ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 21 December 2022 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/CZA-DQ

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

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday 21st December, 2022. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call, attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. We do have apologies from Susan Payne. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

If you need assistance with your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder,

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.

those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process have to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and back to you, Manju, to begin.

MARIKA KONINGS: Manju, you may be on mute.

MANJU CHEN: Sorry. Hello, everyone. Hi. Good to see you, guys. As you might know, I'm the new chair of this CCOICI thing. And today, we have a really minor test to finish. So I guess, do we just start it? If everybody remembers what we're going to do today, we're just going to review the comments we received for the working group self-assessment.   And actually, most comments are just supportive. And Marika and the staff, they have very helpfully listed suggestions that are not included on our report and might need our consideration which, as you can see from the screen, this one is from ALAC, they suggest addition to ALAC.

We should also have the option to select At-Large community, which I think is really reasonable. Because I think I'm one of those people who often kind of conflate ALAC to At-Large, which are actually two different entities in a way. And if anyone has strong opposition to this suggestion, you can please raise your hand now, or if you're supported, they can also probably type in the chat to just support, because you guys then fall in the table below. So yeah, I'm seeing if anybody is responding.

No? Do you agree that we should include a suggestion to our survey? I see thumbs up from Thomas. Desiree has her hand up.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: I just lowered it. Thank you, Manju. No objections, I couldn't reach to the chat earlier. So I believe this is a fair ask because there are many leadership At-Large community members that sometimes had an explicit role, but since they're no longer in a leadership position, and there is a community At-Large, I think it seems fair to include that. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Desiree. So for the second suggestion, the two members who have provided their feedback, which is me and Susan, who couldn't make it to the meeting today, but we both kind of disagree to the suggestion because I think we have practically the same reasons versus like if some people choose to disclose their names and some people do not, then it might be possible to guess who are the ones who are not revealing their names, and also this kind of, in my opinion, encourages speculations which is that there'll be like those who disclose their names, are they the people who say this, or are those who are not revealing their names saying this? That's even worse than knowing who exactly said what, in my opinion. So that's why I disagree.

And again, you can see Susan's rationale and her comments, probably the same as mine. And just checking if anyone has any other opinion. Do you agree to include us? Or are you kind of in line with me and Susan, to think this is probably not good edits to the current assessment questions? Any reactions?

Yes, thank you, Desiree. I'll just take silence as yes. Cool, Thomas, thank you. Oh, thank you, awesome. Antonia and Marika, I see your hand up.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Manju. Just to note in the draft that we had circulated, as no one had kind of provided input yet, we have assumed that this might have been an option that people wanted to include. So there is some redline in the document that kind of talks about this option of people being able to disclose, but seeing that everyone agrees that that is not a path to follow, we'll just go ahead and take that language out again.

And of course, we will include a link to the discussion table so that -- there's particularly Jeff who made that suggestion and he may ask about it as well, and the report gets submitted; we can see the views of the group. So then the only edits that would kind of remain in the document compared to the previous version is kind of reflecting that public comment has taken place and kind of providing the appropriate links and adding your At-Large affiliation. So those will be the only changes then that will be in the final version of the report.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Marika. Well, Thomas, your hand's…

THOMAS RICKERT: Hi, everyone. I think if you wanted to, we could say that names can be published if all participants want their names publicized,

because then you wouldn't have a risk of exposure. Certainly, I don't know whether you want to make things more complicated at this stage. But I think in the spirit of what we typically do at ICANN, transparency is key. And we should be as transparent as possible while it's not being in breach of applicable laws.

And even if we wanted to answer this in the affirmative, and say, we agree that names should be published by way of consent, if individuals can be identified by having other names to disclose, then that would still be a publication or processing of personal data, like the [inaudible - 08:37].

I agree with the disagreement principle; we could make this carve up but I see that Marika is responding. I agree, factually, it might be impossible to reach 100%. But we couldn't make this carve up if we wanted to. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Thomas. I mean, I agree, if everyone is like, it's okay to publish, then it wouldn't be a big deal to publish their names. But then, as Marika has pointed out, you can say it better than me, Marika, please.

MARIKA KONINGS: This is Marika. This seems to defeat the purpose because everyone has participated, you already know that everyone's responses are in the survey, because the summary report would in any case, even if we would publish names, it doesn't associate the name with which answers are from that person. And of course, people could start associating and I think, as someone

mentioned as well, sometimes people will give away in their responses because if you say, as the chair of the group, or as this or that, you may at times kind of give away, and I think sometimes in their follow up conversations, people are willingly sharing that information as well.

But I think it'd be difficult, I'm not really sure how to do that carve out on the assumption, if everyone participates in the set, if everyone participates, it seems to not make that necessary anymore. Because you do have the group of working group numbers are ready, and you're able to see them if everyone participated, or if the number of responses is the same as the number of working group participants, you know who basically provided that input. But I said, I don't recall any instance where we've had 100% participate in the panel.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Marika. And also, I think we had kind of discussed this on our strategic planning sessions about how we will invite the chair of the working group to kind of come and talk to the council and share what they're feeling about the working group. And if necessary, we will even invite working group members to come and share and report what they think might be problematic during their work and stuff.

So I mean, if during that kind of consultation, they're willing to say, oh something and something, and it's on the record, then I guess it's like a nice, how do you say? Complementation. Well, nice plus to the survey too, so I think we can kind of achieve this in other ways, rather than just revealing their names from the survey too?

I guess we're generally agreeing to just not add suggestion B and include suggestion A in our final report to the council. Do we have anything else to do, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Sorry, looking for my unmute button. No, as I said, we'll update the report as discussed today and we can send that back to the group for kind of a last review. Then this would go to council for adoption, possibly before the January meeting, I think we're trying to see, because as you know, the changes in the operating procedures are also linked to the work of the SOI task force.

So we may try and see if we can get those to submit at the same time, because that makes it easier as well than to update the operating procedures in one go. So I think my guess, it will either be January or the February meeting that will go to council again. We may already submit for January, but know that the vote will be for February to kind of tie it together with the SOI work. So nothing else at this stage.

Just to note as well. As you may recall, this is kind of part of the pilot, I think, with the submission of this report, the CCOICI's work is complete apart from kind of overseeing what the task force is doing. But I think Manju is there as a liaison. So if there's anything that needs to be reviewed, that will of course be brought to your attention. And the next step would be for council to review the pilot and basically determine whether to move forward with new assignments, so basically stay tuned.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Marika. Thank you, everyone, who has come to this very short call. I hope I am not wasting too much of your time of this today. And I'll happily say bye to all of you.

For those who are doing Christmas, Merry Christmas. For those who are doing Christmas, but not think of it as Christmas, Happy holidays; for those who are doing nothing like me, happy normal end of December. And I'll see you guys maybe probably at the next council meeting. Thank you, everyone. Bye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you all for joining, this meeting is adjourned. I'll end the recording and disconnect our meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]