
ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 15 December 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/44XOCg>

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:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday the 15th of December 2021.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. I know today we have Kristian on the phone only. Is anyone else on the phone only?

OLGA CAVALLI:

I think Flip is in his car. He shows in the Zoom room.

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.

JULIE BISLAND:

Okay. Thank you. Today, we have tentative apologies from Wisdom Donkor, and Thomas Rickert will be joining us late. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

Seeing no hands, if you do need assistance updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted to the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And 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, Olga Cavalli. Please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Julie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Thanks for joining today. We have had some time without meeting, and I want to go back to this issue at the end of the call about when are we going to meet again. I think Kristian sent an e-mail asking if we're doing weekly meetings or not, which is a very good question. It's for us to decide.

So I have been chasing you personally so you can do your input to the two surveys we have shared that our dear friends from staff have prepared. We didn't have much inputs. We will review them in a moment. Maybe we can think about having some more time to go over them and put some more input, or we just keep it as they are and we take silence as an acceptance to different issues.

There were some comments about the tool, which I somehow shared. I didn't want to put much input because I didn't want to bias any comment, and also, I'm not a member of any specific constituency as a NomCom appointee, but maybe we can see if staff has any comments about the tool and how can it be improved for the future.

We have two documents, surveys. One was about the working group self-assessment survey and the other was PDP 3.0 developed working group leadership survey questions. If staff can show those on the screen.

As you can see, we didn't have much input. This is why I sent you personal e-mails this week. Some of you responded. I know we're very busy and we are somehow overburdened virtual activities. I am also one of you. Don't think that I'm not part of this exhaustion of virtual activities.

Anyway, these surveys don't take a lot of time and it's important for our work. As you can see, we have comments from Sebastien, mainly related with the tool which some of you did agree. I did send an e-mail to Mark and Thomas. Manju, thank you very much for your comments. And then we have Juan Manuel. We have Manju and Juan Manuel in the call. Maybe you can speak up and let us know your comments in this call.

Wisdom has been very busy, and Desiree has put in her input there. And I didn't put input on purpose, I didn't want to bias any comments. So maybe we can review the new comments. I don't know if Manju or Juan Manuel, you have to say something or we

can ask our staff to go through the document. Sorry to put you on the spot, but maybe you want to say something.

Okay, let's review Manju's comment. The first question is what should be kept in the working group self-assessment launched at the end of a working group's lifecycle? Manju, "it might be too late to ask whether the WG members consider the mission/charter of the WG is clear when they already finished the work."

That's an interesting question. Marika, you want to say something? Go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olga. I think Manju already noted indeed, that might be a question that may come later. It won't allow for any kind of course correction at that stage, but it could presumably still provide helpful information to the Council, because if indeed the group felt that the charter wasn't clear or the instructions weren't clear, that's obviously not helpful. But this seems to be, at least from my perspective, a potential candidate question for the periodic survey, because if that is something that you ask earlier on, you're able to identify if there is confusion or misunderstanding around the charter. The Council is able to anticipate or react to that by either providing clarifications or modifying the charter depending on what the issue seems to be. So at least from my perspective, I think it's a helpful suggestion, although it may fit better or have more impact if it's part of the periodic survey that would be conducted at an earlier stage.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Manju, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. And thank you, Marika. That was what I thought too, because the question only asks—I thought this is only going to be at the end of the working group. So I [inaudible]. But as you said, it would be definitely helpful if it was a thing that was asked during the process. I'm not sure if this is specifically to be used only after the working group has done its job, because from the questions, I thought it was, from what was asked in the form. But if it's not, if it's a periodic thing, then definitely, we should ask this question every now and then during the process so we can make sure that everyone feels comfortable about working on this working group, because they know about the mission and the charter and it's clear. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Manju. And you have another made to the question, which question should move or be duplicated from this working group self-assessment to the periodic assessment which somehow relates to the previous comment. And you say, "questions regarding technical, external, and administrative support should not be asked at the end of the WG cycle. it would be much more helpful for the WG members to flag that during the process and get them improved rather than only complaining about not enough support when all work has been done." It's an interesting comment. Any comments, Marika, about this and related with other [inaudible]?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, I think this comment also aligns with I think a comment that Thomas made, I believe. I think he sent that to the mailing list. [inaudible] I think also noted that it would be helpful in the periodic survey to also indeed ask questions about the staff support received, if there are any concerns or anything that's missing. So again, this seems to be a candidate question or around those things to be included in the periodic survey. Again, for the Council to be able to recognize at an early stage if there's certain things that could or should be done better that would help the working group in delivering on its assignment.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Juan Manuel, you did your comments before. Thank you very much for that. And your comment is about what should be kept in the working group self-assessment launched at the end of a working group's lifecycle. And you say you think all questions are adequate to know how the members of a WG perceive their environment.

And then what should be changed in the working group self-assessment launched at the end of working group's lifecycle, you suggest some questions about working climate should be taken off or made in another way.

And about what is missing in the working group self-assessment launched at the end of the working group's lifecycle, you say, "I feel some questions about involvement inside the WG job are missing, jut to better know how is our member engagement."

So I see that in general, comments are related with the process of the working group between starting and ending, and in the middle of the lifecycle of the working group. Thank you very much, Juan Manuel, for your comments. I don't know if you want to add something, profiting that you're in the call today, or ... Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. I wanted to ask Juan Manuel if he could be a bit more precise about what he means about the working climate or if he has some specific suggestions on what type of questions he has in mind. So again, that would help us if in the next step, we're able to suggest some modifications. It would be helpful to get a little bit more detail on exactly what you're thinking here.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: About the working climate, I think I was just thinking that we can add some questions about the relationships between constituencies inside the working group, because maybe we have some representatives, some different constituencies inside one working group, but politically or stuff like that, there is no good relationship between this constituency and another one. So that means that some moment, you have the opposite of the time for another one person or constituency is saying. It's that kind of question that I think we can include, because maybe that can be the work inside of the working group being more slow than usual. That kind of work of question is not just too much [inaudible] or this is a [inaudible] I think, but that is what is my thinking. I don't know if I'm so clear in that.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks, I think I understand what you mean. And as said, I think for the next iteration of the survey, we can maybe propose some draft questions to that point, and of course, you can indicate whether or not that aligns with what you had in mind. And I know that Olga is rejoining. She had some connectivity issues. Olga, do we have you back?

OLGA CAVALLI: I'm back. Apologies for that. And I missed the comments from Juan Manuel. I think he was speaking at the time that I disappeared.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, Olga. I can maybe summarize his comments. And Juan Manuel, please correct me if I'm wrong. But to basically ask some questions about the relationship between the different groups working within the working group to kind of see if or how the potentially affected dynamics and work getting done in the group. I think that's in short what I at least took away. And as I shared in response with Juan Manuel, our hope is that as a next step after we've gone through the input on the survey, we're able to produce an updated version of the survey, both the end-of-life survey as well as the periodic survey with some proposed questions as well as proposed changes based on the input that has been received here, that you then can of course further review, and if there's anything additional that needs to be added or if we didn't capture

correctly the intent of some of the comments, you of course have the ability then to adjust that and provide your input in that way.

I'm guessing Olga is having connectivity issues again, so maybe we just give her a minute to reconnect.

OLGA CAVALLI: I'm on my mobile because something is happening. Apologies for that. The only thing is that the screen is very small. But maybe you can help me. I would now like to review the comments sent by Desiree. Maybe if you can help me, Marika, in reading them.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure. Happy to help here. And of course, as Desiree I think is on the call as well, feel free to speak to them yourself or correct me if I'm mischaracterizing—

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I can do.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Desiree. I didn't see you.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Not a problem. I think maybe we should have a vice chair in case you disconnect again to continue.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, maybe.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: So if anyone volunteers ... So yeah, I would briefly go through my comments. The first question, my comment was that I found all questions to be relevant. So I believe that they should all be kept at the end of the working group's lifecycle. I don't see that we need to take any of them out, even the mission and the charter, because people could have insights or there could be minority views expressed to the charter by certain stakeholders as we're currently experiencing. So I don't mind it staying in there.

The only thing which is a minor comment what should be changed in the working group self-assessment form is that—this is more of a question and a comment, would the GNSO liaison to the PDP working group be asked or expected to fill such a survey or not? Otherwise, no affiliation is missing from the initial identification process of who's filling in the survey. So I don't know if anyone has an answer to that, anytime any GNSO member who is a liaison, like chair, perhaps ask to fill in such a survey. If staff has comments, I welcome them.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes. Thank you very much, Desiree, for your comments.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Maybe I'll finish them all. Thank you, Olga. I just would say that in general, I supported Sebastien's comments about the survey being available in all different browsers and links, relevant, added

to the survey so that people could be reminded. But I also think we discussed at an earlier call. I would think that it's important to the web online survey not to collect the name of the participant so that the participant of a working group, although could be identified otherwise, stay anonymous. I think that would contribute to the quality of input.

And one other comment I started filling in was if there are any parts of the—which question should move to the—duplicated from this WGSA to the periodic assessment. I believe that the input part of the survey is one that could be asked periodically. It's really good to get the members to ask themselves that question even when they're a member of the PDP working group. So I'll stop here. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Desiree. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Just wanted to bounce on your question, Desiree, about the liaison. Being a liaison myself on two groups, I guess the liaison is a member of the group and then on top of it has a liaison role. Now, some liaisons, as I do sometimes on more political aspects, prefer to stay neutral and focus on the liaison, but still member of the group. So I guess about answering the surveys, you would anyway.

Having it specifically labeled as the liaison might be of interest indeed in the dropdown list, but in principle, a liaison is a member

of the group, would answer the surveys, would participate as any other member.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Sebastien. Then that could be identified as other currently in the assessment survey. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Sebastien and Desiree, for the comments. Marika, your hand is up.

MARIKA KONINGS: On the question that Desiree had, I think at the moment, there's nothing prohibiting the liaison from filling it in. Emily confirmed to me that at least for the most recent survey, I think for RPMs and SubPro, we did invite the liaison to fill it in. I think it's probably worth further conversation maybe once we also have a better idea of what the periodic survey would look like, because my assumption is at that stage or at least the discussion on the kind of periodic survey result is probably where the Council would heavily rely on the liaison to kind of interpret those comments or either confirm or maybe not deny but basically maybe challenge some of the findings there, because of course, a liaison in principle is in the working group to be able to alert the council if there are issues that need to be addressed or if there are questions the group has or things that the group struggles with.

So I do think that the liaison in the periodic survey presumably has a very specific role to fulfill, and indeed, the question is, is it then

also appropriate for the liaison to fill in the survey, or would a liaison serve in a different kind of role when it comes to the periodic survey result?

For the end-of-life, I think as Sebastien noted as well, the liaison does participate through the whole lifecycle, so it does seem relevant there that any input or feedback the liaison has is also relevant for the Council to kind of review and consider as the kind of end-of-life input is more relevant for the forward looking, what can we change or improve based on the feedback that that has received?

Another point that Desiree made was around the anonymous entry of survey responses. I think we did discuss this, and at least what I recall, I don't think it was necessarily anonymous, but I think the conversation was more around who should have access to the results or the responses or in what level of detail are these to be reported on. And I think that's probably also one where the group may need to consider a little bit further what it wants to do or what it wants to recommend. And again, maybe there's a difference between what you want to recommend for the periodic survey versus the end-of-life survey.

And there is a concern about making it really anonymous, because then there's no way either for us to confirm whether the person who responded to the survey was actually a member of the working group. So there might be a way of—someone does have to identify themselves or at least provide their name when they fill out the responses, but maybe these are not published with the responses or people are specifically asked if they want to publish their results or not. Or again, maybe it's only available to a

very limited group of people to review and kind of try to derive more kind of general conclusions from that.

But as said, I think that's probably a thing that we need to talk about a little bit more in one of the future calls. And again, maybe it's only possible once we have a better idea of what the periodic survey will look like and how the end-of-life survey looks or will look. And I think also, this question I think that we touched upon before for example about leadership, there might be some sensitivity there in having—people may be less open if they know that their responses are publicly posted. So again, I think it's a conversation we may need to have once we have more clarity around what the surveys will look like, and then also are in a better position to assess what is the value of making this public for the whole world to see versus having maybe a bit more privacy around those to maybe having anonymous response if that is where the group would like to go.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. We have some comments in the chat. Marika, "the liaison is not prohibited from filling it." That's my understanding, but as I'm not a member of any constituency, that puts me in a more neutral position. Philippe says, "Indeed, not sure there's guidance on the matter but it happens." And a comment from Desiree that she already explained.

Okay, thank you very much. So those are the new comments and inputs that we've received in this working group self-assessment survey. Thomas, go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes. Hi. On Marika's summary, I'd just like to make one or two comments. I think that in order to confirm whether a respondent to the survey is part of the group or not, you can provide them with unique links so that only the group members get access to the links without asking for the identify. So I think we want honest responses, and I think therefore there's some value in making sure that folks who might be criticizing fellow working group members, leadership or whoever, are not afraid of speaking out.

I think we're all interested in making the work as efficient as possible and the work product of the highest quality possible. Therefore, I think that even with the interim periodic queries, we need to give leadership and ICANN Org the opportunity to adjust course, maybe throw more resources at a working group to make sure the working group can deliver as it should.

So I think that would be good. And also with respect to leadership, Marika, I'm not sure whether this is the point in time you want to discuss this, and Olga, but I had suggested in my comments—and those are not in the table now because I didn't have access to the table at the time, but I think it makes sense for leadership maybe to review the results with the ombudsman and ICANN staff in a confidential atmosphere to allow for [cross checking] while the working group is running. So maybe that's some food for thought for others on this group that can be considered.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Thomas, especially those comments about anonymity, I think that helps, that people can speak more freely about what they think and without feeling that they are being criticized or harming anyone with comments.

And maybe your comments, Thomas, can be taken by staff when we do our final document about all the inputs received and comments received during the calls. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olga. I think to that point, on sending individual links, in addition to that one, there were some other requirements for a survey tool that I think Sebastien also identifies and from our side we do as well. So I think in addition to more substantive conversation around what survey questions should look like, what should be part of it, what shouldn't, I think we also have a number of requirements that you would like to see for a survey tool. So I think that's something that we'll also separately note down and it's probably something that we need to check internally, whether the current tool that we have can meet those requirements or whether there are other options that we should pursue if indeed those criteria or those requirements are important. So as said, we'll definitely take note of those and make sure—you can also kind of confirm that that's what you would like to see in a tool, and then we can see what is possible or otherwise come back to the group and say, "Look, these are the three things that we can do with the current tool we have. These are things that are not possible. If you want us to go out and find something else, we can do it, it just might mean that other things aren't available because maybe

there's not a tool that fits all the requirements.” And maybe there is, but it would require a bit more investigation from our side.

On the point of the ombudsman, Thomas, I think we did discuss that. I think one or two meetings ago, it was input that you did provide in your e-mail if I'm not mistaken, or in one of the other documents that we did. I think the preliminary questions. And I think at least an observation that staff made that based on the current role of the ombudsman, we weren't sure if that would fit within what his remit is or if that would require some kind of broadening of that.

Of course, at the time of survey results, there isn't any kind of conflict yet, which I think is currently where the ombudsman typically comes in. If there is disagreement or people feel that they're not being heard or where process and procedures are not being followed, where of course most of the surveys at least I think that I've seen so far, it's kind of constructive feedback that's provided on what can potentially be improved and it doesn't rise to the level of conflict.

And of course, there is an escalation procedure that's already available within the working group guidelines, should such a situation occur. Maybe that's something that the group may also want to consider further, as again, we have more details on what the survey would look like. I think then the conversation should focus on indeed who receives that information, who reviews it, what happens with it, and is there a role that should be created or should be there for the ombudsman to play in that regard?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Thank you, Thomas, for your comments. We have reviewed all the inputs received. Should we give more time for other members of the group to give some input, or we should close it now? What does the group think? Any comments? Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: I just wanted to note that just because we maybe close the input here on this Google form, this is of course not the last of it. As I said before, the staff thinking here is that we'll take your input and use that to basically produce an updated version of the end-of-life survey with some of the updates based on the comments that you provided.

And as noted before, this is closely linked to the periodic survey, so those may need to be reviewed by the group in parallel. But of course, that will be another opportunity to provide further input on which questions you think are maybe no longer relevant, could be rephrased, is there still something missing? And again, having a clear idea on what the periodic survey is expected to cover may also make it easier to decide what should stay or what should go when it comes to the end-of-life circle.

So closing the input here on this doesn't mean the end of your input or conversation. This'll be a continued conversation on this topic.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. I think that's a very good suggestion. I would say let's give it up today, and maybe someone hears the

call and recordings. And I will do my inputs today and we close this part of it. So, any objections to what was suggested by Marika and that I agreed with? Seeing no hands up and hearing none, I think we're okay with that.

Moving to the other PDP 3.0 development working group leadership survey questions, this is still to be filled. We have some comments from Flip. The survey to be integrated into the periodic survey or be a standalone survey? He says periodic. Stephanie says that it should be integrated. Juan Manuel says yes. Juan Manuel, you mean that it should be periodic or standalone? Wisdom says yes.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Periodic.

OLGA CAVALLI: And Desiree said something in the chat. Let me check. "Had to rejoin."

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: I did what you did, Olga. My connectivity broke. I rejoined with the phone.

OLGA CAVALLI: Must be a problem all over the world. Who knows. Periodic, says Desiree. Wisdom and Juan Manuel says yes. We don't know if it's periodic or standalone. Then we have, should all questions be part of the periodic survey or standalone? Periodic, says Flip.

Stephanie, yes, all questions are worth asking and should be part of the periodic survey. Again, Juan Manuel and Wisdom saying yes, and Desiree says yes, periodic.

If you answered that not all questions should be included, please specify which ones can/should be removed. No comments. And are there missing questions? No. Juan Manuel says any question about equity from each subgroup or constituency, and no other comments.

Any other comments from those of you now in the call about this working group leadership survey? I see none. Should we give it more time? What do you think, Marika? We have time.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, at least from I think what we see so far, the group at least seems to be, or those that responded seem to agree that this should be part of the periodic survey and should be integrated in that way. I think also from the responses so far, is that the questions do cover well what should be asked. I think Juan Manuel just said that maybe there should also be a question about equity from each stakeholder group or constituency. I think we'll need to have another look. And maybe Juan Manuel can provide a specific suggestion on what a question like that could look like.

And maybe similar to the previous conversation, what we can do here is try to take this input and create a first draft of the periodic survey, including the questions from the PDP 3.0 survey, and as well, looking at the end-of-life survey, which questions seem to be relevant for Council to kind of know what's going on and identify at

an early stage what might be wrong or where it might need to intervene.

So maybe we can try to take that as a next kind of work product for the group to look at and see, does it align with the input that you've provided and your expectations? I think we also need to look at the operating procedures because there is mention of the self-assessment requirements there, whether any updates are needed there. And I think another thing we've discussed where we probably need to have another look is the charter for a working group, and I think this one comes to the kind of periodicity. Are we looking here at something that's timebound or milestone-bound, or is that something to be defined in the charter?

And I think the group discussed and also something that's covered in the preliminary responses, that maybe there should be a default but with an ability when a working group starts for the charter drafting team and the Council to modify that timing, or maybe as well, based on what's going on—I don't think we want to write things in stone either. So if at any point the Council believes running a survey would be helpful to get some insight into what might be the issues that are preventing the group from making progress, that the Council should also have the ability to launch that.

So maybe that's a next step the staff support team can take to again provide something more concrete for you to look at and respond to. Of course, anything we provide is draft and for your review and editing. Of course, if someone else wants to take the [pen,] we have no issues with that either, if someone wants to take a first stab at building that surveys. More than happy for that as

well, but also happy to help with that and take a first stab at it so the group can review that.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika. I think that suggestion by Marika that staff could produce a first draft for us to review is a good starting point. I think that the activity in the group was not very intense, so perhaps it's not easy to find someone to hold the pen, but if there is someone now in the call that would like to do that, we would be happy to accept that volunteering activity.

I don't see many hands up, so Marika, we take your suggestion as I don't see any other comments in the chat. So let's do that as a next step. When do you think that we could—that's about the next step and the next meetings. Kristian asked by e-mail if we're going to meet weekly or biweekly. What happens with the next date that we have holidays and people are not working all the time because they're taking vacations?

So it's up to us to decide. Should we meet next week? That's my first question. The second question is, when could we have some draft to review? That's for the staff. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Olga. I think I can answer that second question because that may also influence whether or not you want to have a meeting next week. We will need a bit of time of course to look at the survey and come up with those drafts, so that definitely won't be ready for next week. I'm hoping that it's something we can share with the group in early January. So again, we won't have anything

specific, I think, to show you for next week. Of course, if the group feels it's helpful to have some further conversation around what you would like to see in the survey, some of the other topics or if people want some more time to fill in the responses to the Google doc, of course, that is possible, but I'm suspecting that some of you may already be off next week.

ICANN's offices are closed between Christmas and New Year, so staff will not be available if you want to have a meeting in that period. But again, I doubt there'll be many of you working in that period. So that would probably mean that if there's no meeting next week, we would be looking at either the first week of January or the second week, again, depending on availability of members of the group, and of course, our ability to turn around those documents.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Next Wednesday is the 22nd, and the following Wednesday is 29th. Then it's 5th of January and 12th of January. Kristian, your hand is up. Go ahead.

KRISTIAN ØORMEN: Thank you. The reason I wrote this mail is because I'm personally not very good at the short-term planning. My calendar gets filled up a bit quickly. Next week, we already have a meeting in the calendar. Of course, we can cancel it, but I plan around my calendar. I would prefer if we could agree on some kind of schedule that we would stick to because then I can also say that

I'm going to participate in those meetings because when I know they happen at a specific time, I prioritize them quite dearly.

So I don't mind if we have a meeting every week, every second, third, fourth or whatever schedule we do, but personally for me to attend and prioritize the meetings as I should, I need a schedule that we can keep. Every fourth week, every third week, that's great, but if we only have a meeting a month or so, I can't really block every Wednesday in my calendar due to conflicts with other work. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Kristian. You want predictability and it's totally understandable. We all have similar problems. The thing is we always plan this call being weekly every Wednesday, but then we had some cancellations due to [inaudible] conflicted like Internet Governance Forum last week and other things.

But maybe we can agree on weekly or biweekly and stick to that. But we have this time of the year now that is somehow different from the usual timing. Kristian.

KRISTIAN ØORMEN:

I think it would be great with biweekly, and I understand how we need to cancel some meetings. The earlier we can cancel them if we need to is great. For example, everything between Christmas and New Year, we know to cancel that for a long time, of course. So if we can do a biweekly schedule and find a time in January to start that, then I can have it in at least my calendar totally blocked, every second Wednesday for example, and then I can be sure not

to put any other meetings there and prioritize this work. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Kristian. And your point is well taken. Marika, your hand is up.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. As Olga already noted, it's probably a question as well for the group on what kind of rotation you want to work. As you all know, we started out with weekly calls, but we have noticed that it has been difficult for members to complete the homework assignments. Even a two-week period has sometimes been difficult. So maybe a biweekly or meeting every two weeks is a more reasonable schedule. But we would, I think, be looking for a commitment for everyone that just because it's on a two-week schedule doesn't mean that in-between, no work gets done, because we do have an assignment here and we're trying to complete that in a timely manner.

With regards to the starting date, if I can maybe suggest that the group would start, and then we can already send out those calendar invites so everyone has it already blocked in their calendar, that maybe the first meeting would be on the 12th of January. So that would allow staff in the first week of January to finalize the different work products that we discussed during the call today. That should then give you hopefully at least a week of review time before we have our next meeting. So you also have a bit of time to look at that.

And again, there'll probably be quite some documents to review, so maybe we'll discuss with Olga if we focus maybe on one thing first and then work through some of the other documents. Maybe sequencing them will allow for staff to get those documents ready for you all to review. We meet then on the 12th of January and meet again two weeks later. And as said, we can then send out those calendar invites already so that it's all blocked in your calendars for the months to come.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Marika. I see there are some comments in the chat about preferences for biweekly meetings. Kristian, "Every three or four weeks is also great for me." Manju, plus one for biweekly meetings, "preferably the second and fourth week of the month." Kristian, "I usually ..." "I am fine with biweekly" says Desiree. "Biweekly or monthly is my preference" says Philippe.

The only thing about weekly meetings is keeping the momentum. I chaired many working groups and I am also a university teacher. Sometimes, when the group has many days in-between, the pace of the work and the momentum sometimes is somehow lost. But we won't allow that to happen.

So any objections about moving the meetings in a biweekly scheme? Wisdom says "support biweekly." So biweekly, no objections. We take the biweekly organization for our calls. Can you remind me, Marika, when could we start in January? I missed that. Sorry.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, my suggestion would be to start on the 12th. That allows us to send kind of homework in the week before that. Also just to confirm, we would be canceling next week's meeting, because I don't think we have at this point anything to discuss as I think we'll be working on the documents.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. So we are not meeting on the 29th.

MARIKA KONINGS: If you want to meet, we can have a Zoom room ready for you, but staff won't be there.

OLGA CAVALLI: No, I just want to be clear. We reconvene in January.

MARIKA KONINGS: 12th of January.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. So let me propose the following. Give those members of the group until Friday for making any additional comments for those of you who were not able or were busy. I will do that because I refrained myself to do that because I didn't want to bias any comment. And then staff can take all of that and I can work with staff in this draft, and we reconvene on the 12th of January. Does that sound like a good plan?

Marika says, “Any additional input is welcome as it would help us in the preparation of the next round of materials.” Wisdom says, “Perfect plan.” Philippe says, “That is great.” One more second to see any other comments. No objections to my proposed—Kristian, “Sounds good. I have added it from January 12th and every second week.” Yes, Kristian, so you can plan ahead.

Okay, so we have agreed on a plan for the next weeks in the future for next year. Any other comments? I see no hands. Any other comments from staff? No. Okay. So let me wish you—well, Wisdom says, “But you should make sure the time doesn’t conflict with other committees schedules.” Yes, we will check that.

“Just to wish you all happy holidays,” says Marika. From my side, thank you very much for your contributions, your comments, your participation. I wish you all the best for these holidays, and I wish for all of you a very happy and successful new year. So we meet next year.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]