council on the 17th of October. I think we'll send out meeting invites for October when it approaches. But for now, you should have the

---

invitations on your calendar. If you do not, please reach out to us so we can send it to you. I think that's pretty much the work plan update. We will continue to review the CCOICI charter. I've sent reminders to you all to add comments, but I haven't seen any. It's okay, I've added enough comments myself, so we can probably start with my comments. And people, please feel free to chime in whenever you have comments to make, too.

First, before that, I would like to let you know that Damon is now replacing Susan as the IPC rep on this committee. Welcome, Damon. We think it's a better fit since Damon is also representing GNSO council on the CIPCCG, so it's continuous improvement on both fronts. We don't want to create extra work for either Damon or Susan. Of course, Susan will be missed because she has been very helpful during all of the assignments and projects we've done in CCOICI. That's about it. Let's start with the charter review. Should we just start with the comments, and we can add things when other opinions arise? Let's just start.

For the mission part, I think we all had Berry explain the whole charter the week before last. I made comments in this paragraph on the mission where it says "policy development process," and I think it's better if we just refer to "policy effort" because there are other policy efforts in the GNSO aside from PDPs. Does anybody else have suggestions or opinions?

BERRY COBB: Hi, Manju. I'm sharing my screen. I don't know where I can raise my hand, and I forgot the keyboard shortcut. The reason I'm using the

formal name here is that it's conceivable or highly likely that the CCOICI or a task force will be working on something like what we've experienced in the past—PDP 3.0 or the old policy and implementation working group. So, it's conceivable that in the future, if there's a PDP 4.0 or if you saw on the agenda, there's the policy implementation status report that the council is considering. These types of efforts directly impact the GNSO operating procedures and possibly parts of the bylaws. This is formally recognized as that phrase. Those types of activities could amend the PDP procedures or structures. For example, policy and implementation is the group that created the EPDP, GGP, and those kinds of things. That was the intent of trying to use a formal label here. The remainder of the text emphasizes that this group is not doing consensus policy development or policy development against existing or future consensus policy, but drawing a line that this group could be making improvements to the policy development process.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. That makes sense. Now I see Jennifer Chung, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju, thanks, Berry. I appreciate Berry's context on this, but I think it might be useful for that information to be captured in a footnote or a link to what you just mentioned. Because my initial reading was similar to yours, Manju. "What about the other items?" Oh, I see there's a list. Thank you for showing that list to us. Maybe just where the phrase "policy development processes" is, there could be an anchor link that brings us down to that. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Jen. I was going to suggest the same. It would be helpful to add an explanation or a footnote to make it clearer. Thank you. Let's move on. I didn't make any comments for the scope section, so does anyone have comments or want to add anything?

BERRY COBB:

Yeah, just real quick. So this is a placeholder. So the intent here, as we had discussed before, the pilot charter was very prescriptive about the work of what the pilot would or could be doing. Now that this is becoming a standing committee, it doesn't make sense to be prescriptive about the future work that it specifically could be doing, but more an attempt to create guardrails about what it could potentially be doing. And so the idea here is if you look at the old pilot charter where we've ripped out all of those prescriptive assignments, and for right now we have a very informal backlog of potential work that could be done, after we consider this draft of the charter stable, our next task, of course, with staff support is going to be to reconcile all of this work that's in the backlog and anything that's on the council's plate right now to really start to map out what's been done, what is being worked on right now, what's in the backlog, and then probably start trying to prioritize what are the next things this standing committee could be working on. So, again, just kind of a pointer to this informal list. When we get substance around what the work could be, we'll be migrating this to our program management tools. It's not just going to be a Google Doc list here, but carrying on the project management approach to how we manage our work. And so that's the intent of this. And we'll get this

formalized before we actually submit the charter to the council. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Any questions or any other suggestions? If not, I guess we can move on to my… Oh, I did make a comment on this section. So, considered, I thought it's a good word that captures all but I'm not sure if we want to be more specific, as in, after consideration, if it's approved, it will be implemented. You know, by whoever. I mean, considered already captures, I guess, whether it's like a catch-all word in the sense that it could means that the council consider and not approve or council consider approved, so I thought it's a good word, but I don't know if we want to kind of suggest, if it's approved, then it should be implemented. Any thoughts?

BERRY COBB: So I'll provide context here, but none of this is die on the hill for me. In fact, you should not be relying on me to be the authoritative scribe here because I'm a horrible writer, and I don't choose words very well. I was being specific with "considered" because as you mentioned, Manju, the way this is being structured, the GSO council will approve and initiate all work that the standing committee or task forces do. They will also be the receiving end or the outputs from the committee's work or the task force work. In either case of whether the work products have high levels of consensus or no consensus at all, that report will be sent back to the GNSO council so that the council can consider the next steps. If it's something that is achieves consensus or higher, then likely, there would

be a motion accompanied with it to adopt those recommendations and then come up with an implementation plan, which, of course, implementing it would very likely come back to this particular committee. But in the cases as a recent example of statements of interest, where that did not achieve, well, at the time, I guess, full consensus, it went back to the council and ultimately got defeated. But unfortunately, the work didn't stop, and so in that context, the council considered the task force's work on statement of interest, and we're still waiting for new work to be coming back for the council to then consider are we going to do more work on this or not. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. So, any thoughts? Is it sufficient enough that we just put "considered" here? I think it wouldn't harm to add something like if approved, then it should be implemented, but does that sound like we're indicating there are more chances than not that it's not approved? I am not sure, so I'm welcoming thoughts here. I guess people are nonchalant about this, which is okay, too. We can go. I assume that after reviewing the whole thing, we will have to go back and like speedily review everything again. So if anybody has second thoughts by then, maybe you can think of it more. For now, we can move on.

Yes, for this one. Also, this is me being unsure if we should use the words we always use, which is "consensus." But then I understand that there are different levels of consensus, so I'm not sure if we put "consensus" here, you will raise questions where people will be like, what kind of consensus are you saying? So this is also a question for all of you. Any thoughts or any suggested edits?

BERRY COBB:

I can go either way. I guess in some ways, this is kind of repetitive to the statement that we just talked about being considered up here. I think consensus does work because if you look further down in the draft charter, based on feedback from the surveys and the like, it's clear that any work that the standing committee or the task forces do will indeed be operating under the 3.6 guidelines on the consensus designations. And so under that, it probably does make sense to refine, ditch agreements and put in consensus or some kind of framing of that language. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Okay, and I'm not seeing any other objections, so I guess we are okay with changing this to "consensus." So let's wait a bit and move on to the next, I think. For this one, we actually had several discussions already from the week before last week. Susan raised it. It wasn't marked down here, but I can raise it for her again. She was questioning if we have to be so specific about one council member from each stakeholder group. The concerns she raised was that she thinks, according to her, when people in the CSG see that there's only one member from the stakeholder group, they will automatically or naturally start arguing about which one should be sent from CSG. Damon, please.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure, and this just could be a newbie question, so forgive me in advance. But it says we're going to have 20 members and 12 observers, that seems like a lot. I guess my concern would be is if we have this many

members, but we only have 50 to 60% of that participating, is it going to be counterproductive, and do we maybe want to revisit the overall number of members? Again, forgive me if that is a newbie question, but it strikes me that it seems like a lot of folks for this group, but just a question there.

BERRY COBB:

So yes, hopefully, maybe what I'm going to say here is not only to help Damon from his newbie status, but generally to reinforce why in this draft we went the approach that we did. And me being a structured data guy, I've always got to use a sheet to help me figure out and organize things. So just as a quick reminder, I've got, let me zoom in on this for you a little bit. The top rows here are the current council. These rows down here are the broader GNSO divided by the houses, and then their subsequent stakeholder groups, and then particular roles. So columns D and E are a representation of the persons that actually sit on the council versus their voting capabilities. Rows F through H are derived from the pilot charter that was put in there, recognizing the key aspect here is the under the pilot charter, the CCOICI was comprised of these nine members that currently exist and sit today. Whereas a task force had it specifically outlined that this is what the task force would potentially look like if they were being assigned. So after reviewing through not only the past, the present and the future of work, the main motivation for even trying to go down this road is this structure here is likely not fit for purpose, given the workload demands. And at the same time recognizing if the workload demands are high, can we really have five different task forces operating in parallel? So previous calls we discussed that it's already a tall order to be a councilor, given your particular roles,

and that given the likelihood of higher workload demands, especially over the next three years, the intent was to be able to reach out to the more broad GNSO for resources to do this work. And I think it's also kind of a general understanding that any of these types of improvements, whether it's a PDP 4.0, or the board readiness small team that has just been formed that would likely have been for the standing committee, all of that work doesn't just have to be only GNSO councilors. All of it, policy implementation was an actual non PDP working group. The PDP 3.0 was born out of the SPS. Staff wrote a paper that was ultimately adopted by the council, and then PDP 3.0 was actually the implementation of those improvements. But again, we're looking ahead and looking at the workload demands. So columns J through L, specifically J is an attempt to try to push the resource demands out to the broader GNSO. Now you're going to see labels of LT for leadership team or labels for OB for observer. So it definitely is a valid question. Why do we have all of these observers? We have all of these observers for a few reasons. One is because we're likely going to be operating under a represented model. It's been staff's experience that some representatives are not great about sharing information back to their respective groups. And that is one of the primary reasons for keeping the chairs of the SGs and Cs on the mailing list, so that they can be aware of these transformative activities that will affect the GNSO or the GNSO policy development process. And the same will also go for the board chairs, board seats 13 and 14. The whole aspect of this in the context of the continuous improvement framework is that the continuous improvement framework is meant to replace the aspects of organizational reviews. That suggests to me that there is now a higher level of importance to this work. And therefore, in my opinion, and I'll

claim I'm the one that dreamed this up based off of previous discussions, but I take no pride of ownership. But the way I see it, these changes are potentially so impactful, we need to keep all of the stakeholder groups and its leadership teams informed. And that's why there's the bigger list.

The final thing I'm going to say about some of these council representatives, in particular the NCAs, it seemed plausible that we would want to rely on the NCAs more as being members of this standing committee. Even though they're on the council, they are typically different than the other councilors representing their respective groups. It's more often than not that NomCom appointees are not a part of any particular SG or C, and also likely that they're not participating in SG and C other activities and those kinds of things. And therefore, at least to my knowledge, I believe Paul had tried doing this as the non-contracted party house NomCom appointee was trying to increase collaboration on council matters, but they were only emails. And so what I'm saying is that those NomCom appointees aren't meeting with their respected houses that they're assigned to. Their council workload is conceivably a little bit less than other councilors on the stakeholder groups. Thus why we were lighting up that they be represented here.

The final thing I'll say, and then I'll turn it back over, the vice chairs of the council. So for those that don't know, the leadership team of the GNSO council is a second job on top of just being a councilor. But there still needs to be this element of oversight from the council on the committee's work, if for anything, to keep informed about the status, the progress of the work, as well as when any issues may prop up. So the idea here was that the vice chairs would actually be a part of the

leadership team of the standing committee and whereas the chair of the GNSO council would just be in an observer mode.

And then finally, I lied, one more aspect. Damon raises a good point about having such high numbers on the CCOICI or I believe Manju even made a comment about the task force and having all of these people. So the reason why there are bigger numbers here is we need resources. I don't know where to get them other than to reach out more broadly to the GNSO. So the intent and the way this is worded that this is a ceiling, not a floor, and it is conceivable that some groups will not put forward certain amounts, especially on the task force items. We already have an example of that, which was the statement of interest group. It was a task force, and when you look at that assignment form, it gave the opportunity for 29 GNSO participants to participate in that effort, and we got one from each group and nobody wanted to be a chair. So I don't know how we overcome that, but resourcing is definitely an aspect to this, and I'm going to stop there because I've carried on for a while.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Damon?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Just one quick question. I mean, on average, how many people, how many councilors attend these calls of the committee as it is right now? I think this is like the third one I've been on, and it seems like typically we're running somewhere between five to ten folks. Is that right?

BERRY COBB: So I did actually do an analysis of all prior standing committee calls, and we're about 74% attendance rate, which honestly was a lot higher than I had anticipated.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: And then 74% of nine because we're supposed to be at nine members right now?

BERRY COBB: Correct.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Okay. Just my two cents worth, if we're running roughly six to eight people right now, which just sort of sounds like where we're at, I think staffing it with 20 and 12 observers, you're going to have a largely empty group. And each constituency group obviously needs to have a voice in it if they want to have a voice. I just think planning for 20 based upon the current attendance may be a bit, or actually I think is pretty aggressive, and you may want to cut that down. So that's all. That's all I'll say. Just my thoughts. And apologies for speaking out of turn, but those are my thoughts.

BERRY COBB: Definitely don't apologize. I also want to bring forward something else about this proposed approach. So again, there's a massive amount of

work that's got to be done. So that is independent of whether we have two people listed here, one person listed here, or 10 people listed here. So I think that's something that all of the GNSO needs to consider about—we've got all of this work coming our way. We have to do it. How are we going to get it resourced? And again, that was the primary motivation of trying to push this out to the more broad GNSO. The other point I want to make here is I've tried taking a balanced, represented approach here. And the attempt here is to actually hard-code whatever the structure is of the committee, as well as the task forces, because every time the GNSO launches some kind of effort, we rehash the same debates that one group is over-favored or another. So I mentioned before, this is directly connected to the consensus level designations and why we're looking—A, we need resources. B, we need balance because it's tied to the consensus model designations. And what I'm going to talk about here is a possible use case. Let's forecast into the future, where we are doing SOI 3.0 based on a council assignment that's based off of the new external ethics policy that's going to be delivered to the community at some point. What happens if the CCOICI gets handed this assignment, and for whatever reason, we wind up with an imbalance where we have six contracted parties and three non-contracted parties? Can the chair of the committee be able to gauge consensus on some of those recommendations on an imbalanced matter? And so what I'm really wanting to avoid here is when we think about the future work, once the standing committee is made permanent, I don't want the council to have to rehash the balance of, or the represented balance for each charter. The point of having charters, or at a minimum, assignment forms for this new work is A, that we don't have to rehash the balance of the structure, but we focus more on the

scope of the work, because every one of these are going to be projects. They're going to have a start date, and they're going to have an end date, and they have a requirement of a deliverable based on the scope that is defined in the charter. That's the important part, so that we can gauge how long these efforts are going to be, so we can do prioritization and resource planning for the work that is in the pipeline. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. Thanks, Berry. I have, hopefully, a simple ask. I'm looking at this list. I don't have the depth of knowledge or that beautiful spreadsheet that Berry flashed earlier. Yes, this one, but let's go back to the charter. The request is, after each of the points, or the category of members, can we just have in brackets the total number of people, so I can very quickly see what the balance looks like, because it says 20 members, 12 observers, but obviously, I don't know exactly what that is. Would that be two? It says from each constituency or stakeholder group, so the total would not be two, right? Maximum of, so maximum of whatever. You don't have to do that now, but that's my request, so it would be very easy for me or anybody reading it to understand, okay, this is our balance. This is what we're looking at. We're balancing between contracted, non-contracted, other kinds of balancing considerations. It would be quite quick, and I mean, if you would like to, it's good to do a deeper link to a reference to your spreadsheet, but I

think having those numbers gives us a quick appreciation of what the balancing looks like. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jen. So, it's going to be two times seven, which is 14 for the maximum of two. So, I made a comment here about the council and NomCom appointee. I think Berry has explained the rationale behind this design, but I'm thinking the fact that before becoming an NCA on council, they still belong to their own stakeholder group or constituency. And they still attend their stakeholder group or constituency meetings. So, I'm not sure what interest or what stake they're going to represent on this committee. I'm not sure the added value of putting them or forcing them, in a sense, here. Yes, Berry, I see your point. But in the case when the NCA are like what we're having now, I can already envision people raising questions of, is this factually, actually some groups' interests are more represented in this group or whatsoever? So, I'm not sure it's necessary. And also, I actually don't get the distinction of putting the voting members as members and non-voting as observers. Because I don't take them that much different. I mean, in council, probably they are differentiated by the ability to vote or not. But I feel like on the committee, this shouldn't be what's restraining them from participating. If we are necessary to add NomCom appointee, I would actually suggest we add one and we let them decide which one we put them as members. That will be my suggestions. But, of course, again, welcome thoughts from everybody else. And any reflections, probably, to what I said also.

BERRY COBB: What I'm going to say here is the number of meetings this particular standing committee is going to have to finalize the charter is directly correlated to how this group is going to get to agreement on what this structure is or some other path that is not in my view right now. I want to be very clear here. These observers, I think in the table, I refer to them as observers and guests. It's conceivable, for example, that the board chairs from the GNSO may actually decide to do a guest appearance on these calls. Maybe they have some information that they want to share with the GNSO about the board's view on the pilot holistic review or the future holistic review. But typically, A, I'm calling these out to put on the notice about GNSO leadership that they need to be aware of what's going on. But then secondarily, there could be opportunities where these people may randomly participate. But generally speaking, these 12 persons here in their particular roles are strictly observing from a distance, just to kind of keep in the know, as a backup plan, if representatives of their particular groups are not giving them information.

The second point for why I raised my hand is the NCAs, if we remove them from this list, and depending on the type of work, they decide to participate on the standing committee or the task force, to your point, Manju, if one of them is perhaps associated with a particular group, does that disrupt the balance of the work when trying to get to consensus, especially on quite hot topic issues? And I'm going to close with this, is way back in the early days, I don't think I have the document, but I pointed out when we were talking about membership, that the council has had all of these same discussions before in one form or another, especially in the context of the reason why the CCOICI was a

pilot was about the membership structure and who's going to be participating on it. So the more we tweak this is correlated to the more meetings we're going to need to get to agreement. And even if we get to agreement here, of course, the full Council still needs to consider this as well. So we need to keep that in mind. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I understand what you are explaining, but I still think one NCA is enough, and we let them choose to be, like, we let them appoint one to the CCOICI as a member, and we get rid of the observers. But that's my opinion. I welcome any other objections or support. And I guess from what you're saying, then we could probably add a footnote saying that, okay, so there are three, and we let them appoint one. And it's preferably going to be someone outside of GNSO. So, instead of someone who is already well known, who belongs to any of the stakeholder groups or constituencies, we welcome the NCA that's from none of the constituencies or stakeholder groups, which, well, coincides with what you were saying. We've actually had more NCAs that were not part of previous groups. So, I think that would be my suggestion, but I'm not seeing any reaction to this.

I see Jen's comment in the chat about board members as liaisons instead of observers. I support that idea. So, I don't know if anyone wants to adjust—please raise your hand now. If not, probably we can add another category as liaison, or I don't know. We have a list of, like, in the membership structure, probably we can have a list of, well, if it's a liaison, then they're part of the leadership. Because I think that's the

logic this document is using. So, probably under the leadership section, we can add them as liaison.

Another thing, I have a question per the one chair from each constituency and stakeholder group. I think my question is how a lot of, for example, NCSG, more often than not, we don't have enough volunteers. A lot of times our chairs, they have to be the volunteers on certain working groups or committees or whatsoever themselves. So, does this chair as observer actually forbid them from participating as a member? That's my question. Or it's more like, do we, should we do this?

BERRY COBB: So, I'll just add here, again, the observer role is that they're not an active participant in the work. They're meant to be informed. And your particular example from the NCSG perspective, if that's all you've got for a resource, then their active participation on the standing committee, by extension, keeps them informed of what their stakeholder group or constituency should be aware of. So we can add a footnote that this does not prevent them from participating in one of the active member roles.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, cool. Thank you. So, another thing I didn't mark down, but I wanted to point it out. I don't know if you missed the two council advisors here as part of the 12 observers, because below in the leadership section, you actually pointed out that they are going to be members or participants. And in your spreadsheet too, I think they're marked down

as part of the leadership team for the CCOICI. So, I don't know if they're missing from this list, or is there any ...?

BERRY COBB: Well, I think somebody put—I think it was you, Manju—that we can replicate the details under the leadership structure to mimic that. Again, I'm really thinking about this from a resource and information perspective. And while some of the roles are showing up here, that is distinct from their participation as being a part of the leadership team, but we can work on that. And again, maybe I need to do observer email only. So, I can delete that, but I'm trying to make very clear here that the intent of this term "observer," in fact, gets used a thousand different ways across the ICANN community. You know, in the GAC, for example, an observer is a formal role assigned to an IGO that is a member of the GAC. Whereas here in GNSO land, typically our use of the term observer means anybody can sign up for a working group and be added to the group's mailing list without posting rights. And if they choose to, they can show up on our working group webinar formats as a guest in the room, but they don't have the ability to actively participate.

The idea here is that none of these people are really active participants in any way whatsoever. I'm not even sure that we would even give them posting rights, but we can, because we trust that they're not going to send spam to the list. But the intent here is that they are not actively participating. They are merely informed. And if they choose to and would like to attend every call like I do, then they're welcome to attend, but they aren't part of the consensus calls. They're strictly here to be informed.

MANJU CHEN:	Thank you, Berry. The explanation has been very helpful because I kind of assumed they have to attend every call, and I thought it's a lot to ask of them. So, if it's just email, I mean, we can definitely ask for some clarifications, explanations about what we mean by observers so people don't get scared when they see their titles in this charter. Jen, you have your hand up.
JENNIFER CHUNG:	Yeah, thanks, Manju. Sorry, I need some clarification with my confusion in the chat. So, when you had the example about resourcing or the limited personnel from the non-contracted party house, Berry says that the observers—being an observer does not preclude them from being able to participate. So, I just want clarification. Is it true that one person can be both an "observer" and also an active member in the standing committee?
BERRY COBB:	So, to re-emphasize here, maybe I just need to delete it, but I felt it's important. Again, given the importance of this work, it is critical, in my opinion, that the GNSO leadership be continually informed about these big changes. So, if under this role—and I can footnote it, or maybe we need to put definitions around some of these terms so that it's clear about what the role means—but again, they're just observing from a distance. So, Manju, who's the chair of NCSG right now?

MANJU CHEN: Julf.

BERRY COBB: Julf. So, in the future, Julf would be an observer email only, and then Julf terms out. And let's say he gets replaced by Manju. And Manju's now the— I saw a shaking head yes, not a no—but let's pretend Manju became chair of the NCSG. Now by default, she would be replaced as an observer email only to keep informed about the continuous improvements across the GNSO. But then Manju realizes, "Oh gosh, I don't have a deep bench for resources, so I'm going to take one for the team and participate in this particular group." Because as her observer email only status, that really wasn't meant to be an active participant, I personally don't see any harm from a resource perspective that she fills this role because it's only going to be this group where consensus is determined, not by these groups. I hope that helps.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you for the explanation. I think that's clear. One thing I thought of, because I guess we were having questions and concerns about how many observers there are, and after clarification, it's okay. But I was thinking, so Berry, you were mentioning the essential purpose for adding them, especially the chairs of SG and C, to these observer roles is because they have to keep an eye on what's happening and be kept in the loop with this important work. I can't help but think of the meetings we always have during our face-to-face meetings where we have the SG and C chairs come to the council room, and we have an informal meeting or discussion of sorts. I'm wondering—it could be either or, or

on top of this—do we add the CCOICI update as a standing item to that meeting? It could be a good way to keep them informed. So, that's just an idea to throw out here for everyone to kind of ponder. So, that was for that.

BERRY COBB: And if I may, I want to go ahead and forward to your comment here as well, because it is directly connected to this kind of structure. But to talk about it, I'm going to go back to my sheet. So, the intent here—naturally, any GNSO councilor that ever participates in any one of these things is going to naturally term out based on the term structure defined in the GNSO bylaws or the ICANN bylaws for the GNSO section. So over time, whether it's one to four years, there's always going to be this churn in the standing committee or a task force that gets launched out. And you'll notice the task forces hardly have any representation from the council on it because they're going to need to be fairly busy here in this particular work. But at any rate, because they naturally term out or there will be natural turnover over time, the question on the table when I was putting this together is, well, this is a standing committee. It's going to exist forever until the council decides to shut it down. So the question is, do we do term limits for non-GNSO councilors that participate in this—not as an observer role—even the observers naturally term out over time because of their particular charter guidelines that dictate how they get into and the duration of their leadership positions. But where we see numbers here from the respective groups, and I started thinking about it we're already kind of resource-strapped. There are going to be a bulk of GNSO persons who just simply aren't interested in continuous improvement. They're

interested in the next round. They're interested in accuracy and those kinds of things.

So instead, it seemed to over-engineer that we're providing term limits for the core body of members that are going to be doing the work here. For a task force, it doesn't matter. Task forces are always a project—start date, end date. When it ends, these people naturally term out when the project ends. But here, we may more likely have individuals put forward by the groups because they're really actively interested in improving GNSO operations. And if they're interested and then get termed out after two or three years, does that hinder or improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations of this particular standing committee?

So that was my attempt in the wording here, that the council members and/or SG and C leaders as observer email only to these particular groups, that turnover is going to naturally happen based on their roles. But the core of the workhorses here get to participate for as long as they're willing to participate, and it's up to the SG and C leaders to determine who they want to backfill in these particular roles. So, that was the intent on those.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I think after your explanation, it makes it more clear. But I just—from reading it, it sounds very weird. Because it's like, in a sense, they all have terms, but we're saying they will not have terms. It's like they have their own terms; it's not terms on the CCOICI. I guess we can probably think of how to rewrite it to make it clearer, especially for non-native English speakers like me. Because the rationale was clear, but

I just cannot get it from reading the sentences. Maybe we can wrap here.

BERRY COBB:

Yeah, I'll just add here real quick. So, I very much encourage—typically I'm not a fan of multiple people redlining a document, but it seems overkill to try to control suggested edits to this in a separate document. So, I'm going to ask that the members here please come into this group, make sure you're in suggestion mode, and if you really think you have a great idea about how to improve the text, please redline it. If you have any kind of doubts or you're not sure it's going to get support, then make sidebar comments and we'll continue working through this particular document.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. Please, people, go to the document and make comments. I feel very lonely being the only head in this document. I will be very happy if you guys join me and we see a lot of other head icons in this document. And with one minute to the end, do we have any last questions, opinions, or last reminders for anybody to note?

If not, let's try to wrap up this meeting a few seconds before it ends for a nice restart. Please, people, go to the document and make your comments. Next week, we're having a meeting at the same time. Please come. And before coming, make your comments. And I'll see you next week. See you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]