
ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 08 September 2021 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/KQEuCg>

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

JULIE BISLAND:

Hey, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee on Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call on Wednesday, the 8th of September, 2021. This call is being recorded and attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. As a reminder, please be sure to update your statements of interest. If help is needed, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat. And also, as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected

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.

Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it over to Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Julie. Good morning from very rainy Buenos Aires, Argentina. And good morning, evening, afternoon, wherever you are. Thank you for joining this meeting. We are recording it. So for those of you who cannot participate, then you can check the recording afterwards. First, let me thank Marika, Julie, and Julie, and Stephanie for helping me with all the documents that we will show you today. Of course, those documents were already developed by the GNSO Council and approved in different meetings. So Marika, maybe you could give us some general background about the scope of this pilot and our committee before I share the screen with my slides.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure, Olga. This is Marika. Maybe you want to pull up the slides because some of the information is, of course, on there as well. Maybe I can talk a little bit about the role and the assignments that the group has. I don't know if you want to start, actually, with slide four and have everyone introduce themselves maybe, briefly, before I immediately jump into discussion.

OLGA CAVALLI: I have many acronyms in my mind but now I'm having some problem in putting a new layer of new acronyms. This one, I have to read it— Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement, CCOICI, which is very challenging. This

is our committee. I will give you a very brief background about the framework in general and the group.

This is the agenda. We will review the purpose of this committee. We will review the working methods and then assignments that we should focus on, which would be our next steps for working. And then, we would agree on the next meeting. So this is the agenda. Do you have any comments, additions, ideas, to include or change? I don't see all of you because I'm sharing screen but I don't see any.

Okay. With this agenda, first of all, I will briefly introduce and maybe Marika can comment on this. This is the general objective of the framework. The document is quite large. If you see the PowerPoint, it has links to the document. And it's the GNSO Framework for Continuous Improvement. It has the objective of creating this framework that allows improvement and execution of projects that are focused on the GNSO structure of procedure and process improvements. So this committee will be responsible for overseeing this prioritization of projects and assignments.

What we are starting now, it's a pilot so we are not doing the whole thing. But this is a pilot that is launched. This is to see how it's evolving and how it's working with the task force and all that. So a pilot specifically, we're launching this. So a limited rollout of this framework—which is quite [comprehensive] and a long document, very complete—and learn lessons that can be then drawn and updated to the framework if the Council decides that it's good to continue. So this is the general scope, the general objective of our work.

We have a group composed by one Council member for each stakeholder group or constituency. So we have Kristian. He's with us this morning. Sebastien, Philippe, who is also in this meeting. Mark, Thomas. Also, he's here. Stephanie. Juan Manuel is with us this morning, and Wisdom, and one NomCom appointee. I am the chair so we are expecting another NomCom appointee to join.

The thing is the two NomCom appointees that are still in the Council, which are Tom and Carlton, they should be stepping down at the end of October. And new Council will be appointed, which is Desiree and I can't remember the other name. He wrote us yesterday. So we have to decide what to do with them. They should decide if the new ones want to join the group or not. That's something that is not decided so far. So I'm chairing the group.

Stakeholder groups and constituencies may appoint experts to advise the committee—one subject matter per expert. So depending on the task force and on the issue, that could be a possibility. Do we have any idea of when this appointment should happen? Should happen at the beginning, when the task force are starting or that would be at any time? Maybe Marika, you have any idea about this?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Olga. It's not specifically foreseen in the framework itself. I think that's really something up to the Council committee to consider. It could be, as you talk about the assignment, that you see a need for specific expertise, or knowledge, or that certain representatives will identify that within their groups, they have someone that has specific knowledge of that subject that might be

helpful to include in the conversation. So I think that's really flexible and dependent on the topic that's under consideration.

OLGA CAVALLI:

So flexible is the right word. They could be appointed at the time that is needed. So they don't have to disclose it now or at the beginning of the definition of the task force. Perfect. Any comments, questions so far? Perfect. Okay.

So this nice figure is in the document. We are here. We are the Council Committee with the stakeholders and committee members appointed. And there, task force that we have to assign. That is something that, at least for me, it's a bit confusing. "Assign" is we have to oversee the work of the task force and at the same time, task force will be set up by constituencies and stakeholder groups. Am I correct, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yes. Correct. And maybe to explain a little bit more, the graphic you see is from the framework document—the full scale of the framework. Of course, now we're in a pilot phase, which is a bit more limited application of the framework. But as Olga noted, the Council Committee is, in principle, there to oversee and assign work to dedicated task forces that are expected to carry out specific assignments.

The main difference there to keep into account is that task forces work on those issues that are GNSO-wide—that are not Council-specific. Any kind of topics or assignments that focus purely on Council or Council-related activities, those are the ones that are

carried out by this committee. So the committee basically has a dual role in that regard.

I think, as Olga already noted on the previous slide, it's also very important to keep in mind that the work that—I think the one before that—the work that is part of this framework is really focused on process and procedural improvements. So those are, of course, touching various levels within the GNSO. There are improvements that focus on how the Council does its work and how the Council performs its role as a manager of the PDP. And there are processes and procedures that are on level of working groups throughout the GNSO.

So again, that's where this work is focusing on as part of the pilot. The Council decided to focus on two very specific topics, one of which is the review of statements of interest, which is something that a task force would need to look at because, again, that's something that is applied across the GNSO and even beyond.

And then secondly, it has requested a review of working group self-assessment. That is a tool that's used by the Council at the moment to review how working groups have performed. Did they get all the information they needed? And more specifically as well, is there anything that would come out of that review that helps inform the Council on potential improvements that they could take. That is also, to a certain degree, linked to conversation around is there a need, as part of the working group self-assessment to also look at a review of leadership, for example. But I think I'm already probably jumping too much ahead in the substance part.

But again, this is what the main focus is going to be of this pilot—two specific assignments. One is to task a task force and oversee the work of that task force on statements of interest. And then secondly, for the Council Committee to actually review and make recommendations in relation to working group self-assessment.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Okay. Self-assessment. So the committee assignments are Council-specific and task force focus on GNSO community-wide perspective. I think that's very important distinction that we should have in mind, also for the work of this committee. So this is the pilot. These are the two assignments that Marika has. We will go in detail in a moment. And then, there are the other task forces that are very detailed in the GNSO Framework document. So you can read it.

We already have a wiki. One comment, "Will we have a wiki?" We already have a wiki. All the documents and exchange of information of our work will be reflected in the wiki. Thanks, ladies, for getting that together. That's very useful. Maybe we can share the link of the wiki in the chat or afterwards, in the minutes of the meeting.

So as Marika rightly pointed out, this is a pilot. Here you have the link to the Council resolution that decided that this pilot was going to be done. And then, two assignments—oversee Task Force C, Accountability and Transparency requirements, assignment number six, PDP 3.0, statements of interest. That's very interesting. I always wondered if these really are efficient but we will see how it evolves. And then number two, assign and

implement Council Committee assignment number four, PDP 3.0 working group self-assessment, as we mentioned by Marika. These items are carryover from the Council's PDP 3.0 effort, which you have a link here.

So this is the pilot. This is our work. And about our scope of work, how are we proposing to move forward? We are proposing a weekly meeting—one meeting per week of one hour. This time, we thought it could be okay but I would like to have some feedback from you if this is a convenient time. We could meet on Wednesdays at this time, which is 10:00 AM for me and 9:00 AM is the East Coast. West Coast is a little bit early. I don't know if someone is in the West Coast or in Asia. I think that we are mostly in Europe and the Americas, in the East Americas. But I would like to hear from you if this time and date is okay to meet every week. I will take silence as a yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Qui ne dit mot consent, which means if you are silent, you agree.

OLGA CAVALLI: I will take silence as a yes. Thank you, Philippe. Okay. No comments. No comments in the chat. I don't see the chat. A link to the wiki. Thank you, ladies. And Paul McGrady, yeah. I didn't remember his name. This is one of the two new NomCom appointees, also with Desiree Miloshevic. Okay. I don't see any objects. So Wednesdays at 10:00 AM. That will be our meeting time every week and then we will see the frequency—if it's

needed one per week or we can change that. So Google Docs, mailing list, and the wiki. But also, you have the link in the chat.

The committee is expected to first scope the assignments for the task forces and then continue its own assignments. So any comments, questions up to here? Because we will start now more specific work.

MARIKA KONINGS: Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. Go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: I just wanted to note that, indeed, we're waiting for some feedback on the group—if there was any concern about starting with weekly meetings. I think, based on the conversation we'll have under the next agenda item, hopefully we'll get a bit of an idea of how much time the group thinks it will need to complete that work. Based on that, I think we'll try to put together a bit of a timeline that will give an indication of the progress that it's expected to make.

Of course, for assignment number six, it's something that will also need to go back to the Council for its blessing before the task force is formed. So again, following today's call, we can try to map out a bit of a rough timeline against which the group can work.

As you already noted, I think the group can also see whether ... Indeed, getting the task force assigned and the work scope for

that is probably the first priority here. And then, after that, the Council committee can look at its own assignment and again, there, decide. Is it helpful there to continue with a weekly schedule? Is that something where more online work can be done or whether every two weeks frame is more helpful so that homework can be done in between.

OLGA CAVALLI: Many thanks, Marika. Yeah. Totally agree. But for the moment, we have this Wednesday, 13:00 UTC, right? It's 10:00 AM for me, 13:00 UTC. Let's see how it evolves. Thank you for your comments. I think Philippe wants to make a comment. Philippe, go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Olga. Just a question. Where do we expect to find the members of the task forces? Is the intention that we try to find them among this group or is the intention that we try to find them among the members of the GNSO Council?

OLGA CAVALLI: Let me give my perspective but perhaps Marika can help me with this. My idea is that we work as an overseer of this issue and then we communicate to the community that the task forces must be convened and they should do that. Am I correct, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. I'm just going to post in the chat. The framework document foresees the following composition of task forces unless the assignment form says differently. It's a similar way of how the chartering of a working group goes. There is different models that can be chosen but the charter basically needs to spell out if it's different from what's currently in the GNSO working group guidelines.

So here again, what has been suggested in the framework document is that each task force would have, as a maximum, two representatives from each constituency or stakeholder group and up to two alternates, and one Council committee liaison who would participate ex officio. So someone from this group to serve as a liaison to be able to answer any questions the group might have about the scope of work or clarifying questions that may need to be taken back. But it's up to the Council committee to confirm what the proposed membership is.

For example, in relation to the statements of interest, it may be worth considering whether that participation needs to be broadened. I know that the concept of statement of interest---and I think even the template—is actually used beyond the GNSO as well as in other groups. So there might be an interest or need to also hear from others. Of course, it doesn't necessarily need to be done through members of the task force. It could also be done through consultations, or public comment, or something like that.

So it is, in the end, up to the committee to define what membership should look like. But there is a default that's suggested in the framework, basically, as a starting point. I hope that's helpful.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Perhaps responding to the question from Philippe but it's somehow my question. We will review the template from the committee perspective and at the same time, we should inform the Council to convene the task force? That would be the different steps? Sorry for being so—

MARIKA KONINGS: No, no, no. I know this is new for everyone. Even for us, this is something ... This is a pilot so it's something we're trying out to see if it's a way to facilitate the work and have some structure around how it's done. So the first step here for the committee is to complete the assignment form. That was something that was attached to the framework document as well. It's basically the charter for the task force. So once the committee has completed that work and we have a draft that we've prepared, that we can share, where we've included as well some of the background information.

But of course, it will be up to the committee to talk about the main aspects of that and to finalize that before it goes to the Council. We need to see. Does it need formal adoption or is it more a non-objection to the assignment form? Once the Council basically says, "Thumbs up. Please go ahead," the Council committee would then convene the task force and basically pass its assignment on to the task force to undertake the work that it has been assigned.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for that because there is some sequence that must be followed. Perfect. Thank you. Any comments about this? Apologies if it wasn't so clear for me. I read the document several times but it's good to have Marika's help in understanding all the details. Any comments so far? Okay. This time I will take silence as a no. No comments. Perfect. Thank you, Marika, for sharing this in the chat about the membership of the task force.

So perhaps we could Could you please share the document about—I have it in my hand but not at-hand in my computer—so we can check the task force assignment sheet for the statements of interest.

FLIP PETILLION: Olga, you have a hand up from Stephanie.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. Thank you. Stephanie, go ahead. The floor is yours.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much for noticing. And thank you, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Sorry. I didn't see you at the beginning of the meeting.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I was late. I'm always slow and [inaudible].

OLGA CAVALLI: No problem.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: This is rather a philosophical question. It arose when we were discussing how we would proceed in terms of striking groups to study issues. I have been struck lately—possibly since we got rid of the reply comments phase—about this accordion-like nature of working group activities. We have a big group that is hard to manage. We strike small groups to get to issues. We go back to the big group. It's still hard to manage. We post public comments. And I'm struck with, of course, the phase we are right now with the EPDP, which with I have been closely associated. Pretty well every man and his dog is going to put in a minority statement just to get their argument back out on the table.

This must be hard for staff to manage. I think, procedurally, it's something the GNSO needs to focus on. And there's been lots of work on how PDPs are supposed to run, most of which I'm not up-to-date on. But I wonder if, as we figure out whether we do something through enlarged membership or whether we do it through public comment—it being getting the impressions of the entire community—we could focus a little bit on whether we did the right thing in getting rid of reply comments way back when we did that a few years ago on the public comment process.

It seems to me the public comment process has become a little withered as compared to this robust, accordion-like small working groups, big working group, small working groups, back to the big process that is inherent in the PDP. Thanks. It's a bit of a non-sequitur but it arose because—

OLGA CAVALLI: I don't know if I can answer that. It's a weird philosophical question about working methods and dynamics of the GNSO. I don't know if Marika or staff can add something to that.

MARIKA KONINGS: Not really. As said, this is something that the Council is trying to see as a way of managing the work while still being in a representative model—hopefully being able to not have any need for minority statements in this sense because it's really focused on process and procedural improvements that hopefully everyone will welcome. But as said, this is a pilot. So the whole idea is, as well, to test and see if this works. And if it doesn't work, are there any changes that can be made or should we just forget about this approach and do it in another way.

So I think it's important, as well, for everyone, as you work through this new approach, to think about those things and also write down if you see things that you think should be done differently or could be done differently because when the time comes—when this part of the pilot completes—the Council will ask all of you what the experience was. Should it continue to also work on the other assignments that were included in the Framework document or, as said, it's decided that it's not enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Council undertaking these activities and it's better to do it in some other shape or form?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. I totally agree with you. Stephanie, if you think that part of our work can address some of your concerns, which I fully understand, please let us know. And then, let's try to chime in and include some parts of these issues in our work. Okay. Any other comments? Stephanie, it's a new hand or old hand? Thank you, Stephanie. Okay. Comment, "I am certainly not committed to ..." Okay. Thank you, Stephanie. Old hand. I don't see ... Can I share my screen? I do have the document at hand. Or you can share it. I don't see it now.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. I was already sharing but I think someone has—

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. But something happened.

MARIKA KONINGS: Okay. Let me see. Resume.

OLGA CAVALLI: Oh. There we ... Okay. Let me check. I have to ... Okay. I see it now. So this document, you already have links in the PowerPoint. You have links in the wiki. It's Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement Task Force Assignment Sheet. This is the assignment sheet for this task force about the statement of interest. So the task force name is Task Force C, Accountability and Transparency Requirements—assignment number six, PDP 3.0 statements of interest.

Short description. Task force to review statement of interest requirements and make recommendations accordingly. This should include soliciting inputs from the community on the current use and experience with statements of interest, as well as suggestions for possible improvements. So that's the general assignment and the short description.

The background. I don't go into details of the links but there is background information provided by staff. Chapter six of GNSO Operating Procedures that covers statements of interest, with annex in this document. This is from 2010 so it's quite a time passing by. Following the Board's endorsement ... And then, February 2008. So those documents are background information but have some time. And the Board Governance Committee Working Group report noted that people who take part in the GNSO Council and GNSO policy development in particular do so because they have an interest in the outcome.

This is the issue about interest and showing those interests in the statement of interest. And those principles can be based on some financial or different interest. The traditional concept of conflict of interest may be difficult to apply in some of these ... I personally always have some doubts when I fill it in. But that's okay. Rather than conflict of interest which might preclude an individual from taking part ...

So I won't go into details. Can you put it a little bit down, please? No. Other way. Thank you. So this is the background information. Those documents are what makes the statement of interest as it is now. So these were the resolutions.

And then, we have different adoptions by the GNSO Council. Then there's the discussion about the PDP 3.0. Some items were identified that might be beneficial for the work. Statements of interest ... This is what we are reviewing now. Okay. What else do we have? I don't to go into all the text.

Staff observations. Can you scroll a little bit? Thank you. Some concerns raised in the past about the usefulness. I think this part is relevant. Concerns have been raised in the past about the usefulness and effectiveness of the statement of interest in highlighting potential conflicts of interest. As noted, it's not an issue to have an interest in the potential outcome of a policy development process as long as this is publicly-declared and known to other participants. For example, some have noted that for confidentiality reasons, certain information, such as clients who may be paying for consultant or lawyer's participation may not be declared.

Lack of enforcement. Who verifies whether the information that's included there is right or wrong? Regular updating is required. That is very well done by staff. They always ask you to update your statement of interest but it may be not done by each individual. At the same time, the recent shift to representative model may have made the statement of interest less relevant, as members participating in policy development efforts do so on behalf of their respective groups whose interests are well-known and not as individuals.

And the template has been used and referenced across the ICANN organizations, not only in the GNSO. And there are 1,100 statements of interest.

So this is the general scope of the task force assignment. Any comments? Should we park this text and let the committee review it during this week? Marika, your hand is up.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yes. Thanks, Olga. I just wanted to provide a little bit more context. So as I explained before, this is like the charter for the task force. So the assignment here, or the role of the committee, is to fill out this document with the specific instructions to the task force to address this topic. Staff has gone ahead and included some of the basic information and some of the background information that we thought might be helpful for you as you further scope this issue. But of course, it's up to the committee to further define what are the specific questions the task force is expected to address and what it is expected to come back with.

You may also include further information. And as you see here, at the bottom of the sheet, there are a number of other aspects that will need to be defined—as I mentioned before, membership composition. There is a default membership composition in the framework document. But if you think it needs to be different, you can propose a different composition and provide a rationale for why it needs to be different.

Similar for the decision-making methodology, there is a default defined the framework. But if you believe it needs to be different, you can again make that change and provide a rationale for why it should be different. Time and expectations. I think it's always helpful as well to give an indication about how long you think the task force should be working on this and at what point you would

expect recommendations back from the task force, as well as what are the expectations in relation to consultation.

And as we mentioned previously, statements of interest are used, probably by almost everyone that's working within an ICANN context or especially those that are involved in GNSO efforts, as it's a required element of any effort. But I think it's also used beyond that. I think, for example, when you apply for a review team, they typically ask, as well, for a link to your statement of interest. Other groups may also make use of it as a way of knowing more about someone as they apply or want to participate in other groups. So I think it important, of course, that the task force is aware of those broader potential implications if changes are made.

What we've included here as well, as part of this document ... It is a Google Document. So it's really intended, as well, for the committee to collaborate on this and provide your inputs and suggestions there. The annex in the GNSO Operating Procedures that basically—or the chapter in the GNSO Operation Procedures that outlined the current requirements in relation to statements of interest—so the definitions that are used. The policy is there, the purpose, the procedures that need to be respected. And it specifically defines, as well, the content of a statement of interest.

So it's important as well to keep in mind that any recommendations for changes will need to go through the procedures that are in force when it comes to changes to the GNSO Operating Procedure. So there's a public comment period that's required, where you need to publish the specific changes you are proposing. The Council needs to approve those and it's

also sent to the ICANN Board for its oversight. The Board doesn't need to approve it, if I recall well, but it is being sent to them to oversee what is in there and if there's anything of concern. They can, of course, raise that.

There are also some other elements here to talk about completeness and accuracy and failure to comply if members do not fill this out. So again, there's a whole section that probably would be part of the review of the statement of interest and any recommendations would result in changes to that.

As noted by Olga, in the background information, at this point, I think it's really intended information for the committee to help inform your work on developing and filling out assignment sheets. But of course, if any of this is also helpful and relevant for the task force as it conducts its work, you're free to leave this in.

We did take the liberty to add some staff observations, basically based on our experience with the statements of interest. I think we have noticed that, in the past, there has sometimes been confusion—and I think Olga already mentioned that as well—about what needs to be filled out. We've also had people saying, "How much value is there in a statement of interest?" For example, there is sometimes client confidentiality that prevents people from stating who's paying them for the work, which may not make it very transparent who someone is working for.

What kind of enforcement or verification is there in place? I think I recall at least when we originally discussed the statements of interest, we've always made clear that it's not possible for staff, at least, to enforce this in any shape or form. There is updating

required. We sometimes see statements of interest that haven't been updated for a long time. I know staff regularly prompts members to say, "Hey. Is this still up-to-date?" And that often triggers an update.

And at the same time, I think we have seen a shift—at least in some of the PDPs—to a more representative model, where I think the question may also need to get asked, "How relevant are statements of interest still, at least in the context of policy work?"

If you have a representative model, you're there representing your group. So it should be clear at the outset which perspective you are representing. And it's basically up to the group that has assigned you to that effort to make sure that you understand the instructions, and if you are working for someone else, that you declare that to your respective group that has appointed you. It's no longer a question or issue, presumably, than for the working group or team itself.

So again, that's at least from a staff perspective, some of the things you may want to think about and factor in as you think about how this issue should be scoped for the task force. Of course, it's very important and that's part of the general scoping of work and chartering efforts—really making sure that questions are as specific as possible to make sure that the task force is able to comply with the instructions provided. Very open-ended questions are always difficult to respond to.

So providing a framing of the issues and the specific questions or things you would like to see addressed are probably the most helpful here. And as said, this template and Google Doc is really

intended to help and facilitate your collaboration on completing this assignment form before it gets submitted to the Council.

OLGA CAVALLI: I have a hand up from Stephanie. Stephanie, go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. I don't know how deep into the substance you want to get on this particular topic. I have decided views on the statement of interest. I think it's one of the worst I've ever seen and I think that its lack of utility differentially impacts members of the multistakeholder community. Insiders know who an IP lawyer might be representing. Outsiders don't.

And I'm not saying that we should have a holus-bolus declaration of clients out there. Obviously, that's a nonstarter. But members of various groups ... I don't mean to pick on the IP lawyers. I got into a major fight in my own group because we have plenty of people who are basically on contract to various organizations and they're not obliged to declare it.

I think that this is a problem. Either we fix this and make it a useful SOI or it ... I'm thinking in French at the moment, which is not helpful. I can't remember the English words. Sorry. But it eats away at the credibility of ICANN as a multistakeholder community if we have undeclared representatives of other groups.

So for instance, just to pick on the IP lawyers again, they could be on contract to a government. So they're not actually representing the IP lawyers in that capacity. They are representing a

government. We could be doing the same thing in the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group because we have NGOs that could get government grants to do particular work. I can think of a few. So I just wonder. Is there any real appetite or are we bringing this up in our trial as a way of killing it for another round? Just a question. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Can you clarify “killing it?” It’s not existing anymore? Is that the idea?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Killing the concept of improving it, I guess, is what I mean.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. My English is limited. Okay.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. Couldn’t do anything with it so it’s back to being a stupid SOI for the next 10 years or so. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. I think your point is interesting. I have a feeling when filling it out. But it’s impossible to know everything about everyone and everyone has its own interest that could be disclosed or not. So I think it has some purpose and some utility in having a general information about each participant, which I think it’s okay. The

thing is, I don't know how efficient it is in showing the real interest behind every person. But you never know that, having it or not.

So I think the purpose of this exercise is trying to enhance this concept of statement of interest—try to make it more efficient, more useful for the whole community. I think there is value in having it and there is value in the revision. That, at least, is my own opinion. Marika, you have a hand up. I don't know if it's old or new.

MARIKA KONINGS:

It was a new one in response to Stephanie's question whether this is the time and the place. I think, to a certain degree, probably not. That's probably something where the task force needs to debate what needs to happen.

But I think your comments do highlight the questions that need to be asked to the task force—for example, can the task force confirm whether the objective, as originally stated, is still relevant? And if not, what should be the objective after so many years of experience with the SOI? And maybe, in that way, frame a number of questions that drive, then, to an answer. Is the current statement of interest, as it is included in the GNSO operation procedures ... Is it still fit for purpose? If it isn't, what needs to be changed? Maybe it's completely irrelevant or it needs to be replaced by something completely different. Those are all potential outcomes that the task force could come back with.

So in short, I think it's helpful for the committee to think through what are your own views on the statement of interest when it

comes to relevance, its use, the value, but then be able to translate that back into questions that the task force should answer in getting to a response. So I hope that's helpful.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika. Stephanie, I encourage you to make your comments as concrete as possible into this Google Document. I think this should be our next activity for this committee. I would change that staff observations and input from all of us into Council Committee or general observations about the statement of interest. I think this could be the first activity that we do through this next week.

And also, we could think about the membership composition. Should we propose the same suggested composition that is in the general framework document? Or we would propose a different membership composition of the task force? I think this is important for you, from your stakeholder group or constituency perspective. What is your expectation? You're expecting the same structure or you want something lighter or something stronger. That could be also an interesting thing to fill out in consultation from your groups. We could then think about the decision-making methodology.

So I would propose, for next steps, is to review this part of the document—that observations. Start to put your comments in. I will do mine, as I have filled out the statement of interest many times and I had some questions about it. And then, Stephanie and others could chime in and comment. And then, we could refine this part. I think it's very good but it could be enhanced and then could be part of the general background for the task force. And

then, think about the membership composition. I think that could be the two tasks—our own tasks that we can do during this week. Any comments? Any suggestions?

In the document, remember that you have all the background, which is very important sometimes to understand why this form was prepared in that way. It could be good, perhaps, if staff could add into this document an empty form of a statement of interest so we can refresh what's that information that is being requested every time that we fill it or we updated it. I more or less remember but that, perhaps, could be useful if that could be copy-pasted—thank you, Marika—just for general reference.

Any comments? Do you think this proposal from me is okay for next steps? I will take silence as no comments—that it's a good idea. Also, remember that you have all the definitions. That's in the Annex A. That's very important to understand the form. If we have the form, then we will have all the information that we need to evaluate the relevance. Remember that this was defined a while ago so perhaps and update is worth thinking about.

Okay. So do we have all the documents? We have the background. We have the staff observations. We will try to review them. Think about, also ... I would propose to think about the membership composition for the task force that we should propose. Think about it from the perspective of your stakeholder groups and constituencies. Remember that then the task has to be done. So the commitment should be done. And then review these observations and add your comments in the Google Doc. I'm forgetting something, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: No. I think that's it. The Google Doc should be set up so you can provide your comments. Of course, if you have specific suggestions for text that should be included, feel free to suggest that, maybe in the form of comments so everyone can see and review before it's included in the document. And as said before, look at this as a work assignment or charter for the task force. Make sure to be as specific as possible to make sure that that task force, once formed, has all the instructions and tools it needs to basically come up or come back with recommendations for the Council's consideration.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you Marika. Okay. Looks good to me. And yes, please. If you can copy-paste the form, that could be also helpful. Stephanie, I see that you already have in mind many comments. So looking forward to your input into the document. If you can, send to the committee e-mail list this link so people can work this week. And we are almost reaching the hour. Any other comments?

Can you stop sharing so I can see who is on the call? Thank you for that. Oh, Sebastien. I didn't say hello to you. Welcome. I couldn't see everyone yet. So, Marika, we can put that in the action items. Perfect. Any other comments? Any other ideas? Okay. I'll take silence as no ideas, no other comments. So thank you very much for being with us. This will be recorded for those of you that could not participate.

The idea is that you review the Google Doc. Go into the part of the observations. Put your observations. Review the form that will be copy-pasted in the document. Review, if needed, the background. It has some time. And if you have any doubt, comment, let's do it in the e-mail list. And I wish you a very nice rest of the week and weekend and see you virtually next week.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Olga. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned.

OLGA CAVALLI: Very many thanks to the staff. You're great, ladies. I couldn't do anything without you. Chau.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you, everyone.

JULIE BISLAND: Thanks, Olga. Bye, all.

OLGA CAVALLI: Have a nice week. Chau. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]