EN

ICANN Transcription

CCOICI

Thursday, 18 July 2024 at 11:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:
https://community.icann.org/x/hIDIF

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Thursday the 18th of July 2024. We have apologies today from Prudence Malinki and Thomas Rickert. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted to the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With that, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Manju Chen. Please begin, Manju.

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.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Julie. Hi, everyone. I don't want to waste too much time on saying nonsense. I guess if we don't have any immediate questions or whatever, we can just kick start the meeting, which is the second item of the agenda. We are going to start to deliberate on the CCOICI charter update. We will start with the reminders and work plan, which I think Berry is going to do for us. And then we're going to review the conversion table. Is it in the chat already? Probably later. And this is going to also be led by Berry. And I wish we all can actively discuss what we're seeing on the screen later when we're seeing the screen. And let's get started. I'll give the floor to Berry. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Welcome, everyone. And so, yes, no point in restating the agenda. I will add we have one item for any other business or maybe it's next steps, which will be talking about the next call that we're going to have after today. So, just as a quick reminder, we're obviously here to construct a new charter to make this standing committee a permanent standing committee. Our primary deliverable is the charter itself that we'll return back to the GNSO Council for their approval. We're still targeting the end of the year to be able to return this back to the Council in preparation for partly being ready for what's coming out of the continuous improvement project, the cross-community group that's defining that continuous improvement. Framework. But additionally, there are still plenty of other improvement items that this committee, as well as task forces, once this is stood up, could essentially start working on. Or basically, we already have a pent up demand and

backlog of potential work. So we really do want to try to get this charter completed before the end of the year.

So really, there's not much other to update in the administrative department. So I'm really going to go ahead and kick on over into what we're going to review for today. Just as a highlight, previously last week, we kind of talked about this particular table that I put together, which was kind of a review of the past of kind of everything, continuous improvements that has been a part of the GNSO over time. We briefly touched on some of the previous GNSO reviews. We highlighted some of the continuous improvement types of work that had occurred over the timeframe, most of which is more in the genre of enhancing and updating the policy development process, such things as PDP 3.0, or some of the items related to the implementation of consensus policies. And then kind of an idea of where we're at now, and then a review or items of potential work this standing committee and its task forces could potentially take on. As well as, as I noted just a minute ago, there's still work that is within our pipeline that will eventually need to be reviewed, determine if it's for purpose for this group to work on, and then eventually get into working on it.

The other quick image to keep in mind is what we labeled as kind of an overarching principle that the framework of this standing committee, as well as its task forces, are fit for purpose. Ultimately, the GNSO council is the decision making body here that will task out various improvement work items as the council determines needs to be done. This will be passed to the council committee. The council committee will be doing particular work related to GNSO council and PDP related type of improvements.

While there are other improvements that could be worked on that require involvement and scope beyond just the GNSO council, but the full GNSO. Regardless of which group is doing that work and once it's scoped, chartered and agreed to initiate, all of its outputs are returned back to the GNSO council for any ultimate decisions.

The second tab is what we'll be reviewing through today. Before I go through an overview of this, and I know that the text is going to be a little bit small. When the council approved for this group to start working on its permanent charter. Staff had taken a first step of trying to take the content from the pilot charter and put it into our standard GNSO charter template. But the first problem with going down that road is that we wanted to avoid perceptions that staff was making any decisions about the components of the charter.

And at the time, for me personally, I had my own visual ideas about what would belong in this charter. But as I've started to peel back the layers of the onion going through the past of previous organizational reviews, previous work on types of improvements that the GNSO has done, trying to dive a little bit deeper in the previous work that this particular standing committee and its task force worked on, such as the statements of interest, the work stream to items from the Council ,and starting to actually read the details of the existing charter. What I had in mind about what this charter could look like has dramatically changed from probably what it's really going to look like. And that's really kind of the desire or outcome that I hope to get from the group today, is to understand what we're really up against.

And first off, I kind of hope that this is the last call where Berry does most of the talking and that it's really more of the group. And certainly part of the homework that's going to be done is trying to go through a similar thought experiment about thinking about use cases in the future to help test what we're constructing in the charter to see that it is fit for purpose.

With that in mind, kind of an overview of what this particular tab is about. The first column over on the left are the key sections of our template charter that we'll go in. You know, essentially there's always an omission and objective of the group that's being formed. What is their scope of work, which is something we'll need to navigate around when we're thinking about this being a permanent standing committee and not having to continually update its charter.

Below is a section about this standing committee itself and what does the membership look like? What does the leadership team look like? What its decision making methodologies are, what its responsibilities are going to be as well as any deliverables and outcomes it produces. And we're also going to be comparing and contrasting that with the work of the task forces. Which again, the membership typically will be beyond just the GNSO councilors, but a more open model to other stakeholders across the GNSO. But it still has the same components. What's its membership look like, the leadership look like, what its decision making methods are, responsibilities, deliverables and outcomes.

And then the bottom section are items that weren't really in the pilot charter, but what we have picked up on other working group charters as well. And some components that we may want to think

about. So, one of the items that kind of popped into my mind is this is going to eventually be a permanent standing committee, but at some point we still need to review. Is it working or is it not? So kind of a mini standing committee review for lack of a better term. And we'll need to figure out or find mechanisms about how this group can provide input and information back to the Council to determine whether the structure and charter is still fit for purpose and working as designed. Are there any kind of data and metrics that the standing committee might need as well as its task forces?

Something that wasn't mentioned in the pilot charter, but is certainly a topic of interest is statements of interest itself. Even though that might be a particular topic this group might be working on. And another component that we may want to think about is, are there any escalation or complaint kind of processes that we need to attach into this charter when we think about going through it? So that's kind of the rough breakout of the different sections.

And then essentially columns B are those, the content from the pilot charter itself dropped into an appropriate section that we think will be the target charter. And then column C, a first attempt at trying to take the principles that we talked about earlier, which is basically these particular slides. And some of these have evolved since we wrote these particular slides. But each particular cell has a mini section to kind of have a high-level principle statement to help guide the content that this group will create, any kind of color commentary about of statements about the pilot charter or some things that we need to think about when we're advancing our work to this new charter, and then of course, there's a boatload of questions.

And in full transparency, a lot of these questions are mine. Because when I started thinking about what would the contents of this future charter look like, reading and comparing it against the text that we have in our pilot charter, I walk away with a lot more questions than I do than I have answers for, which I think will be important for all of us to collaborate on.

So, the purpose of the call today, we're not going to go through all of these questions in detail, but I do have a couple of items that I want to highlight to try to help spark this thought experiment. Then I'll also want to touch on a possible couple of use cases for us to think about as we're working through these sections. So, before I go any further, I'm going to pause here. Any comments, questions? If anything, please feel free to tell me that I'm way overthinking this or over engineering this. You definitely won't hurt my feelings at all, but I want to make sure that we're taking this methodical approach so that we can try to turn over as many stones or known unknowns that we can try to make this charter as fit for purpose. So comments, questions, Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I guess one question, and that's for all of us. Now that we all have access to this document, I guess is that we are all allowed to ask questions to that column where there are questions, right?

BERRY COBB: Yes. What staff can do, we can maybe build some columns over here on to the right for each of the groups to add text. That way

we can try to track who's adding questions or adding comments. Or we assign colors to edit cells, but that can get a little bit messy. But yes, this is a wide open document. It's free for anyone to contribute to.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you.

BERRY COBB: All right, so kind of the first part of the discussion is we're talking about the macro level components of the charter, specifically its mission and objective and the kind of scope of work. I'm going to start with kind of an easy one about a section of the charter labeled scope of work. This is unlike our working group charters or charters that have specific outcomes in mind, are project oriented meeting that there's a start date and an end date, it's critical and imperative that you fully articulate the work that that group is to be doing and specifically what its outcomes and its deliverables are supposed to be.

However, this is a standing committee and the type of work that this group or its task forces will be set out to do, this particular charter can't be overly prescriptive. Otherwise, we would always be revising this particular charter. Instead, and the intent of the framework kind of going back to our picture is any new work that comes through or comes out of the council and is assigned through this standing committee, depending on its size and what the initiative is, it will have its own tailored charter to specifically define its scope of work and what it hopes to achieve versus what

we're trying to accomplish here about making this a permanent standing committee. So, the obvious difference between the pilot charter and our permanent standing committee charter is that we can't list out all of that work. There were specific details of what could be worked on, what its outcome might be, or what the problem was that is to be addressed. And it was basically put into an appendix of the pilot charter.

Those being very prescriptive like that would force us to constantly redo our standing committee or permanent charter as work was completed or no longer needed. So, that's where we're trying to use this concept of creating a backlog of that work that the standing committee can review on interval basis and determine what work is going to be prioritized and depending on the resources of working through.

But one of the challenges in reading the current pilot charter is that the mission and objective of the pilot standing committee and its scope of work were blended. So one of the questions here that I start to have over on the right and thinking about the mission and objectives and the scope of work is, first, what part of this original statement is still usable to help describe what this permanent committee is going to be doing? When you read the details of this particular statement, it starts to suggest that this standing committee has a bit of an authority to analyze what work needs to be done, prioritize it, and send it out. But at the same time, we also kind of have a principle that really no work can be initiated unless there's a decision by the GNSO council. So who should really be doing the priority prioritization here? Is that this standing committee, is it going to be the council that does the prioritization?

What happens if this committee were to prioritize some work, but then new work comes in to the GNSO council that the council believes this standing committee should be doing? Could there be conflicts here? Are there some exceptions that are listed in this particular statement? I guess I can zoom in for you to read it a little bit. But are any aspects of these statements applicable for the mission and objectives that we want to load into our permanent charter? Do we need a more clear delineation between the mission and objectives versus the scope of work? And if you read this statement closely, you'll start to see that there is kind of almost a Venn diagram, so to speak, of some of the scope fitting within the actual mission and objective, which I think will probably help us to draw a brighter line between that. And will this structure and its mission and objective allow for the efficiency that we need to be able to handle the work that is in the pipeline or in our backlog or potentially coming the other way and kind of thinking about it—or another thought provoking question is, is this standing committee and its task forces by itself going to be efficient and effective? Or depending on the type of work coming our way, is there a different way to try to achieve this work other than our standard approach of going through a formal process of trying to charter—take for example if there's some small type of quick improvement that needs to be done. Can just a quick small team be stood up to try and achieve and get to a particular outcome within a very short time frame that doesn't necessarily warrant having to go through a formal process of developing its own charter and that kind of thing?

There are pros and cons to thinking about that when you look at the small teams that have been formed at the GNSO Council.

What appears to be a small team and a small effort can quickly grow into six plus months and an outcome that was not necessarily foreseen when that particular group was spun. But that's something to keep in the back of your mind when we're thinking about the mission of this particular group. Versus the scope, I really won't rehash this one too much because, as I mentioned, I don't think it will be prudent for us to be very prescriptive about the work, but there is nothing that would prevent us from creating a pointer to that permanent backlog of the work.

Okay, so we're going to move down into just a couple of highlights about the standard structure here. Again, this, the pink or, I don't even know what color that is, but this particular section is specific to this standing committee only. Based off of the pilot, the structure or formation of this group is current GNSO councilors only, and it's generally tasked to do improvements that are within the GNSO council's remit. And so we need to really talk about some of these things. So the membership model and criteria.

I think generally this is probably going to remain the same in that there is essentially one representative from each stakeholder group and constituency, as well as one from the NCA. But when you really start to dig into the details of the statement from the draft charter here, it's also talking about this collaboration with other experts from the SGs and Cs that may help this particular group, the standing committee, achieve its particular outcome. And this starts to feel a little loose to me or not very prescriptive, and I suspect that it maybe kind of creates some anxiety a little bit

about who are these subject matter experts, how do we get them to belong to this particular standing committee?

And I'm not sure that I have all of the answers for that, but let's take a current example that we're kind of dealing with. As you're aware, or as I mentioned, in preparation for the implementation of ATRT3's, I think it's 3.5 recommendation about converting organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program, all of our SGs and Cs have a representative that is participating on that cross-community group. We also have two representatives from the GNSO Council that are there to represent the GNSO Council in that work. And rightly so, it happens to be Manju as well as Damon Ashcraft that sits on the council. Technically, Damon is not a part of the standing committee, but he is the primary representative of the GNSO Council to the CCG over there. So does it make sense for Damon to be attached or a part of this standing committee since that particular work is—basically this standing committee will be on the receiving end of that output from the continuous improvement program? So is Damon a subject matter expert or not? Should he be a part of this particular standing committee or try to think ahead about future work that may be coming this way? What does it look like to have a subject matter expert from the GNSO that is outside of the council participating on this standing committee? So those are kind of some of the general questions that kind of came to my mind.

Something to think about here is this is a, air quotes, permanent standing committee. You know, every annual general meeting, we have councilors that term them out and new ones that come in. I think the max that a councilor can have on the GNSO Council is

two consecutive two-year terms or a total of four years. It's anticipated that this standing committee and its task forces are always going to be doing work. So this is a significant commitment in addition to being your role as a GNSO councilor representing your particular group and all of the council work. But those that volunteer in the council to sit on this standing committee will also be doing work in parallel and outside of the typical GNSO Council work. So what does it look like if we have GNSO councilors that sign up for this and they serve their term over four years? That's great. We build great institutional knowledge within the standing committee. But at the same time, what if the councilor becomes too busy or can't commit to that work? You know, how do we move people in and out? And just by the very natural nature of the AGM, roughly a third of the council swaps out. So how do we replace people and bring them in? And what is that criteria? And thank you, Jennifer. Yeah, that's a great point. Those who complete their terms and then have their own two-year terms, which would add up to more than four years. Nonetheless, over time, the membership of this committee will need to evolve. And we should be thinking about that. What does that evolution look like? What are the criteria that are going to be required of councilors to participate on this particular group?

Leadership, the pilot charter was really just basically one statement that it'll be chaired by a councilor in an ex officio capacity. Now that this is becoming permanent, and in the same context of what we just talked about the membership model of this standing committee, who selects the chair here? Is it the standing committee, or should that be determined by GNSO Council? Should there be terms for the chair of this particular group? Again,

in the context of thinking about how the council operates over time.

Should there be a succession plan? I'm really forecasting that this is going to be a significant amount of work over the coming years. It's going to be an important leadership position to have, because the downstream outcomes of this will have significant impacts to either the council and or the full GNSO. Given the. I guess not only the importance, but the complexity of this work, should there be a concept, like, for example, the NomCom of having an incoming and outgoing chairs so that we have greater continuity at the leadership level of this? Again, just questions for thought. How do we do expressions of interest? And does the standing committee kind of also need a council liaison or not? Or should the chair of the Council be kind of a mandatory observer of this particular standing committee? So, those kinds of questions, I think we really need to think about.

Decision making methodology. So the pilot charter didn't prescribe this at all. And what I find interesting about it, especially since the feedback from the survey that we did about the charter, there was a lot of concern about the decision making methods that were described under the pilot. So, is that fit for purpose for our future charter? I added my own color commentary again, and it's just full Berry thoughts here. This is not meant to be a formal staff position or anything. But the way I see this standing committee is it's really not going to operate much different than the standing selection committee. That's a permanent committee. But it also operates like the GNSO council small teams that have been formed over time. And the intent of those small teams, or the SSC, its outputs

are delivered directly back to the GNSO council where a decision is taken at that particular time. So, thinking about this permanent standing committee, thinking about what its scope of work might be, some improvement related to improving the PDP or some operating type of procedure that is prescribed in the GNSO operating procedures needs to be updated. Any output from this standing committee will be delivered back to the GNSO council for that decision to be taken.

So, do we need to be prescriptive in this permanent charter that the standing committee operates under a prescribed decision making methodology such as the standard consensus model? And I'm unsure about that, but it's certainly why I'm asking the questions. Susan. Please go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks Berry. So, I'm just wondering if you can help us understand, or at least help me understand, what is the decision making methodology used in the SSC? Because I've never been in the SSC so I don't really know how they operate. But I know, obviously, the SSC has representatives from the various SGs and Cs. They are there as representatives of their group, but when they come to make a decision on the selection of the candidates, for example, is it a full consensus kind of unanimity sort of decision? Is there an assessment made that is based on their representation of their constituencies or stakeholder groups in deciding whether there's sufficient support, or is it like each person for themselves? And it's just if we've got 10 members on this group, is there a majority of members who are supportive of one candidate over another? Because the problem I think that we had

already is the problem that some of the feedback had for this exercise in the pilot was that we were basically going on unanimity in this group effectively. I don't know if that was the test applied, but that was effectively what the decision making requirement was, and so we didn't have unanimity and so we didn't pass on a recommendation where a lot of people were in support because not everyone was. Since you referenced the SSC, can you clarify how they work?

BERRY COBB: So, yeah, I'm going to turn it to Julie, because it's our luck that she helps support the SSC. So, I'll leave her with the details. They were all very good questions and they were questions that started to come to my mind when I think about this. I think when we think about the decision making methods at this standing committee, and we'll talk about task forces separately, because I have use cases for us to think about. But Just this particular standing committee, I think, regardless of the outcome of levels of agreement or disagreement about what this standing committee is tasked to do by the GNSO Council, they're always going to be sending its report or its outcome and its results back to the council. And the council will be in the position to make a decision about that particular output. So is it necessary that there's full consensus or levels of consensus at the standing committee? We certainly don't want this to operate support absent of objection, because that's too prone to capture. So, I don't necessarily have an overarching answer for you, but I'll turn it over to Julie about how the standing committee, the SSC operates.

EN

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks Berry. And thanks Susan for the question. It's a very simple answer. The SSC operates under full consensus. All of its decision making is full consensus. So there is no need for any kind of consideration of representation in the decision making process. And essentially absent any objections, the decision goes through. For instance, we had a decision recently on the pilot holistic review team nominees, and we put that out for consideration for a consensus call for 48 hours. There were no objections and so the team was approved as the recommended at full consensus. So that's essentially it. But thanks, Saewon, for putting the charter link into the chat too, so you can take a look at the details. Thanks.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Julie. So yeah, again, great thought provoking question, because again, that's a perfect example about how when I first went into this to where I'm at now about trying to come up with an initial draft of the charter, there are some important questions that we need to get settled here. All right, I see we're only got about 18 minutes left, so I'm going to speed this up a little bit.

The responsibilities and deliverables and outcomes. So kind of to my point is the principle, that draft principle, it's not prescribed or written in stone, but yes, as I noted, no matter what the level of agreement is for the standing committee, its output is always going to be returned to the council for consideration and any decision as appropriate. So again, does it really mean that we need to be prescriptive about the decision making methodology? Maybe so, maybe not.

The responsibilities, this particular section, I really just kind of pulled the same principles from the scope section up top. Again, I think mostly we want to not be prescriptive, but we still need to try to establish guardrails about what this standing committee will do and what it won't do.

Okay. I'm going to move on into the task forces. This is really more of the same types of questions or discussion, thought experiment we need to think about, but it definitely gets more complex because this instrument, these task forces are for sure intended on the improvement types of items that will require resources, input, expertise from the broader GNSO community and that are likely outside of the normal improvements that would be normally outside of just what the remit of the GNSO council is about. And in some instances, even if it is within the remit of the GNSO council, it may be appropriate to use the task force instrument because we do want more broad input and collaboration amongst the GNSO on a particular topic. Take for example the statements of interest.

So I'm not going to read through any of these in particular, but I do invite the groups to really think about, compare and contrast the standing committee versus the task force model and think about how they operate differently. So I kind of used an analogy that the standing committee here will more or less operate kind of like our SSC or our small teams, whereas the task forces, because of its requirement to have that more broad representation, it's more than likely it's going to operate under our traditional standard working group levels of consensus, full consensus, consensus, strong support, significant opposition. That's the feedback that we heard,

that we got from the survey input. However, in this particular standing committee charter, do we specifically list that it must be this standard level of consensus, or do we save that as a part of the charter that will be developed for a particular specific level of work?

What I will highlight here, and I think is very important for the group to go back, and I believe I put it into the chat, but back in the day when the council was discussing standing up the pilot charter, there was a particular response from the registries that I think everybody should read. And essentially it was a message sent by Kurt on behalf of the registries. I'm not going to read through this, but it was really drawing or highlighting some questions that should be considered here. If each little piece of work is going to have its own charter and it's a decision initiated by the GNSO council, is it better to be prescriptive about the model, the decision making methodology in that particular charter versus us trying to be prescriptive in this particular standing committee's charter? Or as another route, and I see your hand, Lawrence, I'll come back to you. Or as a defined middle ground, can we use terms shall versus must use this decision making methodology or the decision making methodology of task forces will be prescribed in its particular charter and we encourage the council and task forces to use the standard levels of consensus? How do we frame this in this particular permanent charter to provide guidance for that future work or do we actually mandate it that all task forces will use the standards levels of consensus? So again, something to just kind of think about.

The final section, I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time here because I kind of mentioned it in the overview, but these are certainly aspects that we should probably consider in the standing committee charter. Things about requirements of statements of interest, what happens if there's a dispute that goes on that can't be resolved by the chair of either the standing committee or the task forces, and do we do a particular self-review?

So I think what I want to conclude on, and this is again continuing about the thought experiment here and we'll highlight this in the notes and we can talk about it a little bit more on our next meeting, but we need to think about use cases to test what our thoughts are, our principles are for this permanent charter. And I'm going to use two of them here and we can certainly add more use cases to help kind of test the efficacy of the charter.

But use case number one is going to be statements of interest. I believe everybody here on the call is familiar with the previous effort of the task force assignment on updating the GNSO's statement of interest. They did a lot of good work there, but there was one particular issue where we couldn't find agreement. That task force created its report and passed its report to this standing committee that took another review of that work in hopes to trying to find middle ground on a particular issue, that there wasn't agreement found on that particular issue. Of course, it eventually made it back to the GNSO council where it was deliberated on and ultimately the outcome of that effort was voted down by the GNSO council even at just a simple majority level, let alone a super majority level.

Of course, the impact of that is still out in the wild today. It's now an issue of importance for the GAC. The board is interested in the topic and where we sit today is that we're awaiting, it's an ethics policy that the board will publish at some point in the future. I'm not familiar with the work, but the idea generally is the output of this ethics recommendations or document may provoke or prompt more work in the context of statements of interest.

So that's where we're at from the history and current state. Now, let's think about the future. And this is total game theory because I have no idea what it's going to look like. But conceivably, the board will deliver this ethics policy guidelines, whatever shape that may be. I presume that there would be some sort of public comment. Then somehow that ethics policy becomes memorialized or it prompts additional work.

So, game theory, let's presume that that particular document enables the Board to ask the to consider additional work on statements of interest. So, that assignment is tasked to the GNSO council. It's going to be deliberated at the GNSO council about what to do. It's also conceivable that it's going to make some additional task force or an assignment through the standing committee on improvements to go tackle that work and come up with an eventual outcome.

So, what does that look like when the council receives that particular action item from the board to do additional work around the GNSO statement of interest? What does the council do to instruct this standing committee to do that work? It's conceivable in my mind that the first thing that will the council will want is, well, we need a charter to properly scope and define what this work on

statements of interest is going to look like. It's conceivable that the council would instruct this standing committee to put that charter together. It's conceivable that the standing committee would send the charter back to the council to be adopted and approved. And then it's conceivable that the standing committee would be instructed to stand up a new task force with appropriate representation across the GNSO that would then be tasked and chartered to come up with new recommendations related to statements of interest. And then it's conceivable that whatever that output is, back to our picture, would go back to the council as the overall decision making body. So, comparing what happened in the past with what conceivably could happen in the future, what things in this particular charter do we need to make sure that that happens in an efficient and an effective manner? So that that's kind of use case number one to think about.

And then I'm going to conclude with a second use case, because we've got five minutes. And again, it's coming back to this larger amount of work that is essentially coming our way, which is this continuous improvement program. So, I'm going to also use this time as kind of the any other business. For our next call on the 31st, we're going to devote at least half of our time to give you an update about the work that's going on over in this continuous improvement program.

At a very high level, they have draft principles. They want to define criteria that connects to those principles. And then the eventually the CCG will create indicators that are mapped to the criteria that are mapped to the principles. And I think Manju can attest to this. It's quite extensive when we're looking at all of these particular

criteria and principles. And if you're not already collaborating with the people of your respective groups that are on the CCG, you should start collaborating yesterday, because it's a lot of work, and we'll go through some of the details in a minute. But the reason why that this is an important use case is because it's conceivable that when this CIP framework is adopted by the Board, these CIP assessment periods will kick off. The initial intent is that there's some sort of survey instrument based off of the principles criteria and indicators that would be done on an annual basis.

These continuous improvement assessment periods and the outputs of these surveys will be fed into the larger holistic review. But the use case from us is really kind of two paths. One, what if this standing committee identifies issues that should be improved upon within just the GNSO itself versus some kind of issue that's identified by the holistic review where the board may instruct the GNSO to go implement a certain type of improvement. And what does that look like in the context of us doing the charter?

Again, for next week's call, we're going to give you a highlight of where the CIP is at. We'll probably talk about both of these use cases a little bit more. And I'm hopeful that this is going to spark the kind of discussion that we need so that you don't hear me talk. But really want to hear more of this group talk.

And the final thing I'll just note. We don't have a meeting invite sent out for our meetings in August. We'll work with Manju on the side to make sure that these dates are still appropriate. So you can expect to see a calendar invitations for these dates that we have outlined here. I'll stop there. Manju, please close this out.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. So we don't have a meeting next week because we have the APAC DNS forum and I'm going to have to be there. So, the next call is going to be the week after next week, which is the 31st of July and it's our usual time Wednesday at 13:00 UTC. I guess that'll be all. Please review the document and add questions if you see fit to any of the charter text. Or if you want to already answer one of the questions, please feel free to do so too. I personally have problems with using Excel. There was this time I deleted the whole column unintentionally. So probably we'll try to add something next to it. So make sure we're not messing up with the original content. But yes, please go review it. Please feel free to leave any questions or answers or any other comments. Thank you all. See you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]