
JULIE BISLAND:

All right, for the recording, this is Julie Bisland. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday, July 31st, 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Thomas Rickert, Susan Payne, Saewon Lee. 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 right, seeing no hands, if you do need assistance updating your statement of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. 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. Thank you. And over to our chair, Manju Chen. Please begin, Manju.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Julie. Hello, everyone. I hope you guys are enjoying summer. I want to start with sharing a fun fact, probably not so fun. You probably won't find it as fun, but I thought it's pretty fun. So, starting next week, it's going to be the month of ghosts in Taiwan. And these ghosts are not like the ghosts in Coco, the movie.

They're not your ancestors, just like ghosts hanging around in the world. And they're all coming to the earth, to the human space, and they're

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.

going to enjoy a lifetime with us for the next month. It's a lunar calendar month, so it's going to be until September in our sun calendar. So, yeah, that's how it's going to be in Taiwan. We're going to hang out with the ghosts for a whole month. And I guess that's my welcome, and we can move on to the announcements.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Manju. Berry Cobb for the record. So, the second part of the agenda items, just really quick, want to bring your attention just to our tactical work plan. We're here at meeting number four, continuing to still discuss the charter concepts for the new permanent standing committee charter, but a slight deviation because we felt it was important to kind of get a status update on the work from the continuous improvement cross-community group. We do have the meeting invites sent out through the month of August, so they are on your calendar. And here pretty soon, we'll be looking to schedule the September meetings. Just to note that we're most likely not going to have a meeting the first week of September.

The transfer working group will be hosting a webinar at our usual time. And depending on what work we get done in August, we either may look to schedule the day before or just cancel, but the rest of the schedule seems intact.

Next item I'd like to draw your attention to, if you haven't seen it already, ICANN org and the board strategic planning committee released for public comment the next draft of the FY26 to FY35 year strategic plan and operating plan. Of course, this is not in scope for

what the standing committee will be about. However, I do encourage everyone here to closely read through the materials, not only for your respective groups, but in particular, if you take a good look at the strategic plan as well as the operating plan, specifically within draft objective number one, there are a few strategic goals that basically target continuous improvement in the development of policy and advice.

In particular, the policy part directly is pointing to the GNSO here as well as the ccNSO, but for our purposes, it's the GNSO. And I think it will be prudent to understand what the board's thinking is about these particular draft objectives and goals, and in particular, the strategic initiatives or the projects that are being lined up to help achieve those objectives and goals. And the reason that we're bringing it up is it's conceivable, it's not determinative, but it's conceivable that depending on what work gets launched from those initiatives, that it would come through the GNSO and quite likely the standing committee would potentially be doing work around that. So, it's very helpful to be familiar with that.

The next item, this GNSO coordination list, I know that Damon and Manju have already seen an email that was distributed. The email was sent to the GNSO participants on the continuous improvement cross-community group. This is an initiative staff is putting forward to try to bring those representatives and offer a forum for additional collaboration for the GNSO as a whole and what their experiences are on the principles, criteria, and indicators, which is exactly why we have Damon on today, but this idea of this coordination list will consist of participants that are on the CIP.

We're going to be taking this email and also forwarding it to your respective SG&C leadership teams and basically offering that the leaders be included on this list, as well as the GNSO councilors that are participating on this standing committee, and perhaps even those GNSO participants or representatives on the PHR, the pilot holistic review that will start to initiate around September, maybe early October, but what we've come to realize is all of the volunteers from the GNSO, very few of you participate on multiple groups.

So, there are different people doing different things all in the same context of continuous improvement and migrating away from organizational reviews to this continuous improvement program. So, staff will be sharing this with the SG&C leadership and get their approval to try to take this to the next stage, create this central coordination mailing list, and if there's interest in it, perhaps stand up a couple of calls to allow for more broad collaboration across the GNSO. So, stay tuned for more information there. So, I think we're ready to move on to the next agenda item. I'm going to turn this back over to Manju. Oh, Damon, I'm sorry. Please, go ahead.

DAMON ASHCROFT:

Yeah, Berry, I saw and it went by pretty quick. I think on one of your first slides, you had mentioned an update to the GNSO council being in October. I don't remember who, but I think it was somebody from ICANN org had given us a gentle prod and asked Manju and I if we wanted to provide an update to council in August, which we declined. And I think what we're going to do is we're going to probably provide a

more substantive update to the council as a whole in September. So, I just wanted to give folks a heads up on that.

BERRY COBB:

Yes. Thank you, Damon. In fact, it's an AOB agenda item for the August meeting next week on the 8th. And then, yes, I think the September meeting would be a good opportunity to give the full council a more in-depth presentation. All right. So, let me turn this over back to you, Manju and Damon, and please fire away.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Berry. So, I'll start with a brief introduction of what the CIP-CCG is. And I'll give it to Damon after I do the brief introduction. He will take us to dive deep into the criteria. And I'm going to skip this one. So, what is really CIP-CCG? It's this thing that's a cross-community group that's working on continuous improvement. And why this group has come into place, is because of this recommendation from the Third Accountability and Transparency Review. So, in this review, the recommendation 3.6, it recommends evaluation of organizational reviews.

If you remember in the past, different structures and ICANN, they'll go through organizational reviews every several years. And it's usually conducted by an outside independent examiner. And what the ATR D3 was thinking was that they think this is not good or they didn't think it was effective enough. They feel like for the communities to do it themselves, they know better how they should improve and how they

should continuously improve. And that's why they are recommending that the community do the continuous improvement themselves.

In order to implement this recommendation, ICANN org has helped to solicit this group, which is the CIP, and we actually only convened this year in January. And we will be developing a framework for this continuous improvement program. And within this group, we have everybody from the SOs, ACs, SGCs, and we even have representatives from the NomCom. So, that's what really the CIP is doing. We are developing a framework which each structure will kind of customize under the framework, their own criteria as indicators to evaluate and examine what they have to do to continuously improve themselves.

Okay, move to the next slide. So, this is like a brief roadmap what we're going through. So, if you see the July, between July and August, we are actually should be receiving inputs from our structures. For Damon and I, it's going to be the GNSO Council. Receive input on the criteria indicators, which is what we're going to introduce you later. And in August, they aim to finalize the criteria as indicators. And by the end of this year, actually, we will have published a framework already for public comments.

And that's also why Berry has been kind of alerting us what's coming in our way next year for the CCUSCA, because once the framework is out, we will probably be tap into doing this, doing the continuous improvement work under the framework. And I'll skip to the slide six. This is really how they envision this continuous improvement is going to work. You can see the period one will be between 2025 to 2027. And we can imagine that for the GNSO Council, probably it's going to be a

task for the CCUSCA to do. So, that's why, as I've mentioned, and as Berry has mentioned multiple times, we really have to take this into consideration when we're reviewing our charter.

Let's go to slide eight. So, as we're saying, there's a framework, continuous framework. And under the framework, there's principles, five principles. And under each principle, there are going to be a set of criteria. And under each criterion, there are going to be a set of indicators. And that's how we evaluate how we're doing the performance and how we can improve. I guess we can go straight to slide 11.

So, the principles, as you can see, is these five. The first principle is we're fulfilling our purpose. And the principle two is the operation is effective. The third principle is the operation are efficient. And the fourth principle is we are accountable internally to our stakeholders and externally to the wider ICANN community. And the fifth principle is we collaborate to further the mission of ICANN and the effectiveness of ICANN's bottom-up multi-stakeholder model. So, these are our really just general principles. As you can see, it's like it could be mountains and seas everywhere. That's why we really need a criterion to kind of nail it down what we mean by we're fulfilling our purposes. And I think I will finish here and I'll let Damon do the criteria.

DAMON ASHCROFT:

Sure. Thank you very much, Manju. And thanks, everybody, for joining the call today. And just kind of to recap, basically, for continuous improvement, the group has set forth five general principles. And what

we're going to look at today is we're going to look at the criteria for all five principles one by one. And we're going to get your input on that because we've got to get back to them by August 7th. So, what I'd like to do is let's start, yeah, with page 17. And the first criteria are going to be fulfilling the purpose. And there's three different criterias here. And they're different there's different amounts of criteria for different principles, but what are, and I have, and I don't necessarily want to taint the group's thoughts.

I have sort of some overarching thoughts on the criteria as a whole that I can share with you, but I wanted to get sort of this group's feedback on the criteria. And I think when we're looking at the criteria, we want to look at is it applicable? And are they things that are going to be easy for the council to implement and measure as we go through a continuous improvement process? Does that make sense? Hearing no comments, I'll take that as a yes.

So, what are your guys' thoughts on sort of the criteria for principle one? And this is about fulfilling the purpose, excuse me, fulfilling its purpose, if I could speak. No general comments on these. I mean, I think tend to go to as one would expect, kind of the bylaws and more of a global nature, et cetera. Any comments on these? Jennifer, you have a comment. Go ahead. We're a small group.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks. Thanks, Damon. This is Jen, for the record. I just have a quick question. The principle one is the one that you mentioned on the previous slide, or Manju mentioned on the previous slide. This is us

assessing whether or not the GNSO council is fulfilling its purpose as a GNSO council's purpose. Is this correct?

DAMON ASHCROFT: That is correct. So, it's a very overarching principle.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay. And so, the three things that are breaking down is that we continue to contribute to or advance ICANN's mission. I was thinking more of like, where is the part where we're talking about GNSO council as in being the manager of the, I guess, the policy development process, that sort of more operational stuff. I don't know if that's appropriate to insert in any of this part.

DAMON ASHCROFT: No, that's perfectly fine. And also keep in mind, Jennifer, these criteria, they're generally meant to be used by all the stakeholder groups and all SOs and ACs, I mean, it may very well be that we might want to tweak these to make a more GNSO specific. So, that's certainly good feedback.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Oh, okay. No worries. I'm just still kind of digesting the first slide. So, thanks for that clarification.

DAMON ASHCROFT: No, that's fine. And as you can see, like you can see on the screen, my understanding is what staff has done and we as a group have done is

like we're the GNSO council, you could sub out other groups for that, for that. And so, it's literally kind of a cut and paste. So, it is very generic.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Damon. That makes sense. Thanks.

DAMON ASHCROFT: And what we'll do is, there'll be criteria like this for all five principles. Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Thanks, Damon. Yeah, I think the first principle, it looks good. In addition to what Jennifer mentioned, whether we need to tweak it more towards what the council does. I would support something like policy development process related to these that is obviously missing to fulfill its purpose to be more into detail, but it's nice to have the first criteria as these overarching things towards ICANN mission. I would just be careful about using, for example, to help ensure a stable, secure and unified global internet. Sometimes we use a different word than unifying global internet. Use a secure, stable and trustworthy global internet. So, whatever it's in the ICANN mission, I think we as an org tend to use different adjectives all the time, but it'd be good to stick to one.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Another thing you could do, Desiree, is you could just strike out the definition and you could just say contributes to ICANN's mission. And

ICANN can define its mission, however it so chooses and how we as a community choose.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Sure. Thanks.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Okay. Prudence.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Hey Damon, and thanks for going over the first principle. So, everyone's kind of flagged that, and as you pointed out as well, that this is kind of generic in nature. And I just wanted to ask, is there a specific reason why when looking at if the GNSO Council is fulfilling its purpose, we've gone in a generic way as opposed to going for the more granular? Was there any reasoning? Does anyone know as to why we've got three very general criteria, three very generic criteria?

DAMON ASHCROFT: Prudence, I don't know specifically. I will give the caveat that I joined the other committee late. Manju was originally in that role and I went ahead and I joined late, so I don't know the specific purpose, or excuse me, I don't know the specific rationale, specific answer to that question. I will say with respect to the generality of it, when you talk about fulfilling its purpose and contributing to the global public interest and kind of the general aspects of it, we may not need to be super specific because purpose and public interest and all those different things will

be defined specifically elsewhere. And you can look at the Council's charter and figure out, what is its purpose? So, there is some leeway in there, and I think it gives us a chance to do that. Manju?

MANJU CHEN:

I think I was trying to help, but then I see Berry has a hand, but he's not having a hand, so I actually raised my hand for Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Oh, thank you, Manju. Yeah, sharing a host, I can't find my raise hand button. Yeah, just to take this up a level. So, when you look at all of the groups that are on this, the CIP-CCG of course it's all of the SOs and ACs that are representing there, but the GNSO, as well as At-Large, has its constituent parts that make up that constitute that SO or that AC. So, each of those groups have representatives from registries, registrars, BCIPC, et cetera, as well as the five RALOs that make up At-Large. I think the general concept here is the end result when the CIP concludes its work and it has this framework based on the principles, criteria and indicators, the instrument to measure this will probably be in the form of some survey.

There's talk about who the audience of that survey is and likely done on an annual basis, and I would kind of predict that that instrument would include quantitative as well as qualitative methods to determine, looking at the indicators and then comparing that against the criteria that this all feeds up into kind of macro level results where these results can be used by the holistic review and or its individual SO or AC if it determines that based on the results, some of the principles or criteria

were failing or not meeting a certain baseline, but your point is valid and the way Damon described, it is to really hone this in on what it means for the council is it probably does require kind of digging into what the council's mandate is and its operating procedures to understand these things.

DAMON ASHCROFT:

I mean, I think, and I think we should go on to the next, to the next principle after this, but I think if I had to summarize the first principle in a single sentence, it would be, are we complying with the bylaws for the GNSO? I think that's kind of been at a very, very, high global level. So, let's go on to the second one, second principle. It talks about are the operations of the council effective? And here's the different criteria. We've got seven of them. What are your thoughts on these? And just one of the things I want to add is we're looking at the council.

I think one of the things we ought to consider is when are we, is that when is the council going to be looking at these criteria and kind of measuring itself? And is that an easy process to do that? And I'm kind of thinking probably the best way to do this would be during the SPS that we have. We would probably want to have some type of section of that or session on that devoted to continuous improvement, which is when we would kind of look at these criteria. I'm just sort of thinking out loud, but just want to throw that out there. What are our thoughts on these criteria for principle two? I don't see any hand. Okay. Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sorry. It's me again, Damon.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Oh no, this is-- Please, go ahead.

JENNIFER CHUNG: So, for criteria two, is there a little bit more kind of detail on what that really means for the GNSO council?

DAMON ASHCROFT: Yeah. I mean, basically how we describe it as they're saying is the operation affected? Is it efficient? Is it getting its work done? Again, these are fairly overarching principles here and they apply to all the different groups. So, that's how I would describe that. And the one thing I would maybe tweak about these criteria as myself is, output is implemented at a timely fashion. I mean, we might want to possibly tweak that. So, all deadlines are being met, et cetera. Does that answer your question, Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes, it does. And I agree with your assessment about criteria seven. I think it should be according to whatever it is that the policy development process timeline is. So, I mean, I guess if it's timely in that sense, I'm okay with it, or we can find better descriptive words to describe that.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Yeah. And I think that's what they mean by timely here for the GNSO, because that's what we do. Any other thoughts on these criteria? Okay. Let's go on to principle three. And this is very similar to principle two. The operations of the GNSO council are efficient. We've got nine different criteria here to take a look at. What are your thoughts on this set of criteria? Manju, go ahead. Then I have a couple of thoughts as well. Go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Damon. So, for me, my initial kind of reaction is, I don't really think criteria six fits the council.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Okay.

MANJU CHEN: Because, I mean, yes, we neuter consensus, but then we make decision by voting mostly, or like, not mostly, but we do vote, and our constituents, our reps, our councilors are voted under instructions. Most of them are both voting under instructions of their constituencies. And I guess we all remember how we tried several times, so we still failed to have the aspirational statement. And I just feel like council, as a representation model, probably, well, we don't these criteria won't be a like a suitable or like a super up. I don't know like a suit. Yeah, 100% suitable criteria for the council and I think if we are agreeing with-- we can probably either delete it or see how we take it so it's more like a customized for a council.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Yeah, Manju, I agree. I would personally strike six. I would also strike eight. I mean, because we're trying to manage efficiency and then we're saying criteria is there's an agreement to operate efficiently, I think that's a little bit of a repetitive, and then also nine the appropriate level of funding support, obviously we want the appropriate level of money. I don't know if that makes sense to that specific that goes specifically to efficiency. Prudence? And if you're getting background noise, I'm sorry I've got my landscaper outside. I'm sorry. Prudence, go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Hey, no, no background noise Damon you're sounding like the consummate professional that you are. So, I wanted to bring back to Manju's point, and I wanted to kind of further support that. I have like questions because the wording just makes me feel very awkward in the sense of (a). How does one even consider or assess how much someone's nurtured consensus? It's so descriptive and vague, and like not objective and hard to assess how one would be efficient and efficiently or sufficiently nurturing consensus within a constituency, and then the other one, as I've put into the chat.

I'm not sure whether that is supposed to be an obligation of GNSO Council, I'm still not entirely sure. I noted your points with regards to the funding, and your additional points as well, Damon. It's hard to assess where this line is supposed to be as to what is the obligations for

consideration for GNSO Council being efficient, and what isn't. Some of this does feel a little out of scope.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Yeah, I agree with that. I also just want to acknowledge Juan has put in the chat, I think criteria three should just say FY strategic plan without year, in order to make it more general. I think that makes sense. Jennifer, you have a good comment as well. Agree with that. Desiree, you have your hand up.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Yeah, thanks. Turning to the criteria number three, I think somewhere we should mention also that the GNSO Council develops and recommends outputs or policies following GNSO operating procedures or having a variety of tools to use to reach those outcomes. So, here I think we have a variety of processes and to form a working group, to have a small team or something. This is how we achieve and operate on a daily basis. It could be inserted elsewhere as well, but it just feels it's missing to show that we have some flexibility as a Council, but also that we need to follow the operating procedures and that's something we can check against.

DAMON ASHCROFT: You know, kind of hearing folks' comments and sort of thinking this through. I don't think we'll get there. I'll just throw that out there, but it almost seems like we could combine principle two, operations of the GNSO Council are effective and principle three and efficient. And really

look to combine a lot of the different criteria for the two different principles. I think that's probably more aggressive of an edit than we would ever be able to get through, but I think that might be a good thing just to throw out there.

So, I don't know if other folks agree or disagree, but I'll put that out there. So, any thoughts on that? Yeah, Manju says, the boat has sailed. I think you're right, but all right, let's go on to principle four and the criteria for principle four. All right, now principle four is the GNSO Council is accountable internally to its stakeholders and substructures and externally to the wider ICANN community. So, here's the criteria. There's a lot of them. What do folks think about these criteria? To me, the font's too small, but that's-- no, I was just joking. Thank you. Manju, go ahead.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Damon. I don't know why I'm always looking at the six, first. I feel like this one, the criteria six is also not very suitable for council because I feel like, well, at least as a councilor myself, I think it's our stakeholder groups that should kind of encourage and oversee and make sure they are councilors that are representing them are actively engaged and actively participate in the council. So, I don't feel like council has a responsibility to make sure our council-- I mean, yes, but no. Right. So, I think it's a more of a stakeholder groups responsibility, but of course I'm open to being convinced that council should do more work too, but yeah, this is my first reaction to these set of criteria.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Other thoughts on these? I've got a couple thoughts.

MANJU CHEN: Sorry, just to react to Jen's comments in the chat too. I feel like, so when I see this, what comes into my mind is the leadership program. Of course, it's not catered to council or customized for council, but we are, we have one spot each year to send to the leadership program thing. And I guess also this one, we've talked about during our SPS, how we should be more specific of how our liaisons are working groups, what are their responsibilities and what they should do. So, that I will think can be considered as an effort to kind of maintain skill sets and technical expertise, but that's my initial reaction too.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Okay. I think in general on this one, I think we've got probably a little too many things here. I mean, as a new council member I felt supported and I felt the resources were there. I don't know if we need to have that as specific criteria, so I might strike four. Five, maintaining skill sets and technical expertise through capacity building. I mean, I don't know if we need to specifically state that. As well, I have the same concern, Manju. You raised about six, so I might strike four through six here. So, those are sort of my thoughts on these.

Other thoughts on principle four before we move on to principle five? Yeah. And I think Jennifer, you have a very good point about-- yeah, we really, we really don't recruit the individual, the individual stakeholder groups do. Prudence, go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Hi, thanks Damon for kind of giving some additional input and insight into that. I wanted to talk about criteria four. I myself also am a newer member of the GNSO council and yes, whilst we don't recruit, I think it's a good idea to have somewhere codified an obligation relating to providing support to newcomers, because if it wasn't for the additional hands of guidance from ICANN staff, who literally held my hand and still do, through a lot of the processes, locations with documents, and just generally being all around excellent people, I would be lost.

And so, making sure that there is somewhere codified that support is part of that, and onboarding is part of the newcomer process, I think is actually quite important. So, ICANN, I'm happy to strike part of it, but I think it's actually quite relevant to have it somewhere that not only is, codified somewhere as being an obligation, but is somewhere that's something that's considered something that we're holding like GNSO council accountable to as well.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Okay. Thank you, Prudence. Jennifer, I see your point in the comment. All right, should we move on to number five?

MANJU CHEN: Sorry.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Sure, Manju, go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Did we talk about criteria three too?

DAMON ASHCROFT: We did.

MANJU CHEN: Yeah, so that means striking two, right, as well as four.

DAMON ASHCROFT: I'm sorry, Manju, could you clarify, did you ask if we talked about principle three or criteria three?

MANJU CHEN: Criteria three for principle four.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Okay. Yeah, I mean, what is your concern with criteria three? I mean, I look at it, and I think it's, again, it's kind of a wider obligation that I don't quite know if we necessarily need to list out here, but tell us what your thought is.

MANJU CHEN: I don't think we recruit or develop or maintain membership. I mean, we are a bunch of people selected by our say-holder groups or CUNCs to the council. So, again, this is like criteria six. I think the responsibility

falls more to the say-holder groups and CUNCs and less, or in this case, for criteria three, I think council really has no say or like our hands are tied when it comes to recording, developing, or maintaining membership.

DAMON ASHCROFT:

Yeah, the only potential exception would be the GAC liaison, but that's really a liaison role and not so much an official membership role. So, all right, let's move on to principle five. All right. So, this is council collaborates to further the mission of ICANN and the effectiveness of the ICANN bottom-up multi-stakeholder model. Three different criteria are here. Thoughts on these? I think the one thing I would do is for criteria two, we say meets regularly with the ICANN board. I might even make that more specific and say, meets and communicates in an effective manner with the ICANN board.

I wouldn't add it into the criteria, but I think part of that is sort of the board readiness aspect of that we're talking about as a council as a whole. I wouldn't put the board readiness into the criteria, but I think that kind of goes to it. And Berry, thank you for your comment. Yeah, we do have the ability to add additional criteria here. This is not just a you must pick from this or you must add it from this. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Damon. I completely agree with you regarding criteria two. I think it's not just meeting. It's also communicating to avoid situations where we have a bigger problem down the line. So, obviously, don't put

what I said into there, but someone with better language skills than I do can probably wordsmith that into something beautiful, which isn't me.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Oh, I'm sure you could do it, Jennifer. Okay. Other thoughts on five?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I'm sorry. This is Juan, for the record. Maybe we can add something about not only ICANN board, but GAC, because we are also in communication with some of them or responding from, for example, GAC Communiqué or something like that. I think that we could add that.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Yeah, I think now would you, Juan, would you envision sort of adding that to criteria two or having a separate one, maybe adding in a criteria four that talks about we're in regular communication with the GAC. We have an effective relationship with our GAC liaison, etc. What was your thought there? Modify two or add in a four, a criteria four?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Oh, I think that it could be a new one or maybe just modify or add something in the one because it's one in criteria one we have. We have another process. No, we could add a new one, I think, just for that or that kind of processes.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Yeah, I would be in favor of adding one because one is communicating according with the ICANN global multistakeholder community. The GAC is a different animal within that community in the fact that they actually have a liaison. I think they're the only group that has a liaison. Other groups have representatives on the council. So, I'd kind of leave one alone and add in four would be my thought. Any other comments on five? Principle five? Jennifer? And then we'll go ahead and we'll probably wrap up. Go ahead, Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sorry, it's me again. I just, I think I put it in chat as well. I hesitate a little bit to single GAC out and I think I agree with Berry to kind of name some of the other SO ACs as well. I do know that we do have, we do spend a little more time looking at the GAC communique. We have a small group who does that each time, but that communication is directly to the board and not back to the GAC.

I know we have our GAC liaison too, but we also have our liaison to the ccNSO and we've started to meet with them. I'm assuming more regularly as well. So, if we're going to single out the GAC, I think it would be fair to mention the ccNSO. And then if we do that, then there's the other ACs as well. I'm not really sure if we should be doing it specifically for the GAC unless there's a really compelling reason why we should.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Thank you. So, that's pretty much it as far as the review of the criteria goes. From kind of a global view, kind of what I'm hearing from this

group is we ought to make it a little bit more council specific. I think there are some deletions of some criteria that could occur. I think there are some additions as we just spoke about. Are folks on the call in agreement with what I said? It's just sort of general global feedback on the criteria, then I'll suggest some specifics as far as next steps. I'll take the silence as agreement with what I just said. Let me know if you disagree.

My overall impression of the criteria, and I'll say this with the caveat that I think the ship has sailed. I think the criteria in general, it's a lot. And I think that as we're going through a continuous improvement process, keep in mind, this is a process that's going to kind of run in the background. And it's going to be a very administrative thing. And it's not going to be part of our day-to-day activities as council. With that being said, I think the simpler we make the criteria, the easier it is to understand the better.

I think in general right now, I think this is on a more complex level than I would like to see it. Me personally speaking, I think this ought to be something that ought to be simpler, just to make it easier. And I almost say that the simpler it is, the less we say, the more effective we'll be. Yeah. Berry, thank you. Yeah, wait till I see the indicators. I know. So, that's sort of my thoughts as a global network, as a global opinion-ist. What I would suggest as next steps. Julie, do you happen to know when our next meeting is? Not this group, but the other group?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Sorry, Damon.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Sorry to put you on the spot.

BERRY COBB: The next CIP call is Wednesday the 7th at 20 UTC.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Okay. All right. So, we've had some specific things mentioned on the call. What I would like this group to do, and Manju, feel free to chime in and say no if you don't think it's a good idea, would be to take the criteria. If you have specific edits to it, go ahead and make your edits and just circulate it via email to the list. And then I'd like to sort of have general agreement over email. If we have any specific edits, and I'll kind of take the general I think we ought to try to work on making it more council specific.

If we can get that by August 4th or 5th, that'll put myself and Manju in a good position to take your feedback globally in any specific levels back to the CIP by its meeting on the 7th. Does that sound workable for folks? All right. Excellent. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate it. And it was a pleasure to be a guest today on today's call. And so, I will give the floor back to you, Manju, as chair.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Damon, so much. I think we had a very good discussion and definitely we will note down what was discussed today and hopefully can give Damon something to feed back to the CIP during the next CIP

call. So, I guess we were hoping we have a little bit of discussion of the chart update, but I guess we will use like five minutes here just to kind of remind people to do your homework. So, I think, if Berry, you don't mind, I'm just going to do the talking here because I think we've talked through what we should remind people to do here.

So, you guys remember this chart, this mission objectives, and then there are the draft concepts, like the principles that the staff will use to kind of start drafting the new charter, but before this, we really have to put in our comments for the original charter language and to react to the questions listed here. Your answers, or if you have new questions, please also list it in your designated field too.

So, we have something to discuss for our next meeting. So, we have some materials that we can start talking and start diving deep into what we think the objective and mission of the permanent CCOICI should be and what the scope of work we think should the future CCOICI be. And if you remember, Berry has talked about some use cases that will kind of help us think through what we think of or what we envision the CCOICI scope or mission should be. And I have requested staff, I've pleaded them to do a one-pager of the use case. I think it's definitely very helpful. When we see the use case, it really helps you kind of rethink what mission or objective of our CCOICI should be.

And of course, if you're a very diligent students, you should really go to the work log and read through all the documents Berry has so carefully curated for us. And you will be as invested as all of us and as knowledgeable as Berry, which none of us is. You'll be the secondary and you can lead the discussion for our next meeting. So, that's our

reminder. Please do your homework. Please put in your response to this thing. I forgot how to say in English to this log thing. Under your stay-at-home group, please put in your response.

For those who are not attending today, we will definitely ping them and ask them to put in. Only when we have things here that staff can start drafting the new charter and only when this whole starting that we will have a new charter in time to review, to publish or to give it to the council. So, that's my five minutes to remind us to all do the homework and we can go back to the final item on the agenda, which is the next step in AOB. Berry, I'll give it to you.

BERRY COBB:

That's pretty much it. We'll be sending out homework after we get some of the use cases put down on paper. Next meeting is the 7th of August, I believe, at the same time. And that's all that I have. And I thank you, Damon, for presenting. That was helpful.

DAMON ASHCROFT:

You're most welcome. Thank you for having me.

MANJU CHEN:

Sorry, I don't know. I don't even know if it's columns or rows. So, most importantly is the mission and objective and scope of work. So, the first yellow thingy. Of course, if you have more energy to move on, please do. We're certainly welcome, but the most important thing is the first two. I don't know if it's columns or rows. Sorry, the first two. I don't even know how to say them in Chinese. The first two rows. Thank you

very much. So, please, please, people following the first two rows. And so, we have something to discuss. And so, staff will have the power to start drafting our new charter. Thank you. Thank you very much. The due date is before next meeting. We will send out, I guess, a reminder with the meeting notes. And look, we are three minutes ahead of vending time. We did so good. I'll see you guys all next week. And I hope you enjoy the rest of your week and the three extra minutes of your life that I give back to you. Thank you and bye.

DAMON ASHCROFT: Thanks, everybody. Bye, bye.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Damon. Thank you, Manju. Everyone, have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]