
ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 26 June 2024 at 13:00 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/wgAfF>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

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, 26 June 2024 at 13:00 UTC.

We have apologies for Juan and Thomas.

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 email 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.

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.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN:

Hello everyone. I think we're not having as many people as we usually do, but hopefully this will improve by our next meeting next week. And I hope you all are enjoying summer. I think all of us are located in where the summer is ongoing now.

Today will be an important meeting because we're kicking off the charter review. Because it's so important, all of the issues, to not for me to do it for you guys. So I have to rely on our, as always, marvelous staff to do it for us, they will do the presentation. And I guess my only function today probably is managing the queue when there's a need. And I'll just give the floor to Berry, I guess. First of all, I think it will be beneficial for us to understand again the context of this CCOICI, as in how it became this thing today and why we're doing this now. And without further ado, I'll give the floor to Berry. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. Berry Cobb, for the record, with ICANN staff. And I'm happy to manage the queue as well. I think I'll be doing a bulk of the talking today. So as Manju mentioned, our agenda is, you know, we're going to set the stage of why we're here. We're going to take a brief view through our proposed work plan and why we're doing it. We'll do a quick review of the key issues that

were found from the survey about the standing committee and its task forces. A bulk of our discussion is going to be about the guiding principles. When we get to that, that will make more sense about where we're at with creating a charter for a permanent standing committee. And then we'll close with some next steps and any other business as necessary. Next slide. And you can kick over onto the next slide.

All right. So I think everybody really understands why we're here. The standing committee was created as a pilot back in June of 2021. Essentially, it was recognized back then that there were certain items coming out of the PDP 3.0 of additional possible work for improvements, as well as the conclusion of ATRT 3, which is essentially trying to change the structure and allocation of organizational reviews and move that into standing improvements or standing continuous improvements. Thus, at the time, the GNSO Council and the larger GNSO felt it was time to stand up a certain committee like what we're doing here, eventually to do some of that work.

But in the meantime, we did have several assignments that were tasked to the standing committee that ran from September 2021 to 2023, almost two years. There were essentially three assignments that the standing committee and a task force were assigned. We had the deliberations and sent the bulk of those results back to the GNSO Council for its consideration. Earlier this year, we did conduct a post pilot survey to evaluate if this structure is fit for purpose and if it can continue to move forward as originally determined back in June of 2021. And then, of course, May, the Council task this group to redo the charter to make it a permanent

standing committee. And in that light, there's a fair amount of work ahead of us.

So that's where we're at. And let's talk about where we're going. So we're going to start off with the work plan. And this is a tactical view of the possible meetings that we'll have between now and essentially the end of the year. This is subject to change a little bit depending on the pace and the amount of work this group can complete between now and then. But you'll see that it is a rather aggressive schedule. We're mostly meeting on a weekly basis with the exception of July and August. There's a couple of blank periods where we're not meeting every week. And I'd also note that, you know, the August schedule is also typically when many community members take summer breaks or vacations before school and then those kinds of things start. So depending on what work we get accomplished in July can influence whether we need to meet during August or not. And if so, you know, we can relax the schedule if we get a fair amount done. But we can also reallocate this for homework with your respective teams and especially your respective groups. Put differently, there's a fair amount of slack in this schedule because unlike the development of charters for a working group that usually occurs at the GNSO council level, this charter, this conversion to a standing committee is quite a transformative change for the GNSO. And so the padding here between now and our target of November is also set up because it's going to require you as representatives from your respective stakeholder group or constituency to collaborate early and often with your stakeholder group or constituency and especially your leadership teams as well because this impacts everybody in the GNSO, not just the GNSO council. So looking at

the number of weeks here, the idea is that as frequently as possible, you're working with your respective groups to keep them in the know of where the standing committee is going, what the scope of work is going to be, and the decision-making methodologies and those kinds of things.

So the other takeaway here is when you look at it from a calendar-based perspective, June to November, that's roughly five months, it's easy to brush it off and say, yeah, we'll be able to get this done. But unfortunately, calendar-based scheduling like that puts us into and kind of backs us into a corner because when we're only meeting on a weekly basis, that really doesn't equate to a whole lot of actual interactions and in-call collaborations when you look at it from an hourly basis on the meetings that we have and those kinds of things.

Nonetheless, we're trying to target to November, maybe no later than December, to have the draft charter sent back to the council for their consideration and adoption so that we can get to the work. Let's see, is there anything else on this slide? So you may be asking, you know, why is this schedule so aggressive? So let's kick over to the next slide. It's because there's a lot of other things going on around and above what we're just trying to accomplish here for converting the charter. So for those of you that are familiar, there's an initiative going on right now, which is the implementation of ATRT3's recommendation 3.6, which is to develop a continuous improvement program or a framework that can be used for the respective SOs and ACs to evaluate their fit for purpose and their structure on a continuous improvement type of initiative that is meant to replace what we are familiar with now

as organizational reviews, all of which are currently on hold. And the intent of this slide is not to go into the details of what the continuous improvement program is about, but generally their work plan is to develop a framework that touches on the key principles, criteria, and indicators to create a somewhat congruent or consistent mechanism by which to measure the efficacy and fit for purpose of the SOs and ACs from an accountability perspective and operational perspective. And this framework is meant to be somewhat standardized across the groups because as each SO and AC conducts its continuous improvement program and assesses where they're at, that information from the assessment will feed into the future holistic reviews. And it's foreseen that this particular, for the GNSO, that this particular standing committee and/or its task forces will likely be tapped on the shoulder to do these CIP assessments, these continuous improvement assessments.

So the framework that's being developed in the CIP right now, again, the principles, criteria, and indicators is a first attempt to try to create a consistent way to measure this across the various groups, but it is not pretty determinative that it is just these criteria. So it'll be up for the individual SOs and ACs to build on the frameworks to include additional metrics that they think are valuable to determine the principles and the indicators of how our groups are being accountable and transparent and all of those other criteria. So it's not perfectly prescriptive. There's room for each of the groups to build upon the framework to do their evaluations. But the takeaway here for this particular slide is that it's anticipated that the CIP CCG will conclude its work by the end of the year. It'll be sent to the board for their consideration. And in

parallel, the CIP assessment periods are intended to kick off early next year. And again, it's foreseen that this particular group will be responsible for starting to conduct these assessment periods. Therefore, you can kind of think of this as a critical path for why it's important for this group to finalize on its standing committee charter, get it adopted by the council so that we're ready to take on this work when it comes our way.

The other takeaway from this particular slide, and again, this is in the context of what we know as organizational reviews, all organizational reviews are on pause for right now. But in June of 2025, given the runway that has been required to implement the ATRT-3 recommendations and those kinds of things, the board in June will not only consider the results of the CIP pilot and the progress that's been made there, but they'll also be evaluating if it's fit for purpose to continue deferring organizational reviews, or if in fact they think that there's some sort of urgency that an organizational review should be kicked off. And this is particularly important to the GNSO because at the time right before these reviews were deferred, the GNSO was up next in the queue for its particular organizational review. So that's something that we're going to need to keep an eye out. But in conclusion, we want to try to wrap by the end of the year so that we're ready to go early next year for when these assessment periods kick off.

The final thing I'll say here, so we're fortunate that Manju is a part of the CIP CCG framework. She started off as a primary, but given the meeting schedule, it was challenging for her to attend those frequently. So you'll recall that Damon Ashcraft took over as primary and Manju is our secondary. So something that this team

may want to consider is how do we engage with Damon to bring him in either as a part of this group or at least as kind of a liaison because the work that we're defining here in the charter is directly related to what's going on in the continuous improvement program.

So I'm going to go to the next slide and then I'm going to stop for questions before we kick over into the next section of the presentation. And you know, these two slides are not meant to scare you, but we should be scared. There's a lot of work that is going on in the context of reviews and a lot of this is directly centered at what we're trying to accomplish here. So at the top of this slide, we talked about the continuous improvement program. You should also be aware that your respective groups have submitted candidates to participate on the pilot holistic review. We expect that to start sometime around September timeframe. And that pilot holistic review has its own scope and mandate to help inform future holistic reviews, which you see below it. There is no specific schedule for a future holistic review by which the outputs of our improvement assessment periods will feed into, but the holistic review is a dependency to the pilot holistic review. And we won't really have clarity about when that may kick off until the board considers the outputs of the holistic, the pilot holistic review, which probably won't start until the tail end of next calendar year.

The life cycle of reviews is not so important for this group, but it's something that we'll want to pay attention to because their specific scope is how do they make the ATRTs or the SSRs, or even the future holistic review, how to optimize that process for how reviews are conducted. Again, it doesn't impact us directly, but we

may want to pay attention to it because there could be little nuggets that are important for our work here.

And as if there's not enough going on, the ATRT4 is scheduled to start around April of next year. And its scope again is not directly impactin the CCOICI group or the standing committee, but it is a review team that was supposed to start April of this year. It was deferred until April of next year. And I have every expectation that that will kick off. The scope of the ATRT4 is not yet determined, but I'm sure at least one part of their scope will be to evaluate the implementation of previous ATRT recommendations and where they sit. But primarily why it's here is because GNSO persons will be appointed to also participate on that ATRT4. And there is connective tissue to a degree about what we're trying to accomplish here and what's going on there.

To your question, Lawrence, how is the holistic review dependent on the pilot? I'm not a super expert here, so I'll try to give you my understanding of it. But the idea of the pilot holistic review was the board wanted better clarity and certainty about how a holistic review will operate. And they can't get that clarity until a pilot is completed because one of their primary responsibilities coming out of this holistic review, should the board adopt it and consider it, does mean that it is a bylaws change in the sections pertaining to the organizational reviews as well as the specific reviews like SSR-2 and the RDDS reviews as well. So that is why there is a dependency before the true holistic review can start, because it won't be able to until those bylaw amendments have been made.

So moving down below the ATRT4 is the organizational reviews. As I noted earlier, those are deferred, but the board will be

considering those as to whether continuous deferment should be necessary. Or if things aren't progressing to the board's satisfaction, they may determine to initiate an organizational review just because they have been deferred for several years now.

The last takeaway on this particular slide, which is something that I've added, this slide is part of the reviews team slide, but we can't ignore the FY26, FY30 strategic planning process either. If you're paying attention to that, there was a couple of sessions at ICANN 80 about the five-year strategic planning. Several community groups are talking about the contents of the draft strategies and goals that have been included. And in particular, I believe sometime in the middle of next month, they'll be releasing for public comment the next iteration of the five-year strategic plan, as well as the five-year operating plan. Why this is here is because there's a draft strategic objective and strategic goals that are specifically targeting improvements to the policy development process, which is something that the GNSO has worked on before. And based on some of the input from that, there's likely more work to be coming that way. And it's quite possible any work that is initiated as part of the next five-year strategic plan, that this group could potentially be tasked to oversee some kind of task force on improvements. So think of a PDP 4.0 or something to that effect, but the board is definitely signaling that there are improvements that need to be made.

So I'm going to stop here. Are there any questions about our tactical work plan and these larger forces that are at play? Okay. Hearing and seeing none, let's go ahead and move on to the next

slide, which are the key issues. This will basically be pretty quick. This shouldn't be anything surprising.

Based on the outputs we retrieved from the survey, determining the fit for purpose of the CCOICI, its standing committee and its task forces, it was very clear that there are issues that need to be resolved in regards to the decision-making methodologies of not only the standing committee, but its task forces. There needs to be better clarity about the responsibilities of the standing committee and the task forces, specifically about the membership structure and what work that this group will be tasked with. And then finally, what we need to do here is we're transitioning from a pilot to a permanent standing committee and why we're here today, which is to formalize the charter. And next slide.

So again, scope of assignments. We need to better understand what are going to be the membership, leadership, and structure of these groups, and probably the most important, the decision-making methodology, all of which these three are interconnected. I'm getting the sense that we may not be able to talk about any one of these in isolation because it will impact things like the model structure or the scope of assignments and those kinds of things. There are other fringe types of issues that were surfaced from the results of the survey. We didn't include those here, but they'll be considered as we work through iterations of the charter.

This is the core of our discussion for today. And let's stay on this slide for a minute. When staff was trying to prepare for this work, it's always been staff's view that it's more efficient and effective to have something on paper and allow groups to respond to what is on paper. Except this time, given the nature of what this charter is

about, how the high degree of transformative it is to the GNSO, we didn't really feel empowered to come up already with the first draft of the new charter. We were cautious about being, you know, about staff making decisions about some of the structure of the groups or the decision making methodologies. And so, really the principles section here is more about trying to get some general agreements that will empower staff to come up with that first draft. And then from there, then we can work on an iterative basis until the group agrees that the charter is fit for purpose. So, let's go over to the next slide.

This particular slide may seem out of order, but I wanted to introduce it first. This is going to be your homework, and we'll highlight this in the meeting notes for those that didn't attend. But I do urge everybody here to become familiar with the past. And the reason for this is the three primary issues that are in front of us in regards to converting this to a standing committee are the exact same three issues that were discussed at the council level before that actually led to a pilot. The original intent of setting up this standing committee was to make it permanent right away, but given issues about decision making methodologies, membership, who does what, it was basically downgraded to a pilot to first test its efficacy and then only then convert it to a standing committee based on lessons learned. But to be very clear, these specific issues that this group is going to be tasked with resolving have been discussed before at the council level.

So, the quick takeaways here about this slide, the top left is what led to the formation of this standing committee. And notice how I'm using standing committee instead of the acronym. But you'll recall

way back in 2018-ish, 19-ish, and there the council launched the PDP 3.0 initiative. There were a lot of improvements that were identified and implemented, but there were some items that were identified that weren't necessarily specific to the council. So, that was kind of one input as to how this standing committee got formed. And as I noted in the past, at that time, the ATRT 3 had completed its final report and it was adopted by the board. That also meant that what we're faced with now is that this continuous improvement committee is likely to be tasked with performing these continuous improvement assessments at a minimum, if not identifying other areas of improvement that this particular committee and its task forces may be working on. And then a third factor into this is the annual SPS sessions where issues are surfaced there. And I believe the SPS in November of 2020 had also identified some possible areas of improvement. So, it's really these three converging forces that led to the standing committee that we have today that is still technically a pilot.

The second section on the left is just kind of a reference. I thought it was important to identify what the council looked like in those council years that led to the formation of the standing committee. And I also included a link in here about the voting thresholds table. And if you think about how the standing committee is set up and its potential outputs of continuous improvement, whether it's an assessment period or an organizational review type of thing, or a PDP 4.0, the outputs coming to this, it's foreseen currently that the council would be the decision making body that ultimately decides on these outputs. But if you take a look at this voting thresholds table, there's really only one voting mechanism that would evaluate the outputs. And that's really the voting of all other

default, which is a simple majority across the two houses of the GNSO council.

So, while all of the other types of voting thresholds are specific to issue reports or consensus recommendations or election of board seats or empowered community, at the time or presently the GNSO does not have specific voting types or threshold types based on continuous improvement. So, that's something that we're probably going to want to be aware of when we're thinking about what the work this group is going to be doing.

Third section, the ICANN bylaws. I didn't want to paste the entire link into there, but if you look at section 4.4, it does talk about the organizational reviews, which is specifically targeted to be changed should the board fully adopt the whole holistic review concept. And then lower left is a little bit of history. So, there have been two previous GNSO reviews. The first one starting back in 2005 or 2006, I believe. That review eventually led to the bicameral structure of the GNSO council and its mandate that we're familiar with today. And then the GNSO 2 review, I believe, kicked off around 2013 or 2014. That also came up with a bunch of recommendations that have since been implemented. But there's some good history to find there.

Now, the right-hand side is the main purpose of why I put this slide together and why I put the header that we've discussed this before. The key events timeline, I would encourage everyone to go through these little breadcrumbs so that you can evaluate and understand the previous discussions about these critical topics that are in front of us today. The structure of the groups

themselves, their decision-making methodologies. And it's those same types of discussions that we're about to have again.

The roster, there's the current standing committee roster for your reference. There's reference to the CIP CCG work that's going on. And as we noted, that the pilot holistic review is currently selecting candidates and is anticipated to kick off in September. So let's kick over to the next slide.

And now we're getting into our principles. And there are no decisions that are going to be taken here today, but this is an attempt to help staff get to this kind of first working draft of the charter. And based on our evaluation of the inputs we received through the survey, largely stating that the framework of this standing committee and its task forces and its assignments is largely fit for purpose. And a slight kind of a reminder here, the reason for this particular council committee, the standing committee versus the task forces is directly connected to the types of assignments that this group or groups will be assigned. Some assignments of improvement opportunities are going to be specific to just the GNSO council, its mandate as managers of the policy development process and its operations. And therefore the participation and the scope of work was really meant to be conducted at the GNSO council level. Whereas larger types of improvements, such as a continuous improvement program that's meant to replace organizational reviews and those kinds of things, we need broader participation from the full GNSO. But at the end of the day, what we're really looking here is just to confirm that this framework in of itself outlining the different task forces versus the council committees is still fit for purpose because it does set the

foundation for what the new charter is going to look like. I'm going to stop here. Any questions or comments about this higher level principle about the structure? Hearing and seeing none. Okay. So let's kick over to the next slide.

So these next three slides are basically the guiding principles for the specific charter revisions. They're identical to these three overarching issues that we identified from the survey. The first one is that this standing committee, the CCOICI, the composition will pretty much remain the same. It's one councilor from each stakeholder group and constituency plus one of the NomCom appointees. Now, this is important because it is directly connected to the decision-making methodology that we'll be talking about on the next slide. But when you think about the concept that worked under the pilot is that it was essentially a full agreement or full consensus for something to be delivered from this committee back to the GNSO council. Put another way, it wasn't operating under full consensus or consensus or strong support but significant opposition. It was basically consensus without objection for something to be delivered from this committee back to the council.

And this group, based on some of the outputs is stating, well, maybe the decision-making methodology should be that of a working group. However, the composition of one councilor from each group plus one non-com appointee may clash with the traditional working group model of a decision-making methodology because of the imbalance of the persons participating across the groups and by the houses. So, this specific point is one of the main reasons why under the pilot, it was agreed to work on full

consensus without objections. And so, we'll be wanting to spend a fair amount of time in that regard.

Second principle is the standing committee shall have a single chair, such as Manju, selected from this committee and approved by the GNSO council. And I guess one point about the first principle that I missed is at the time of this committee's formation, it didn't make sense to have full representation of the bicameral structure of the council also be represented on the standing committee or the full council might as well just be the standing committee. Given bandwidth and resource constraints, it was impossible for the full council to participate on the standing committee. So, that's why it was seen that it would just really be one councilor from each of the SGs and Cs. But either way, this group must have a chair. It's a councilor and any chair would be approved by the GNSO council.

Conversely, task forces. This is also going to get a little sticky and hence the homework that I'm asking for this group to review through because there are varying positions about the representative nature of task forces. And if anybody is familiar with these types of conversations, even going far back as EPDP phase one, there are lots of concerns about the level of balance when you're trying to determine consensus level on recommendations. For the moment, staff, based on the inputs or the outputs we received from the survey, that the model at the time of the task force wasn't fit for purpose and it should be more representative and more broad across the GNSO. But the other competing aspect to this is some groups believe that the structure of the task

force should be determined at the time that it's being set up and not trying to be prescriptive here.

For now, based on staff's experience of the reg data EPDPs, the transfer working group, and the EPDP IDN working group, it seems from a staff perspective, kind of the middle ground is to be able to model the task forces after the IDN's charter. And essentially what that means is that you have members, but you also have participants. The members are representatives appointed by their respective groups to participate on that EPDP, and participants are opened up more broadly to also participate and contribute. Really, the only difference is when they get down to consensus level determinations, it's the members of that group that are responsible for the consensus designations, not the full body.

So that's something that we're going to want to hone in on. But for the moment, in terms of trying to get to a first draft of the charter, it's staff's view that this is probably the most workable solution, and we'll find that out over time.

And the last principle here, and I think which is probably even more important, is the task forces must have a chair. So I know that there are varying views about the SOI task force and whether it's lack of success but I think the, or yes, did I misspeak? I meant the SOI task force. You'll recall when that task force was set up, the representatives was very small. I believe there were only four or five community members that participated, but none of them wanted to act as chair. And so what wound up happening is staff was acting as a de facto chair of that group. And I don't believe that that should be happening in the future. So what staff is

suggesting here is also as a principle, is that each task force has a chair designated by a community group, depending on the scope of the assignment of that group, there could be options for vice chairs from each house. That's not a staff preference. It's really been our experience that you have to have a single decision maker when it gets down to critical times, but we do recognize that there needs to be some flexibility depending on the type of topic being discussed because also acting as a chair, you're in effect kind of removing yourself from the outcomes of what that group is meant to establish.

Susan, to your question. So I don't think there's real bright lines here, but in an abstract or generally speaking, the CCOICI is responsible for executing against assignments on improvements that are specific to the GNSO council. Let's take, for example, the council, gosh, I shouldn't be trying to create examples on the fly here, but let's pretend that there is, oh my gosh, I can't think of an example. I'm going to stay in the abstract.

There's something that needs to be implemented or approved upon that is specifically and only within the council's remit that they need to do some sort of improvement exercise. Whereas the task forces, their assignments are meant to be brought more broad across the GNSO and not just specific to the GNSO council.

And so I guess kind of a rough example I can make is an item that we found in the PDP 3.0, which meant the governance or the management of the policy development process, but not specific to policy development is something that this standing committee would work on. So pretend that we decided to launch a PDP 4.0. It's likely this council, the standing committee that would be in

scope to address the assignment, whereas a continuous improvement assignment about the better collaboration amongst stakeholder group and constituency leaders or some type of change in the organizational structure of the GNSO, those things start to fall outside the remit of the GNSO council itself. And it seems more appropriate that there's more broad participation outside of just the council. And that's kind of the rough delineation that we're working on here. Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. So I have a question here. This question is for everyone, I guess, for us to consider because we were talking about decision-making methodology and how one from each stakeholder group and constituencies has been regarded problematic or not able to reach consensus or hard to assess consensus level. So if we're having a single chair selected from the standing committee, that means we're taking out essentially one representative from the SG or C to participate in the consensus voting, in a sense. I don't know, what would be hard for that person to at the same time vote for their constituencies or stakeholder groups and be a neutral chair? Is that something we should consider? Or do we just kind of deprive the chair from the right to vote, but then we're kind of depriving the stakeholder group or constituency the person is representing to vote too? So I guess that's one thing we'll have to consider while we're going through this in our draft charter review later. But I'd like to raise this and probably just keep in mind that this could be a discussion point. Thanks.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. I would counter and say it must be a discussion point because you're absolutely right. So first, clarity, we don't vote. The chair gauges levels of consensus. Only the council votes. But you're absolutely right. Your role in the NCSG is somewhat diminished by your role as chair here. Is it conceivable that the chair or vice chair of the GNSO Council is also the chair of this committee and their role is to not only lead to the group but to act in that neutral capacity that would free up the other representatives?

So kind of as an example of our current state, if this group decided or thought that it was best that Greg Dibiase also be chair here, he is part of the registrar stakeholder group, but his role as chair is independent and neutral. That would still allow the registrars to have a seat on this particular standing committee as an option. I'm not trying to presuppose this, but I think it is fair to have that discussion about what that looks like. And again, it's a direct, it's directly connected to what the true decision making is going to be like.

And so to Susan's point, if this group determines that it shouldn't be the council leadership that plays this role, then kind of the same applies. How will this group determine somebody from this group to be chair to lead this and still fill in their seat without losing their ability to opine on this?

And the other thing that I think we should think about here is succession planning. Manju, take you for it as an example, unless I'm wrong, you'll be terming out at the AGM next year. Who's going to be the chair at that timeframe? Because this is a standing committee and we need to be pretty regimented about sustaining

a leadership role and looking at ways that somebody that takes on the new chair role here doesn't come in fresh to this. So that's something that we'll want to discuss as well.

Oh yes, six more minutes. So I'm going to have to breeze through these. So these are also going to be homework for you. So next slide, decision-making principles. So right now, staff's working under the impression that the standing committees and task forces, based off of what we heard from the outputs of the survey is the full consensus model was not fit for purpose and that generally we should use the consensus models as described in the working group guidelines, where we have full consensus, consensus, strong support but significant opposition, and divergence.

And there's really only two choices here unless we start to invent a third decision-making methodology. So it seems reasonable that, at least from staff's view, that we're going to use the working group guidelines on levels of consensus. But again, it gets complicated depending on the composition of the group.

Chairs are expected to use all tools available, just like a working group, which utilizes the consensus playbook and other types of aspects, and that this role should liaise with the council leaders frequently. The standing committee and task force chairs are responsible for designating final levels of consensus. We're highlighting that because that's specifically a part of the working group guidelines as well. And in all cases, regardless of the consensus outcomes, the report will still need to be delivered back to the council to close out the project, whether there is consensus or no consensus, will always be on the hook for a report.

And I think a fifth one really needs to be added here, or maybe on a different slide, but I can't stress the importance of whatever the structures and decision-making methodologies that are prescribed here. It's going to be super critical that the representatives are keeping their respective groups informed. Next slide.

[inaudible] principles. This is probably a little bit of the easier one of the three, but I think the main thing here is this new charter for the standing committee shouldn't be so prescriptive in the work that it's going to be doing. Otherwise, we need to amend the charter every time. So the current pilot charter we have, you'll notice that there are other items of work that are still outstanding that could be considered for this group to do, in addition to all of the other larger forces coming down, such as CIP and other reviews and those kinds of things. But the concept here is we don't want to list the specific items of work in the charter, else we'll have to amend the charter. So we need to make sure that it's fit for purpose and can withstand the test of time over two or three years and some sort of review mechanism to determine whether the charter needs to be revised based on previous lessons learned.

All assignments that are given to the standing committee and task force, the GNSO Council must approve of it. More specifically, any project that is initiated by and approved by the GNSO Council, if that work is expected to take more than four months, it will include its own charter and its own project schedule to keep everybody accountable to the work that must be done. Essentially, we can't operate under small teams that are going on in the council that have very elusive start and end dates and deliverables.

And then finally, you know, from the current pilot charter, there is a bunch of items that still haven't been worked on. What we're proposing is that there's going to be a complementary document. I'm labeling it backlog. We can find a more appropriate name for it, but this work that will be assigned to the task forces and to the standing committee, that lives outside of the charter itself to kind of go back into principle number one. Next slide, please.

And I think that is it. So next steps, we're working from here until December. And as an action item, staff will send out calendar invites just for the month of July. And over the next couple of weeks, then we'll go ahead and lay down calendar invitations for August and September when we get more traction. I'll stop there and turn it back to you, Manju. Sorry for taking so long.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. Thank you very much. This is definitely very useful for all of us. I hope, I would definitely encourage everyone to read through the slides again after this, because it was a lot of information, I believe for all of us. I personally have read the slides, but again, reading again through it is still a lot of information to digest. And the slides that we, with a lot of links that you can, you know, crawl through the breadcrumbs is definitely very useful. If you're new as me, I actually commented this in the middle of this ongoing progress, it will definitely be very, very helpful to read through the history and know the context of whatever we're discussing and why we're here.

I guess we will start reviewing the charter next week, because I feel like there were not a lot of objections to the principle. And if

that's the case—if that's not the case, please raise your hand now. Okay, I think that's the case. And I hope by us agreeing to the principles, our lovely staff will feel empowered now to kind of start drafting some content for us to review next week. And sorry for you to have to work during this lovely summer.

But yeah, we are one minute over time, so I will not take any longer. Does anybody have any 10-second AOB you want to raise? And is there anything I forget that I have to remind, be reminded to tell everyone? Seeing none, I guess we will stop now and sorry for the one minute over time. I will see you guys next week. Thank you very much, Berry and Steph. Thank you all for attending.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]