
DEVAN REED: We're 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, 18 September 2024.

We do have apologies from Damon Ashcraft. 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 Statements of Interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

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 chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. And back over to Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Devan. Did we change a little bit of the whole opening stuff that you guys said? I feel like it sounded a bit different.

DEVAN REED: Yes. We changed it towards the end, and we're seeing our name at the beginning as well.

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:

Okay. Thank you. Welcome, everybody. Today, we're going to have our 51st meeting. My fun fact for this meeting is yesterday it was actually the mid autumn festival, which is like a big holiday I think in a lot of countries in Asia. It's supposed to be the day when the moon is the biggest and fullest and the roundest. It was very bright, actually, last night in Taiwan. But today it started raining, and it looks like it's going to rain for another week starting today. So that's my weather update from Taiwan. I'll wrap it here and move to the second item of our agenda.

I guess we will review our work plan first. We're having another meeting next week, I believe, usually. Okay. Well, we are having a meeting next week at the same time and on the same day. We will send out the calendar invites for October, I think, probably sometime during next week. Thanks, Steph, for the hard work. Other than that, I don't think we have any other announcements. Just please remember that we are working towards to have the draft charter to this to be discussed by the Council during the Istanbul meeting. So we have to at least have a full draft before November. So this month and next month, it's going to be us working hard to finish the draft. Well, staff will work the hardest, but we should also put in our effort to make comments and at least participate in the meetings, in our calls, to suggest edits to the currently drafted charter by our lovely staff. So that was about it.

So let's move to item three, which is continue reviewing the CCOICI charter. Thank you. Last meeting, we have discussed about a membership structure. I brought up a few comments regarding how I think there are too many—we're, in a sense, allocating too much work to the NomCom appointee because we need all three of them in this new—oh, are we the Task Force now? Well, it doesn't matter. It's the

same for Task Force and the CCOICI team. I think we all need all three of them in the Task Force and the CCOICI team. We didn't have Desiree who is the Council NomCom appointee on the CCOICI. So I thought—and I'm sorry to put you on the spot, Desiree, but nobody chimed in on my suggestion to let the NCA choose this one to appoint to the Task Force or CCOICI. Now we're requiring all three of them. Oh, sorry, Berry. Please.

BERRY COBB:

First, Julie, I do think you need to scroll up to Section 3. You're in the Task Force section, and there are subtle differences between the two. I just wanted to go ahead and raise one comment about why we're starting here with the membership structure for the CCOICI. The first part, you're going to see a first attempt of redlines for role definitions, and you'll notice that liaison is kind of TBD right now. Because the original concept of having observers, again, is observers are generally not active participants on the group and the two Board members are Board Seat 13 and 14 were also previously designated as observers. We're not really intending them to participate actively, but they should be informed and aware of the activities of the Standing Committee. So the difference between a liaison and an observer is a distinction without a difference in the original concept. If we're going to continue with liaison for the two Board members, then probably could use some help about trying to make it a proper distinction between that and of observers.

The second comment I want to make about the actual structure after the redlines. I think it was two calls ago, Susan from the IPC had

concerns about the quantity of members here, and Damon, also from the IPC, also I think still has concerns about the quantity of members being listed here. I'm unsure how to navigate around this or to find middle ground. But I do want to first as a reminder about this approach is—I believe we previously agreed that we need resources at the end of the day, and the councilors sitting on this committee in its pilot form were not enough and we're easily not going to have enough bandwidth to take on this particular work, because it is foreseen that the Standing Committee will be doing a fair amount of work unlike what was previously outlined in the pilot charter.

So, recognizing the total numbers here again would be 20 members in draft form, 2 liaisons, and 10 observers. We're really focusing on the 20 members. I'll specifically highlight the first bullet which is a maximum of two members. So I think one of the issues that Susan and Damon are concerned about is, are there going to be enough people to fill these spots? That is a legitimate concern. We do have participation issues, for lack of a better term, across a variety of groups. But the rationale for having this quantity was two purposes. The first purpose is we need resources to do the work, and then the second purpose is that we need to try to maintain a balanced structure of the committee and Task Forces, for that matter, because they are operating under the consensus model. Or we're essentially operating under a represented configuration for the Standing Committee, and therefore, we need to strive for balance across the stakeholder groups and constituencies here in the times of when the chair is in a position to make a consensus call on the recommendations coming out of this committee. In essence, at the end of the day, we're practically operating like a working group

developing consensus policies. The only difference is we're not developing consensus policies, but the proposed recommendations are equally impactful as they may invoke change to operating procedures, policy, development processes, those kinds of things.

So I'll conclude there. But I think this is probably the biggest item that we need to get to agreement on because it has connective tissue to the remaining parts of the charter. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. Just a thing, just to supplement what you just said. I think Susan, her main concern that she raised was less about the numbers of what we're proposing for CCOICI, but she was saying it was like we are proposing one Council member from each stakeholder group. She thought this is a bit too rigid. She didn't think it has to be written out this strictly or clearly, because what she was saying is that if we are only assigning one member from the CSG, and also automatically kind of raise these issues of who from the three constituencies should take the spot from CSG, which is, of course, different problems they have within the stakeholder group. I think stakeholder groups might not have as big this problem of constituencies fighting for one seat representing the SG. So that was her concern. I think that concern is valid. And this surely brings to my question too of, I guess, when we're assessing consensus, we assess per constituency or stakeholder group, whatever, that's why when we do constituencies and stakeholder group, probably they worry about not enough representation or overrepresentation of one constituency. That's definitely a concern I

think we should officially address. So that's my supplementation. Berry, I see your hand again.

BERRY COBB:

There's a couple of options here to address that concern. What I have highlighted here, these four bullets. And you're correct. It is a legitimate observation about whether this is balanced or not, and in the Non-Contracted Party House, it becomes a little bit more complicated than the Contracted Party House or the Stakeholder Groups of that side. The primary rationale for these four bullet items is that there are still enough Council members on here to meet some of the resource demands. So take, for example, the Board Readiness Group that's going on right now. Theoretically, in the future, this committee would be doing that work. Right now, that small team on Board Readiness only consists of councilors. So when I think about how that would look under this Standing Committee, A, we still need resources. So that's the primary reason.

So there's two ways to navigate around this to try to address the concern. First, we can rely, from a resource perspective, on the first bullet. The 14 stakeholders there or representatives there are the primary resource pool. So option one is we delete these four bullets so we don't have these councilors on there. The downside to that is that's less Council members on the committee from kind of an oversight perspective or the Council being in the know. I think that was the second rationale. Not only do we have four additional—I'm going to use it as FTEs because this is a Standing Committee—but we have four additional councilors here from a resource perspective, as well as more

people on the Council being aware of what is going on in the Standing Committee for such time when recommendations are sent back to the Council for the decision-making. So, option one, we could delete these all out and we're basically taking down the issue from a resource perspective, or option two, if it's truly a concern of the issues you outlined, Manju, rephrasing Susan's concern, maybe we move them down and they're not part of the consensus designation for any of those recommendations, which kind of leads to the point about I think some are still getting wrapped around the axle about observers and liaisons and what they would be doing. Again, they're not really doing anything other than being informed, these particular four representatives from each stakeholder group could be moved into a "participant" or some other role label we want to assign to them that they're still participating on the Standing Committee, they are providing resource to get work done, and they're being informed for when things get sent back to the Council for consideration. But in terms of actually trying to do the consensus call, they're not included. So, essentially, it would be maybe the first and fifth bullet that would be used for consensus designations. So I'll stop there. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. While you're talking, I have another suggestion, which is probably we can do just, for example, five, because now we have six councilors as participants or as members For the CCOICI. So what if we just do, I don't know, five or six, because I remain my point. I think having all three of the NCA is a bit too much. So what if we just do a maximum of two members from each constituency and stakeholder group, and then we do five Council members, and we don't specify from

where? And we let this Council member thingy kind of function as a NomCom for the Board. Because we were worried also about how probably people won't be able to fill two seats from this constituency or stakeholder group anyway. So if some people are filling their last precedent or they don't have enough people from their constituency or stakeholder group, they can strive for like a councilor to represent them. I don't know if I make this clear. So we don't specify what stakeholder group these councilors should be from. Well, not all, but probably half of them are from RrSG or half of them are from IPC or whatever. So let's just balance out the whole imbalance of constituency and stakeholder group when people are having trouble to fill their two spots. That's my suggestion. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. I'll conclude with this reaction. Me personally, I'm open to any configuration that this group comes up with and can get to agreement that they believe that the Council will also agree on. The primary goal of doing this, though, is so that we can take off the table of having to rehash membership structures, especially for all of the work coming in. And I think that this is probably a message that needs to be discussed at the Council and/or the future Strategic Planning session. And if there are concerns across all of the stakeholder groups and constituencies about filling the seats here, just for this particular Standing Committee, we've got much larger issues to deal with, because there is several waves of work coming the GNSO's way, and we have to do it. Half of this is connected to the Bylaws. Half of this is connected to the Council's Operating Procedures. This isn't optional work. A good portion of it, unless the Council starts saying, "Well, do we really need

to devote resources to Board Readiness? Do we really need to devote resources to policy and implementation? Do we really need to devote resources to SOI 2.0?" So something's got to give. Either the work demands need to decrease to match the resource availability or the perceived lack of resource availability from the community groups or the community groups need to be able to fill positions here to get the work done, and I think that's a large conundrum that probably needs to be addressed way outside of this. Again, from a staff perspective, I think we're happy with anything that this group can come up with, but we need input from all of the people here, not just myself and not just Manju. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. Sorry, Desiree. I don't really understand your question. Do you mind to take the mic and explain?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS:

Thanks, Manju. I like the structure that's been presented here that I see on the screen, but maybe I misunderstood what you were trying to say, Manju, that any five members of the Council could be a member of the CCOICI group without specifying whether they come from different stakeholder groups. So was your fear that it's difficult for them to commit a person? Just trying to understand your rationale for suggesting that, because we do need some balance, and I see a good balance here. If we go down to methodologies and deciding, it would be good to have some balance. Yes, we are all empowered as Council members to act also. So I think we just need to maybe discuss your

suggestion a little bit further. Like Berry, it's fine, but I prefer some balance, if possible. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Desiree. I suggested because the constituencies within the CSG has raised concerns about having only one spot as a Council member to this group. So they were worrying about people fighting for this spot, and they feel unfair because if one of the constituencies gets a spot from CSG, then they are overrepresented, and the other two constituencies will be less represented. So that's why I suggested this to—I don't know if it's going to address their concerns, but that was what I thought could be helpful. But, of course, we are free to ignore that too. Jen, I see your hand.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

I guess a few things, and I'll try to tackle the easiest one first and maybe it's not the easiest one. I do see a difference between observers and liaisons, and I'm expecting the liaison role to play a more active part than observers. Observers, to me, is passive receiving the information, and liaison implies a two-way communication.

The second part about balancing, I like your suggestion. Manju, about taking out, specifying each one. However, I don't know if that's actually going to address the concern that Susan and Damon raised, and I don't pretend to speak either for the CSG. But if we are saying that, "Oh, we're not going to specify what it is," and we have five councilors, are we not just kicking that discussion down the road, right? Unless you're telling me that when we're looking at the Standing Committee, we

actually try to fill the maximum of 14 seats from the SGs and Cs first, and then looking at that balance, then after that, we fill the councilor roles. Because I see the same discussion or argument being made down the line if we don't do it here.

Then finally, I do agree that it seems to be we're asking for a lot from all the NomCom appointees. All three of them seem like a lot. But if you're reducing the seats, I'm going to say for the councilors from six to five, then there also can be an argument being made, or are we actually balancing between the two halves of the Council as well? So I don't know if what I said is actually making things more difficult, but yeah, hopefully it's helpful.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Jen. Prudence, please.

PRUDENCE MALINK:

Hi. I've just got a really random question that probably will hopefully be answered really quickly, and it's just to do with the whole idea of reducing the Council members to five and then kind of keeping it broad as to where the stakeholders not specifying what group. Can someone just explain how this prevents? Obviously, we're from the RrSG. I am from the RrSG, and I represent the RrSG, but I have additional members from the RrSG. And I just want to try and understand how by anonymizing essentially the membership group, reducing it to five, because it prevents, maybe hypothetically, three people from RrSG or two people from RrSG being represented as Council members separately, and then outweighing CSG completely. I just need someone

to explain how the mechanism works to prevent that or that kind of scenario from happening. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Prudence. As I just said, it came to me when Berry was talking, so it's like a super premature idea. I should have emphasized that. But what I was thinking is, so it works as the NomCom for the Board seats, right? So as Jen suggested, what I was thinking, which, again, this is experimental thought. We don't have to go down this road. I just thought it might be another exploration to think about. So we tried to fill the 14 seats from each constituency, stakeholder group first. When there are constituencies or stakeholder groups having trouble to fill their two seats, we will then try to fill that seat with councilors. So it won't happen where they're going to be three councilors as RrSG in this group. For example, RrSG has already filled their two seats with RrSG, then probably it's just going to be one or zero. As far as they feel like they have enough representation already on CCOICI, they can be like, "Okay, we're good. We don't need another councilor." And then when constituencies having trouble, then they can probably say, "Oh, probably we need a councilor to just step up as our constituency rep." So they're doing two jobs but they count as one member. I hope that was clear. Prudence, please.

PRUDENCE MALINK:

Yes, that adds a bit of clarity, but now I have additional questions and points. So I think if that is going to be the process flow, then we can't have it worded like how it currently is, which doesn't explain about the

kind of trickle effect of we start by collecting the members. We then look and address the members, and then we'll select Council members appropriately. And also, I think it's quite important now that we look at what the role of the Council member is. Because earlier, when Berry was explaining, he was just saying making sure that Council has the visibility as to what's happening in the group, rather than what it's sounding like, which is like Council will step in to be a full representative if there is no representatives from the membership that's been collected in the first round of connecting members, because then that obviously changes what the obligations are slightly, and it's not as straightforward as all councilors are created equal. Because it means that, say, for example, there is still also, does it mean that if there were two members that have been appointed from a stakeholder group that then they can't have a Council member, or they have one Council member but that Council member is then muted and doesn't speak or have any obligations to do anything? Or if there's no or one member that's appointed and then there is also a Council member, then the Council member has to take an active engagement role to compensate for the fact that there's only one or not two existing members from a stakeholder group. So if we're going to do something like this purely to address CSGs concerns about representation, it has to be done correctly and it has to be done in a way that makes it makes sense, especially if we are augmenting a Council role from that of merely observation of them, observing and making sure that we have visibility as to what we're doing, to then being a more active engagement and representing the stakeholder group where there was no engaging members from that stakeholder group, if that makes sense. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, Prudence. It makes total sense. That's why I said my suggestion was totally immature. And I just wanted to kind of brainstorm for all of us. I can see all of the concerns you raised, but I just want to raise one thing, which is, when we're assessing consensus, I believe we are only still one stakeholder group or constituency, only count as one vote. It doesn't matter how many members they are from that constituency or stakeholder group on this committee. Of course, if there are more people, they make louder voice. Sometimes it clouds the judgment. But in essence, one stakeholder group and constituency is one vote. Yes, Berry, you know what I mean. I didn't mean both. I mean it's one voice, it's one opinion. Anyway, so it's like one from each stakeholder group. It doesn't matter how many people are there representing that stakeholder group or constituency on the committee. Prudence, thank you again.

PRUDENCE MALINK:

Okay. Thank you for that clarification. So now, if on the basis of what you've said is correct and that ultimately it doesn't matter how many physical representatives are there, there's still one voice for that stakeholder group, then are the concerns about the volume of representatives valid from that perspective from CSG with regards to having one person? Can't they then just deal with how they get their voice unified through that one voice internally? Or have I missed something? Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Prudence. Yes, I totally agree with your question, but then I cannot speak for them because that's the concerns they raised. We only have one person from the CSG today in the call, which is Thomas, which I think is the least concerned constituency in this SG about this one from CSG. I mean, I might be wrong, but I feel like my general impression is they have least concern of when there's only one spot for CSG. Of course, Thomas can correct me if I'm wrong. Sadly, we don't have IPC or BC on this call today. Like I said, I don't mind the structure. I think it's perfectly fine other than I still think three NCAs are too much. But other than that, I think the structure would be fine. Probably we will have to specifically ask IPC or BC for input on this, where we suggest that, "We think it's all right," and we explain how it should be one voice from each constituency and SG anyway. So whoever is representing from Council on this doesn't matter. And now suddenly we're doing this secure practice thing, which I don't know what it is. Is someone going to explain why we're here? I think Berry is trying to do something. Berry, if you're talking, you're on mute still.

BERRY COBB: Julie is sharing the screen. She's getting back to it. Bad mouse click.

MANJU CHEN: Okay. Oh, good. We're back. Yes, I guess my solution or my suggested way forward is that we ask next time specifically IPC about—are they very strong on kind of this idea of one per seat? If not, we can move on. If yes, we try to discuss and address certain concerns. I will really love your input on how many NCAs we're going to have on this committee.

Also I think it's unfair that the nonvoting are only going to be observers. To steal from Prudence, I think NCAS are created equal, although they're not because one is nonvoting. But I feel like they can decide who should be the members and who are only going to be observers instead of because they're nonvoting then they're also automatically observers. Berry, I see your hand up.

BERRY COBB:

Again, no specific dog in this hunt, but including the NCAs here, you are correct, Manju. The NomCom appointees are technically supposed to be acting independent, but the two voting ones are assigned to each house, so there is attachment to the house that they represent. I'm unsure why. When anybody's listed as an observer, you should practically forget that they're even there. They're literally not going to be doing anything. They're not going to be part of consensus calls. They're not going to be attending meetings. They're strictly there just to be informed about what the group is doing. The same for the Board liaisons. Again, I can't speak for the Board members. How the Board seats even showed up is because it was a concept that the ccNSO had their Board seat on their Standing Committee for improvements, the GRC. But in discussing with Bart, their Board seat on that group does nothing other than to be informed about what their Supporting Organization is doing.

I called them out here because I felt it was important that these are important roles being played and we can't just rely on casual communications or updates here and there for the work of what the Standing Committee is going to be about. So, having their title as a

liaison, to me, suggests that there's something more than them just being an observer. I guess we're probably going to have to have a discussion about that at the Council or with the current Board members if that's something that they're willing to do in the role of a liaison, which is elevated above being an observer. But to close off about the NomCom appointees here is, A, we needed resources; B, they're from the Council to help keep the Council informed of the work, and the two voting NCAs are technically assigned to the houses that they're assigned to even though, generally speaking, they're in a neutral capacity. And the nonvoting NCA, at least in today's current environment, the nonvoting NCA is doing a fair amount of work on the Council. They're active liaisons to the SubPro IRT and those kinds of things. But the fact that they're not assigned to any house, it didn't make sense to use bullet six to say three NomCom appointees that are going to be doing the heavy lifting because now we start to get a little bit out of balance. So I'll stop there.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. I was just thinking, because we have this kind of a small discussion of the Board liaisons and what they're willing to take on this, aren't we having like an informal meeting next week with our Board members? I don't know about the agenda of that meeting, if it's not too full, probably we can add that to the agenda and just inform them that "We're considering this. We're expecting you to work. And please be expected that you're going to be working with us on this." Just like a reminder or like a heads up, that would be nice. So if I can trouble staff to check if the agenda is not too packed to add this item, it will be nice. Other than that, yes, the NCAs are supposed to be attached

to either house. But in reality, as far as I'm experiencing, of course, I have a limited experience compared to a lot of you guys, but I don't really feel they're so much attached to their house. Another problem, I think, during my time at least, is that people are not questioning, but people, of course, have more or less concerns, when on the face, it looks like we're having three NCAs. But actually, some people will argue, not me, but some people will see we actually have four IPC people on the Council, right? It's an impression thing. It's not even whether they're speaking for IPC because we know for a fact they are not. But I am just worried that that happens in the future too, people will have the same discussions or impression or concerns, and so that's why I'm not fully happy with the idea that we are only having the two from each house. I still think it could be one, and they, among them, choose whoever should be on this. But that's my opinion and I welcome any other input.

I guess nobody cares. Well, I guess we can keep this. Thank you, Prudence. I'm not sure. What do you mean? Do you mean by the current structure is unfair? Sorry, Berry, your hand's up, and I'll go to Prudence.

BERRY COBB:

Just real quickly again, if there's consternation about the NCAs and/or as we previously discussed about the representatives from each of the stakeholder groups, they can still participate as resources. We just create a separate section that they're not a part of the consensus call. And maybe that makes sense for all the Council members, that they're not a part of the consensus calls created here in the Standing Committee and the Task Forces. So that's the option to consider if you

want to keep them. Or the other option for the NCAs is we just remove them altogether.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Prudence, please.

PRUDENCE MALINK: Hi. I was just clarifying, Manju. I was just agreeing with your proposal with regards to how the members should be comprised and the different members should look. I think what you said made sense with regards to the one representative and just having people agree who their unified voice should be internally. I think that makes sense, yeah, and that's what I wanted to say. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Prudence. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. I also think that your proposal makes sense if we're not specifying which house the NCA is from. Now I'm thinking about what Berry just mentioned, taking them out of the consensus call. But nevertheless, I think we should probably try to put your suggestion forward to the whole list. I don't know how many of us are not there, so we can think about it a little bit more. I don't know if that's going to address the concerns, but at least we should attempt it. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jen. Again, I didn't mean to put you on the spot but, Desiree, as you are the NCA on this committee, do you have any opinion of should both NCAs from each house be on the comedian, the nonvoting one, just limited to observers? What do you think? And it's okay if you don't have any ideas.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Thanks, Manju. Well, I think this is bit of a novel thing to have both NCA members on a committee. I don't have anything against it, that's for sure. But whether we should both be there now, since I'm one, is a question. If it brings additional balance, I think it makes sense. I think it makes sense to have two, not one. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Desiree. So I guess we will have to put the suggestion for, and then probably when we are reviewing at the end of the charter, we think again whether we want both of them.

Sorry, I'm having another suggestion. Can we just have all of them as members? Because I just don't think it's fair because it's nonvoting, or whoever the person is, is limited to just observer. So I guess now we have three proposals. One is we let them choose who, and it's one of the three, and the other is the current draft. And the third option is we keep all three of them as members. Berry, I see your hand up again.

BERRY COBB: As a pointer ahead is there is some connectiveness to the Task Forces—and we haven't really reviewed that section yet—but as a reminder, the

Task Forces, should they be formed, are basically a bailout mechanism for the committee when there's too much work going on or we anticipate something like a policy and implementation working group that went on in 2015 or so, or maybe 2014, which turned out to be almost a two-year endeavor. But should a Task Force get stood up—Julie, you've lost your screen again—also on the Task Force, both NomCom appointees are listed as members and the nonvoting NCA was originally foreseen to be an observer as well. So it's quite conceivable if both of these things are operating in the same time, what is the capacity requirement in that regard? Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Yeah, click on your tab to get back to the charter.

MANJU CHEN: So, thank you, Berry. I guess if we were considering a capacity argument, then it makes more sense to have only one out of the three as a member, as far as it's supposed to be overflow mechanism, right? So they can assign the other from the three to the Task Force. And if they're two Task Forces in one community going on, then three of them all have to work, and they're not burned out or overburdened with being on all of the Task Force or committee. So I guess that I am going to use it to strengthen my argument that only one out of the three should be on the CCOICI as a member.

I'm seeing a very long comment from Jen. "Because if we are talking about balancing or representation, and we decided to really split hairs here, it seems more detrimental than beneficial. Do the houses see the NCAs as representative of their collective output? If this is arbitrary and we go back to just not naming which five seats they are from, I don't see the need to go in circles further."

I think we keep the current structure and just really try to fix the NCA thing. As I promised, we're going to for the next meeting. It's okay, Julie. For the next meeting, we're going to ask Damon specifically if they still have a problem with only one seat from the CSG. And hopefully after that, we will have to move on to other sections in the charter, for example, the decision-making methods and other stuff. Since we only have six minutes left, and I know many of you have been having nonstop meetings because we had the Board and it's just before this, and it seems there are problems with pulling the charter up anyway, please just note down the...

Let me probably ask this question now. Should we do the NCA thing on the list? Or do you guys think we left it for now and we circle back later after we review all the charters? So if you think we discuss NCA thing on the list, please put 1 in chat. And if you think we should circle back later when we finish overviewing the whole charter, please put 2 in the chat. Now it's time for you guys to put 1 or 2 in chat. Again, 1 is for we discuss how many NCAs we want on the list and 2 is for we circle back later after we review the whole charter. Berry I see your hand up.

BERRY COBB:

Option three, both. No, I'm joking. Just one other observation about this. Another component of this draft charter is the charter is to be reviewed. Right now, it's drafted at about every three years to review the charter to see if it's fit for purpose, and that would coincide with the end of the Continuous Improvement Assessment periods that are also a three-year period. There is absolutely nothing that would prevent this group from modifying or proposing to modify the charter with Council oversight and eventual approval. So I guess we shouldn't let best stop us or let best be the enemy of being good. If there's general agreement about this structure, we can move forward with it. Try to explain the rationale for when it's being considered at the Council. Give it a shot, and if it doesn't work, we can easily go—well, not easily, but it can be amended. So that's another thing to recognize as well. Manju, you may be on mute.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. So now I'm going to count to 10. And if I'm not seeing any numbers popping up in our chat, I'm going to decide on my own how I'm going to proceed with this.

Thank you, Jen. I don't think we have several proposals. Probably now we only have one, which is my proposals. So I'll send my proposals to the list, but it's really easier if everybody just go to the draft charter and because I already made my comments there, and we really want all of you to make comments and suggest to add it to the charter. If you see anything you think should be amended or you think there are suggestions, proposals, warranted discussions, please note down. So when we review it for the next call, we can discuss further with the

whole group, with the full committee. Yes, as Berry suggested too, feel free to make a comment if you feel like Berry had done a great job in writing everything too, so we don't have to review anything, and we can just throw it to the Council and let them discuss it.

So, with one minute left for this call, thank you again for everyone. Thank you to those who spoke up today, and I'll see you next week. I'm sorry you have to have two hours of meeting, connecting to each other probably next week too. I'll see you tomorrow at the Council meeting. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]