EN

ICANN Transcription

Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

Wednesday, 26 January 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/YID3Cg

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

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement call taking place on Wednesday 26th January 2022 at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call, attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you are only on telephone, could you please let yourself be known now?

We have apologies from Thomas Rickert.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statement of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

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.

EN

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, those who take place in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Olga Cavalli. please begin.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thanks, Devan. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to our biweekly meeting. We have the agenda on the screen. Thank you, ladies, for that. And are we okay with the agenda? Any additions, any changes to the agenda?

I see no reactions, no hands. So first, appointment of Council committee liaison to the GNSO statements of interest taskforce. And as you know, we finished our work with the review of the statement of interest in document. And there was this assignment of defining the taskforce. As far as I have been informed by staff, the taskforce is already formed by several colleagues from the community that have been appointed by their constituencies. And so a taskforce is formed. And it should have a liaison to the Council to inform what is happening.

Marika says it's formed in the sense that members have been nominated, we will be scheduling the first—Oh, yeah, thank you for that. It has not been meeting yet. But those members of taskforce have been appointed. So that's the status of taskforce now. It should have a liaison to the Council. So that is something that you may have in mind. I don't know which would be the timing

for appointing the liaison. Marika maybe you can let us know when should that role be assigned.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure. And maybe just a point of clarification, this is not a liaison in the traditional sense of a Council liaison to a PDP working group or another effort which comes with their specific roles and responsibilities that are outlined in the liaison guidelines document. This is more the liaison from this committee to the taskforce as providing a direct link between the committee which has developed the assignment for the taskforce, and has an oversight role in relation to the taskforce to provide that linkage.

So it's still a liaison role, but it doesn't come with some of the roles or responsibilities when it comes to a PDP team were there may be also mediation in case of conflict, or assisting the chair if there are difficulties. Of course, liaison may still be asked to do something like that. But we're looking here at a taskforce that's consisting of a very small group of members with a very dedicated a task.

So again, what the assignment foresees is that there's a liaison from this committee to the taskforce to again provide that direct linkage back to the committee in case there are questions or concerns that need to be raised and also being able to keep the committee up to date on the progress that's being made by the taskforce. So I hope that helps.

From a timing perspective, ideally, a liaison is in place when the group starts meeting. We haven't announced a first meeting yet

but I think we'll be looking at and not next week but the week thereafter. And we're struggling a little bit because the makeup of the group is quite diverse from a time zone perspective. So we'll definitely need to discuss with the group whether we need to do some kind of rotation to accommodate that. But that's, I think, what we're currently looking at. So I said, ideally, and we would have a committee liaison identified by the time the first meeting takes place so that right from the start, that person can follow the conversations and kind of assist the group as needed.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. So have that in mind. And if someone would like to step up and say that they want to be the Council committee liaison, that would be great. If not, then we can review how to proceed.

So that's about the taskforce. And then number two is the revision of the document that we have prepared that we have all worked together. There is the link there. We already went through in detail through the document in our last call two weeks ago. There it is. Thank you.

And remember that the document is still redlined. So you can see all the comments and all the changes that have been suggested. And I don't know if any in the call would like us to go through the document in detail again. We already did that two weeks ago. But if someone is in need of more details or some explanation about some parts of the document, please, raise your hand or let us know.

Thank you, for those of you that made some comments. There have been some revisions, there are very small changes. Minor changes, I would say. It's not a substantial change to the document. Apart from that, I don't know if we have seen anything. Marika, I think just some changes in one word and some other common, right?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks, Olga. To date. I've only seen input from Flip and Desiree. I think Desiree made two comments that relate to an issue that we had already flagged, needing some further discussion. That was also included on the agenda in relation to confidentiality of responses, as well as expectations with regards to what information is publicly shared or with others tasked with reviewing that information. And I can just scroll to those places. There's various comments specifically related as well to technical requirements that may be needed, or maybe helpful to warrant the confidentiality of personal data. And then I also saw a proposed edit from Flip which also seems to be a minor issue. I think he has suggested here, instead of using "comprised," to use "consisted," that seems to be more of an editorial change.

Again, of course, if anyone has concerns about that, we can discuss that, but those were inputs that I've seen. And as said, here's the other comment from Desiree focusing on the technical requirements aspects in relation to confidentiality of information.

And I don't know if I've missed anything, so if anyone did provide input or maybe hasn't had a chance yet to include it in the document, of course, you are also free to raise your hands here

and share if there's anything in there that you think is of concern. Or of course, if you had a look and you thought it was all fine, we're happy to hear that as well. We just really want to make sure that everyone had sufficient time to look at this and is comfortable with what there is to date, absent, as said, there is one specific question that we will need to discuss and kind of agree on an approach with regards to confidentiality of responses.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Yeah. Should we give more time? I think at the most, we may have two more weeks for revision. I'd like to know if we need more time or if we are okay. We may take silence as a yes we are okay, but we would like some confirmation from you if you want more time, or at least those of you who are in the call are okay with the document.

I see Wisdom says, "I have read the document and I'm fine with it." Thank you very much, Wisdom. Sebastien, "I'm okay with the doc as is with current comments:" Antonia Chu, "The current version looks good. There's no additional comments from me." Thank you very much, Antonia. And let me check the chat. Desiree, "I'm fine with the document too." Fantastic, Desiree. Antonia. Manju, "Read through the document too and it looks fine." That's good. We have agreement. Yeah. Okay.

So, the next step would be—we may give some more days for those of you that had apologies for today's call, perhaps one week more. And then the Marika, please enlighten me about the procedures about public comments. I think this goes to the Council first and then public comments, and there was an idea of

putting together public comments for two parts of our work. But please, be so kind to give us the details about that.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, thanks, Olga. So that was another question we wanted to discuss with the group. And as part of this concerns changes to the operating procedures, there is a requirement that those changes go out for public comment before they can actually take effect. And that's a standard requirement as part of operating procedures and its process or changes to those.

So of course, one option would be to already put it out now, or first start with the Council and then put it out. But as we were discussing earlier this week with Olga in preparation for this call— and there's of course also the work of the taskforce that's expected to take off shortly and the statement of interest requirements are also part of the operating procedures.

So one thought or suggestion we have for the group is that instead of putting this out for public comment now—and again, we don't think these are particularly controversial changes. But again, it's [another] public comment period that people need to pay attention to. Is it worth kind of holding it until the taskforce completes its work and then being able to bundle those changes and put them out together for public comment? Plus, as well, potentially some kind of cleanup that we may need to do for consistency in the operating procedure as a kind of general best practice?

And, of course, I think we would see with the taskforce once it has formed, how long they expect to take, because of course, if they say we're going to take three years, it doesn't make much sense to wait. But as it's, again, a small group and a very focused task, we hope that they're also able to make quick progress on that.

So again, we're able to put those two topics together in the proposed changes that would go out for public comment. However, at the same time, we would suggest then sharing this report with the Council, so they are aware of the progress that the committee has made and the recommendations that the committee is putting forward. So again, the Council can also already have a look at those and kind of indicate if they have any concerns or any issues that they would like to raise. But basically, as said, wait for the public comment period until the other piece of work is also done and do that then in a kind of joint package form. Desiree has her hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Desiree, go ahead. Welcome.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you. And thank you, Marika, for that clarification. I just want to add that I agree that postponing public comments makes sense after the taskforce has been formed, and that we should wait until they complete their work. We hope that they'll be fast in surveying the documents we've done and in their interactions.

However, just a question. As Marika said, it may take three years. Do we have any indication how long the work of the taskforce

should take? Do we give them any time period desired, or how do we proceed forward? Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: I don't have information to answer that question. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: I think in the assignment form, the committee did indicate that they expect this would complete within I think it says six to eight or six to nine months' timeframe. As well, of course, it depends on how much time and effort the group is willing to put into it. But as it's a fairly small and focused group, it is also a very focused topic. And I think a six to nine timeframe seems a reasonable estimate.

There is an aspect of outreach to other groups. So that is something that can add a bit of time to that because requests will need to be written, groups will need to provide feedback, that will need to be reviewed. So there's some time that that goes into that aspect. But apart from that, I think it's a little bit of a similar effort to what this group has been doing. It's kind of reviewing what is currently there, or what has been the practice, what has been the experience of people with the statement of interest, what are some of the gaps or concerns that we've already identified as well in the assignment form, and then basically come to an agreement on what the path forward is, and how that then translates into specific changes into the operating procedures, if any, because of course, the group could also decide all is perfectly well and no changes need to be made.

And the assignment form does ask the group as well, at an early stage, to kind of plan out its work, again, similar to what we've done as well with the committee here to kind of think through what are some of the steps and work that needs to be done and make an estimation of the timeframe they expect that to take. So of course, as soon as the taskforce has done that, it's also something then that is shared with the Council committee, so you have also some insight into what their expectation is. And again, based on that feedback on the timing, you always still have the ability to say, "Okay, we're not going to wait for that. Let's push ahead with public comments," if we believe that that effort is going to take too much time to complete.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Marika. So just one more question to complete the cycle. If the taskforce completes its work, the findings will be sent out to the public comment, and that time, it would come back to the Council to summarize the findings of the public [comment,] or should this team then reconvene to analyze that and report back to the Council? Just to understand the technicalities.

OLGA CAVALLI: Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, I can respond to that. Another very good question, because the operating procedures actually do not [inaudible] what the sequence needs to be. It just basically says that before the updated operating procedures take effect, they need to have gone

out for public comments. I think in previous experience, and we would basically do that before the Council would take a vote on the new operating procedures because a vote is required for the Council to adopt the new operating procedure.

So it does seem to make sense that goes out for public comment, whatever comes back is reviewed by the taskforce. If it concerns comments on the SOI, if it concerns comments on the statement—or on the working group self-assessment, it comes back to the Council committee and any changes that need to be made as a result of that.

And then basically, that combined package, together with the proposed updated operating procedures would then go to the Council for a vote. And once the Council has taken a vote, they would basically take effect. That's at least what we would suggest as the sequence. Because if it would be done after it has been submitted to the Council, the Council would likely look at the committee as well as the taskforce, if anything comes back that needs addressing in any way. So this seems to be a more efficient way of doing that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Marika. Is that okay, Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Yes, thank you so much, Marika.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Marika, for being so knowledgeable about all the procedures, which is always good to have in mind. Okay, what is next in our agenda? I think that's all we had to review today. Can you remind me the agenda, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yes, Olga, I can just flip back to that. So the one outstanding question—and that's why it's also good that we give people a little bit of additional time to review the document, is we will need to update this based on the direction that the group gives us today, is in relation to the confidentiality of responses. So I think that's both the question of the expectations of respondents, so of working group members, what expectations does the group think they have with regards to the information that they share and provide, as well as those reviewing responses. What is needed from the perspective of those that review the responses? And who should that be?

Of course, from a practical—and I think Emily kind of took the group through that, currently, the way it works is working group members get sent a general link where they go to, they fill out the survey, they provide their name so that staff is able as well to confirm who's provided the response, and that they are a member of the working group. And then staff based on that produces a summary report in which we don't attribute responses, but comments are left in.

And I think Emily explained as well. And in certain cases, we have gone back to respondents, because we thought it would be possible to kind of [inaudible] the response between the working

group members to make sure that people didn't have any issues with that. And as far as I know, I don't think we had anyone saying that they had a problem with that. And then that summary report gets distributed, and I think also publicly posted for the broader community to see.

So I think the question is here, is that aligned with the expectations you have, to continue in the same manner, are those expectations different compared to the periodic survey and the end of life is survey? Should there be flexibility here? Just again, maybe determined based on the nature of the effort, is it something that maybe Council leadership in consultation with the liaison kind of decides before the survey is done so that at least in the communication of the survey, it's made very clear what happens with the responses and who will receive those?

I think you'll all have seen that there is language—I'll go there next—that is currently in the survey that talks about that aspect. So again, I think we're just trying to look for a bit of clarity on what the expectations are of the group so that we can also reflect that accordingly here in this documents going forward, basically.

OLGA CAVALLI: Desiree, you have your hand up.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Olga. Yes, I wanted to say a couple things, but maybe somebody else has more urgent questions than me.

OLGA CAVALLI: Let me check the chat. I don't see comments in the chat. And I don't see other hands. So the floor is yours, if you want.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you. I am looking at the text that Marika is highlighting, the raw data of the survey to be available to the Council members and the working group and leadership team. And with regards to who should be able to review the question that was on the agenda, if you click back to it, what the data should be available to the those reviewing the responses, and what is the expectation from respondents?

I believe I and a few others have spoken about the expectation from respondents' point of view. And so on that matter, I would expect that respondents who are members of the working group would get a unique URL where they can fill in their responses without providing their identity. So in other terms, it's not necessary to reveal who you are when you're sending a response, because it's a small number, it's a definite number of working group members. And the number of responses would give us an indication as to how many members have responded. And so that's the one that I was—and I believe Thomas as well spoke about this, is the expectation from the respondents.

So if that personal data is hidden, then those who are reviewing the responses, as you say, it's been very rare that you have to go back to the respondents themselves to clarify anything. But I could perceive that maybe there might be a need for it. So I'm just saying—it's not that I'm disagreeing, But I believe we need to do

everything we can to make the link as generic to the members and that they don't need to reveal their personal data. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: That's an interesting point, Desiree. Thank you very much for that. Any reactions to Desiree's comments? I think it's a good point for having anonymity in relation with comments. But I don't know if everyone's agreeing or have any comments about it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think it's a good idea in general. I'm not sure how that works technically. If you have a unique URL to answer, presumably we can track you down. We know who what link we sent to whom and etc. I don't quite know how it works. But yeah, in principle, some surveys are good. with anonymity, and some require [inaudible]. Sorry, not very helpful.

OLGA CAVALLI: No, it's very helpful comment. I agree. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. So I actually had the same point as Sebastien. I'm not knowledgeable enough about our current survey tool, whether that is something that's easy to do, or even possible. So maybe what I can suggest as kind of language we can insert is something that says, to the maximum extent possible, your personal data should not be necessary to be submitted or be available or viewable to those that are reviewing the responses. And maybe

also know that in the technical requirements, that that is something that should be explored.

So maybe that kind of finds the right balance between emphasizing that where there's no need to have access to personal data or where there's no need to have that shared, because indeed, through a unique link, you're able to confirm that it is really someone that participated in the working group that is responding to it, we're able to do that, and we don't need to ask for their name or their affiliation, or—and I'm just thinking out loud here, of course, on the other side of the coin, is that, for example, maybe asking for affiliation, even though that may allow for identification of who the person is, does also allow us to see that we get an appropriate balance of responses, or is it really, maybe one stakeholder group that's giving all the responses and they were very unhappy about the outcome, so maybe the feedback they're giving is more about the outcome of the process than the actual process itself?

Again, maybe that's something that adds value while not divulging too much personal information. But maybe it's something that we can kind of note as allowing for some flexibility on that end, but as the underlying goal of limiting as much as possible the collection and sharing of personal information. I think in any case, the language that we currently have does aim to make very clear at the outset what is expected to be collected and what is done with that information. So we'll have another look at that as well. And again, make sure that it's clear in the document that those expectations need to be shared in advance. So when a survey

goes out, it is clear upfront what is being collected and who that will be shared with so that there are no surprises.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Could we check with technical staff in ICANN if they have some information about how to send this URL or other technical tools that may allow for this anonymity that is being mentioned? Go ahead, Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, we can definitely check. I do know, for example—but that's more about the unique link. For example, when there's a vote that the Council does via the mailing list, I know that Council members got sent kind of a unique code, but I think the person receiving the votes doesn't see who do the vote is from, just can confirm that the unique link matches a Council member.

But again, that's a very specific tool that's used. I know that in that context, there is this kind of unique link, although I don't know either if there's a way to kind of, in the end, trace things back. So we can definitely ask and check. As said, there are of course other technical requirements that we've identified. So it's definitely a conversation we'll need to have. And maybe this is also—because I don't think we will likely get an instant response on this, if we're in any case having a bit of a break before we go out for public comment, it also allows for maybe investigating some of those technical requirements and already coming back to the group with basically what we found and what is possible in practice or within the tools that we currently have available.

OLGA CAVALLI: A question comes to my mind. Desiree says in the chat, "I believe that we would collect better feedback if we allow for anonymity." I agree. In my personal experience, sometimes the anonymity is okay, because people can express themselves more freely. And sometimes people want to include their name and affiliation. So just an idea that comes to my mind, if that could be optional. I don't know if that's a good idea. Maybe if someone wants to say who they are, which stakeholder group they belong to, and they want to express their ideas, would that be possible technically speaking, or we are just going for anonymity and that's it? Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: On your specific question, yes, that is definitely possible. Because we do have the ability in the survey that basically says which are required fields and which are optional fields. So that would be a very easy change to make, because we can just change that required aspect and also make very clear in as part of that question that says, if you want, you can provide your name so it allows for potential follow-up if needed, but it's also perfectly fine to not provide your personal information here. So that might be a middle ground between the two and definitely one that we can already implement with the tool we have at the moment.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Manju, your hand is up. Welcome.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Olga. I think optional is a good suggestion. But the thing is, if there are more people who are signing their names, then those who don't, then it's quite easy to identify those who don't. Right? So I don't know how practical this is going to be. I mean, the idea sounds nice. But then if the ratio of those who are willing to name themselves and those who are—then there's gonna be a problem. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI: Manju, you raised a very interesting point. It depends on the size of the group. I was referring to some surveys I have done with other projects which have lots of people, and then it's difficult to identify when you have a large number of participants. But when the group—in general working groups that I have participated in ICANN, sometimes they have a lot of people, but active people are not so many. So it's not so difficult to know who [inaudible] feedback and sent some comments or not. So yeah, your comment is relevant, and it's a good point.

Any other comments about this confidentiality issue? Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. Just one comment in response to a Manju's comment that currently, we do not publish the names of respondents. So of course, for those having access to the survey results, they might be able to kind of do the math, but it's not something that we publicly share. So maybe that is of lesser concern in that case.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Marika. Berry, your hand is up. Welcome.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Olga. Picking up on Marika's point. In this discussion of having the anonymous capabilities or requirements to submit these surveys, it is the intent that Org staff will not see who submitted the results of that survey to, or is this just about that, as Marika noted, none of the results are published with who submitted what? And I think that's very important from that toolset discussion that you just had a few minutes ago.

And I'll note that there's probably one or two options that are available now or that have been used in the most recent past to conduct this survey. But I also have an understanding that other tools are being evaluated in an effort to help consolidate the number of like tools that the Org uses. So that's subject to change. And I think it'll be important that we nail down these requirements specifically. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Berry. It's good to have that in mind. Okay, any other comments on anonymity, the tools? Manju says nowadays, we're doing representative style, the number of members are rather limited. Yeah. Thank you, Manju. And Desiree's comments are already reviewed. Any other comments about this issue? Concerns? Marika, go ahead.

EN

MARIKA KONINGS:	Thanks, Olga. Maybe a proposed next step on this because as said, we will need to have another look at the language that it's in here. So we can make some suggested updates based on the conversation, which I think are, if it is possible, or to the extent it's possible to allow for anonymous responses, which I think also aligns with the kind of optionality of that question. So we can make clear that providing a name is optional. And it would be very clearly indicated that it's not required information that's provided, in case the respondent is interested, should there be follow-up conversations or discussions to be able to be contacted. I think we already have clear language about what is being published and posted.
	So I think we'll just have a second look at that and possibly make some updates. We'll also indeed include language as part of the technical requirements. And I think I'll already start that conversation with our colleagues as part of indeed our review of survey tools, to look at what is being discussed and considered so they can also factor in what the group has discussed here. And then of course, send those updates back to the group so you can have another look and make sure that it aligns with what was discussed today and your expectations on that topic. And also, of course, allow those that were not on the call today to have a look at that and see if they're happy with those updates.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you very much, Marika, for that. It's a very good suggestion. So we would have a new version of this document with these additions and revisions of this part of the issues, and we would have time to let the group review them until next

meeting and send comments in the meantime, and we will inform that in the group list. That would be the next steps for the next meeting, 9th of February at the same time on Wednesdays. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: So I think the question is, indeed, we can definitely put the meeting on the calendar. But maybe we can give the group—I think from our perspective, we should be able to get those update changes out later this week. And we'll flag that to the group when that has been done so you can have a look at those. And we can maybe mark them in a certain way so you can find them more easily. And then maybe give a kind of cutoff date by which people—either if you have further comments or concerns about either any of the other changes or the ones we are making in relation to this topic, so we can also decide—because of course, if everyone's happy with the proposed updates, there may not be a need for a call. So maybe we can as well kind of foresee kind of a cutoff date by which you can decide whether or not a call is necessary.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. So let's see once the updates are done, and then we can check and put a date for comments and see reactions. And we can check if there is need for another meeting or not. And once we are done with this document, what would happen with meetings? We should not meet again, or what's the expectation? We're done?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, so the idea would be that once the [inaudible] is of the view that the document is in the state that everyone is kind of happy with it, it will go to the Council. And I think it would be good then to kind of have probably introduce it in one of the upcoming meetings and kind of talking to Council through what is being proposed as well as kind of the next step on holding public comment until the taskforce completes its work.

And I think at that point, unless the Council has another assignment for this group, I guess the group has at least a break until a public comment opens and comes back, in which case there might be a further need to review.

As you know, this is part of a pilot effort. We had originally identified some other work items the committee might be able to address. So maybe as part of that update to the Council, a question could be, the committee is now going to be basically on kind of a pause. If there is something that can usefully be done and of course, if there's interest from this group to kind of continue working on some of the process improvements, issues or something else that the Council would like to dedicate this group to. But I guess that's a bit of an open question at this stage.

OLGA CAVALLI: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Marika. So please take a look at the changes that will be done to the document and will be shared on the list, and send us your feedback. For those of you listening to this recorded meeting, please do so. And we are not meeting

again next week, thank you very much for your engagement and participation in this effort. And if we meet again in two weeks, that's okay. We will have again a revision of the changes or suggested comments that we will have. So, any other comments? Any other issues? Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS: One other item is of course the appointment of a liaison. So maybe we can—I'm sure Julie has already captured that as part of the action items. Maybe we can also kind of fix a date for that by which we hopefully get someone to raise their hands. I don't know if by the end of this week, if that's reasonable—because as said, ideally, we'll have someone in place before the group starts meeting. Of course, if there are multiple candidates, further conversation may be required. But I think at this stage, I'm already happy if one person raises their hand to take on that role.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Have that in mind, people. And Philippe says, "Agree, Marika, that need for an update to Council and stakeholder groups and constituencies indirectly is something important to bear in mind." Thank you, Philippe, for that. So for those of you in the call or listening to the meeting afterwards, think about liaison to the Council for this committee. And any other comments, suggestions?

Okay, thank you very much. We are 10 minutes before our expected hour Thank you very much for a very efficient meeting. Thank you for your comments and your participation. Please take

a look at the changes that will be done to the document. Think about the liaison role. And I wish you a very good rest of the weekend. We'll keep in touch through the list.

DEVAN REED: Thank you for joining. Once again, this meeting is adjourned. I will end the recording and disconnect all the remaining lines. Have a great day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]