ICANN Transcription

CCOICI

Wednesday, 20 December 2023 at 12:00 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/WYEYEQ

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, the 20th of December 2023, at 12:00 UTC.

We have no listed apologies for today's meeting. 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 or hearing none, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation 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 part in ICANN multistakeholder process

are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Manju Chen, please begin.

MANJU CHEN: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the meeting. I just messaged Desiree to remind her that we're having a meeting but she's in some kind of Internet governance role so probably she's not going to make it. That's a note for Terri, probably.

I hope we are going to have a sweet and short meeting today. That was my welcome, I guess. I hope you guys all have been doing okay since the SPS. Hopefully, after this week, you guys who do Christmas can enjoy Christmas. That's about it.

I will start with—do you think we should do an introduction first, anyone who's joining us, like new? I'm not sure. We have a new person from ICANN Org. Her name is Saewon Lee. I am sorry to put you on the spot. I am not sure if you're ready for a self-introduction. But people are agreeing with me. So please, if you could please introduce yourself. Welcome to this meeting.

SAEWON LEE: Hi. I guess if I'm introducing myself, I should put myself on camera. Hi, nice to meet you all. My name is Saewon Lee. Thank you for the introduction, Manju. I joined ICANN as of December the 1st. I'm still trying to understand the ropes of ICANN Org. But I have been added as support for Julie on the CCOICI. I'm still trying to get used to the acronyms. I don't know the full names. But I'm really pleased to be here.

My previous experience has been in the government sector, specifically in government research and international development aid. I started out in the subject matters of macroeconomic policy but then moved on to ICT and telecommunications policy development. That's my field of interest, field of specialty. I'm really excited to be working continuously in ICANN related to issues of Internet policy development.

I just saw a question, which office am I based in? Yes, I keep on missing that. Currently, I'm working remotely out of Pennsylvania, but I'm tied to the Washington, D.C. office and reporting to the L.A. office, if that answers the question for you. I look forward to working with you all.

MANJU CHEN: Cool. Thank you very much, Saewon, and welcome. I hope this meeting doesn't bore you out because, well, I'm always thinking of this meeting kind of boring. It's okay. Nobody remembers what CCOICI stands for. So you're just one of us. That's about the first item. I guess, we will move on to the second agenda item.

During the last meeting, we discussed how to respond to this WS2 CCG questions. Julie, very helpfully drafted the response for us. And I sent the response back to [inaudible] with this response and he actually replied. Of course, he's like, "Thank you very much." And they are considering how to proceed for next steps. And of course, our feedback is going to feedback into their decision of what next step they're going to do. In the meantime, the other group, the CIP thing is going to start. They have sent out Doodle polls to collect people's available times. I guess that's about this

item. We'd finished it. They could be scratched out of the action items.

Then we'll move on to the next agenda item which is the survey questions. Oh, Desiree, hello. I thought you were having headaches, but thanks for joining. This is the survey question. Huge thanks to Berry who almost did everything, for drafting this question. I see Susan has added something and spearheaded of the text. Other than that, on me, I guess. But we can go through the questions, I guess, one by one during this meeting and see if anybody has any new ideas or edits to be made.

Can we just enlarge a bit because they still look quite tiny from my screen? Okay. Thank you very much. Terri has magically developed all the questions from our previous very short and condensed and not very clearly drafted questions. For the first question set, we will be asking questions about the framework objective of the CCOICI framework, I guess. And here we have four questions. I meant to add CCOICI because I thought that was just going to be clearer for non-English speaker because to someone else, that's a bit confusing. But other than that, does anybody else has any suggestions or edits? I'm not seeing any.

BERRY COBB: Manju, I included links to the framework and the review proposal up here at the top. I think it'll be important when we do distribute this that the stakeholder groups and constituencies will encourage them to read through these documents first. Else, these questions really aren't going to make sense. So I just wanted to tease that out.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. Should we actually add a description of "Please read before you start answering the survey"? How does everybody think about this? Yes? Thank you very much, Berry. I'm not sure, Berry. Do you think it would be more appropriate for you to introduce through the questions than me? Because you were the one drafting it, you know more about the logic. What do you think?

BERRY COBB: I'm happy to. As I noted on my e-mail several weeks ago, I think that the survey looks longer than it is. But the structure of the survey, especially using the options here, builds on one of the work items that this group created, which was the Working Group Self-Assessment. I'm sorry. That was from PDP 3.0. But the Working Group Self-Assessment uses the same structure. So it's a stolen idea. The few things that I have learned about surveys is mostly in the genre of trying to make the question very precise and single barreled and not double barreled. That's what led to the quantity of questions increasing, so that we can tease apart more appropriately what we're trying to get to. Personally saying, when I was building this together, I had to refer back to the Framework document several times. In that, I think, hindsight is 2020, but we probably could have made the original Framework document a little bit more crisp especially in the objective area. I think for the most part of this question, Set 1 is fit for purpose to tease in on that introductory part of the Framework document.

The final thing I'll say here is, again, these first three questions and the Question 4 is the attempt to get a quantitative type of aspect about the question set. We can put percentages or some numbers around the responses that we're getting versus the qualitative component which will allow for more freeform type of responses. If no questions on Set 1, I'll move on to Set 2.

This set is about the scope of the framework, again, trying to take a direct quote from the Framework document itself as just a quick reference. In particular, we're looking at what the CCOCI's assignments were specifically. There were basically three overall assignments that this group was tasked with, but the CCOICI only work two of them while we actually use the Task Force feature for the third one. So we're talking about the scope of assignments, that they were clear, that they were appropriate and then again, qualitative freeform text. As I noted on the previous call when I volunteered for this, I am not a survey designer, so I take no pride of ownership on the framing of these questions.

MANJU CHEN: My question will be we tease out, we want to make sure that there's no compound question work there, unclear or inappropriate. And here, we're asking of the scope of those assignments altogether. So my question to the group actually is do we separate each assignment and ask particularly, is the scope of assignment WS2 recommendations were clear? Then is the self-assessment clear? Should we do that? Or it's okay for this one to be we just ask for all assignments together?

EN

BERRY COBB:	To keep the quantity of questions low, we could expand on the qualitative aspect and ask people to opine specifically on each of these items that were worked.
MANJU CHEN:	Susan, please.
SUSAN PAYNE:	I think it would be helpful—I mean, it might be that everyone thinks the answer is the same for all of them, but we won't know that. It makes it hard for people if they agree strongly on two and they strongly disagree on one, what do they answer? But perhaps could we do it as Question 5 is as it is, but then give them three answers so they can answer for each of the individual efforts so it doesn't seem like it's expanding the question set too much.
MANJU CHEN:	So Question 5 and then bullet points WS2 self-assessment and then SOI?
SUSAN PAYNE:	Yes.
MANJU CHEN:	Sounds good to me. I see Jennifer's agreeing with Susan. Thank you, Berry, for doing this on the spot.

EN

BERRY COBB: I won't do this on the fly, but I'll—

MANJU CHEN: Adding notes. Thank you very much.

BERRY COBB: It'll be kind of 5A, B, and C, and then there'll be three quick responses to each of these. Now, I'm not opposed to this but I think the reason—the original framing of this is I don't think we risk getting into the emotional nature of the topics and not the framework itself. I think one of the concerns here is obviously this was one of the—from a staff perspective, we see that the process itself worked versus the topic itself, which ultimately did not result in changes being made. I think that's the only risk about trying to break them out by topic.

MANJU CHEN: I think they are reasonable concerns. But as we have specific questions later for the SOI one, I guess when we are reviewing the answers for the survey, we will take that into consideration, too. We will put a caveat when we're reviewing answers with this part, one that's related to the SOI. That's my expectation. I don't know. Do people think it's going to be a problem? I'm not seeing any objections. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Not an objection. I just think I understand that concern that you've expressed, Berry, and I can see that it's a risk. But I think that that

EN

risk happens regardless. And I think if people feel like the SOI process was flawed in some way and it feeds into their response to this, then it's going to impact on their overall response. So if they felt like that one was the wrong thing to have done through this process, then they're going to end up putting something like disagree as their answer even though they agree for two of the efforts. It was the right process. So I feel like we might end up with more useful information if we didn't get an answer in relation to each of them individually.

BERRY COBB: Copy that. I'll make that change.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Thank you, Susan, and thank you, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Question Set 3 is the framework use of the CCOICI. This is a little red lining here. Unfortunately, the one cool feature of Google that does not exist is the ability to look at a clean copy without the redlines. In general, here, we're again also reviewing the three topics. Now, I'll note, I think the original intent, and again, I'm flexible here, the only reason that the first two topics were mentioned here is, again, because the CCOICI as a group worked these topics, whereas the Task Force worked the third one. Which I believe goes into question Set 4 about the Task Forces, which was the only one that was done. I'm not sure if it'll be confusing to include this third aspect here.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. The reaction that I had when I was looking at this—and apologies, I only did so this morning so I haven't got any much time to read it—was that although we did delegate the SOI effort to a Task Force, once the Task Force came up with their report, we did end up working on that quite a bit more in the CCOICI as well. Now, I'm not absolutely wedded to the idea of asking questions about the SOI in relation to the CCOICI, but that was why I thought maybe we should also do so. But it did strike me then that maybe they've made sense if we do do that and we include the SOI in this question set through that. Maybe we ought to switch questions Set 3 and question Set 4 around. To the extent that we're asking about the SOI, we ask them first about, "How did it go in the Task Force?" and then we go "What about the subsequent work that we did in the CCOCI itself?" That way, people know that they're only answering about the Task Force, first of all, and then they're thinking about the subsequent work that we did this committee. But if people feel that we shouldn't cover the SOI when we're asking about this committee part, I'm not totally wedded to that. Does that make sense?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. Yes, I think it makes sense to move the Task Force questions before this one. I may add that when I was reading those, I guess I couldn't understand the statement. That's

why I made edits so they get understandable to me, myself. I'm not sure if it's better for everyone. Because I was confused, I guess when I thought that the CCOICI worked on two topics. Well, in essence, we worked on three topics. But I agree that we can further this far, also just ask for the two assignments which the CCOICI directly worked on. That's why I guess I didn't change the later paragraph. Let me see. But considering we did actually work on the SOI thing once we received a recommendation report from the Task Force—I'm not sure. I mean, I'm like you, I guess. I'm okay with only asking for the two texts, but I'm also okay with asking three texts altogether in general. But what are others' thoughts? Do you guys, anyone, has any other ideas? Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. I guess I have the advantage of looking at this with fresh eyes because this is the first time I'm really looking at this in detail. For me, the way it's phrased, I think it's quite clear to me, especially the second paragraph. It splits out, the first two being the direct tasks that the CCOICI had handled. And it explains a little more about the third. So I think the way it's written right now is still okay. If we were to move question Set 4 before this set, I think we would require a little bit more intro. Because we're talking about one of them and then we talk about three. I have no text recommendations right now but I think it's quite okay the way it's written.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jennifer, for that. I guess one of the questions now we are having also is I saw in the document, I was only asking originally for the first two texts. But then we changed it into three texts. Do we think it's more appropriate to separately ask for SOI? And then like, both WS2 recommendations and self-assessment or should we include SOI and these two to make it three texts? I guess for including SOI here, we will have the concern surface again, like Berry mentioned, where people don't like the SOI, they just say no for everything. So if we keep it as two texts, probably we'll get a more, I don't know, neutral or not emotionally and bated answers. I see your hand, Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. A suggestion is if we don't want people to answer about the third topic, then we explicitly in the first paragraph say, "You'll get a chance to respond to this third topic in question Set 4." I think that'll be okay, if we want them to not answer it. We can still include it in the first paragraph and then just direct them to question Set 4 for more detailed question on the SOI topic.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jennifer. I think that's a good idea. So we don't change the order of the questions sets and we ask only for the two first texts here. So I guess we will disregard a part of Susan's edits and change it back to the first two texts. Thank you, Berry. Other than that, do people have any other edits or suggestions? Susan, please.

EN

SUSAN PAYNE:	Sorry. The other one was... And I've included it in a comment. But it's relates to this text that says, "Setting aside the outcomes of these efforts or the outcome of these efforts." Again, I think these feeds more into the SOI effort. But I feel like you can't completely set aside the outcome. Because whether you view things like the structure and the methodology used as having been fit for purpose is informed by what the final outcome was. But I appreciate what we're trying to say is this isn't about whether you agreed with the final decision. I thought maybe could we say something slightly different? Just says something like setting aside whether you personally agree with the final decision. You can still take into account that if you think that there were flaws, which were the reason why we came to the outcome we did, then you can still comment on them, it's not about that. It's about just because you don't like that the final decision was to do X. That's not what we're looking at. We're looking at, "Do you think the way this was set up meant it had an unsatisfactory outcome?"

MANJU CHEN:	Thank you, Susan. I guess I agree with probably, the wording of "setting aside outcome" is too exclusive. But also, I don't know, I feel like if we said something like setting aside whether you personally agree. I don't know. For me, it sounds quite aggressive. It's like, "Well, we don't care if you like it or not." Probably, we need to brainstorm to find a way to say what we want to say better, I guess. I'll invite people to provide suggestions. I was actually okay with just delete the "setting aside the outcome." Can we just ask, "Please response to the following questions"? Because, I guess, especially for this set, I don't see how the

EN

outcome actually really affects people's perception of the structure or the work. But I'm open to any other suggestions. Desiree, please?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Thank you, Manju. I'm just trying to really hear what Susan's saying here. I think we need to unwed the particular outcome of the two things we'd like to give or mention as an example of the work of the CCOIC. Maybe the words "setting aside the outcome" are not the perfect ones. But I think what's more pertinent is whether people would use the CCOIC again and the Task Force again to solve such issues. SOI itself wouldn't have a second bite at the same process. I think there's something here that's missing that still needs a little bit of work out if we're going to quote it as an example so it doesn't overshadow the thinking. Or maybe people may think it's a useless tool, we need something else because SOI is a case that was not being able to be resolved through the CCOIC and it needs something else. So I'm still eager to see something here that does not overshadow the whole work of the CCOIC just by quoting SOI. Thanks. I don't have a particular text to suggest right now, but maybe I can have a look at later. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Desiree. I guess we agree that for this question sets, we are only asking the people who answered this survey to consider the WS2 recommendations and the working group self-assessment. That's why, I guess, for this question set, I think it

would be okay to just leave the "setting aside the outcome" and probably—I'm not sure what Berry is saying.

BERRY COBB: I can verbalize it. I remember this is, I can't believe, already a couple of years ago. But when the Council was making a decision about how to stand up a new effort around improvements, there were concerns and risk about the Council having oversight of any kind of continuous improvement versus it being a mechanism that was more broad and managed by the full GNSO. That's really what we're trying to drive home here. Personally speaking, I'm almost less concerned about the topics themselves versus the actual framework and moving forward. Because if the responses that this group receives from the stakeholder groups and constituencies, if they have concern about the structure of how this operates for the work that's coming down the pipe in six months to a year or even some of the remaining work, if there's not going to be agreement about this structure, then we're definitely going to have to scramble to figure out what the new structure is going to be. That's the key takeaway and reason for this survey and what this group is trying to accomplish. Because it really does point back to the pre-formation days where there were concerns about whether this would work at all.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. I guess we will try to reword this to deliver what we were trying to say. I saw Jen suggested in chat that we can reword it as "consider this" and "do not consider this." I guess, after the meeting, we all try to propose edits to make it sound like

EN

what we're trying to say. For this part, I guess two things. One, we agree that these question sets only ask people's take on the first two texts. And then the second is we have to make a collected effort to reword the last sentence to make sure we ask people how they think about this process, whether they enjoy or like the results of this process or not. That's the two main things about this question set. If I missed anything, please remind me. But if not, I guess we can move to the next question set. I'll let Berry explain the questions.

BERRY COBB: Thank you. This is more of the same but just specifically focusing in on the Task Force itself. But I believe that the questions themselves are pretty much the same, just teasing out the fact that it's the CCOICI that has the oversight of the Task Force by extension through the Council, whereas the CCOICI is being oversighted by the Council directly. I think of it as a parent-child relationship, basically. The parent of parents is the GNSO Council, the child is the CCOICI, and then there's a second child under the CCOICI, which is the Task Forces. Again, I think that this is what's going to be important to know whether this part is especially fit for purpose. I think it's almost guaranteed that when we look forward to 12 months to 18 months from now, and that some cohesive continuous improvement framework that is being constructed by a group that will be starting in January, the Continuous Improvement group from the Reviews Team, their assignment is to try to develop a common framework for how to measure continuous improvement across all of the groups while still maintaining flexibility within each SO and AC to do their own continuous

EN

improvement. And when we think about this from the GNSO perspective, we're going to be working on implementing what this larger group is doing, as well as trying to implement additional items of improvement that the GNSO determines that it needs to do such as there's going to be a variety of topics. And not one group may have all of the expertise or volunteers to tackle that one particular topic. The idea here is, is the GNSO confident enough that there can be two or three Task Forces operating at the same time under the oversight of the CCOICI that is still then reporting back up to the Council and being able to provide and distribute status of the work?

I'll conclude with we've been to this rodeo before coming out of the 2009 implementation of the reviews. There was a Standing Committee on Improvements, a great acronym, by the way, SCI. Nice, simple, and clean. And that Standing Committee was just a single entity. I don't believe it was direct oversight from the Council, but it was a mechanism that was the GNSO. That's the compare and contrast that we're trying to tease out of this. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. And Jennifer, to your question, it is listed in the CCOICI Framework document, which Berry has put the link up top of this survey. Are we opening it? Okay. Thank you, Berry, for providing it in the chat.

So I guess for the sets of questions, we also have to work on the "setting aside the outcome" part of the language. And hopefully, whatever we work out for the Set 3, we will have to just copy paste

it to this to here. Other than that, does anybody else have any other questions? If not, we can move to the next set. Here, I'll also give Berry the floor to explain.

BERRY COBB: This one, I think, to me is probably the most important part because this is the forward-looking aspect of it. There are several edits here from Manju as well as Susan. But I think it really just goes to my verbal interventions just from a bit of a go. I don't think that there's any reason to walk through or read through this in detail. But it does get to the heart of the matter, which is about the consultation with the Council on the remaining assignments. I don't have the full list available to me. But when the CCOICI was originally formed, I believe there were probably eight or so topics that were potential work and that list of overall work was derived with the idea that this wouldn't be a pilot, that we would really just form this group and get all of this work done.

Repeating what I mentioned earlier, because there were concerns about how the structure of this group would be built or constructed, that's why it became a pilot. Therefore, the scope of work of those seven or eight items was reduced down to three or four, and there's still three or four items that are possible to be done. That's the intent here with Q16, is assuming—I guess if this framework is fit for purpose, should this group tackle those remaining items? I believe what I will do—in fact, I'll just add a comment, is there's no context to what those possible remaining items are. So I'll create a short list to either embed into the survey or link to a document outlining what those items are.

Then Question 17, this is looking at the overall structure, that parent-child relationship that I just mentioned. In particular, is this structure going to be fit for purpose as compared to previous organizational reviews that the GNSO is used to from prior years? Are there any improvements that can be considered? I think that one's fairly straightforward. My personal favorite, even Google doesn't like our acronym, so hopefully we get a 100% response rate. No thumb on the scale pressing here. Then finally, if it doesn't continue in its current form, what are we going to do? Because regardless, this work is coming our way.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Thank you, Berry. Actually, I have a question about the Question 16. When I read the question, I was like, "How can people disagree?" Because the CCOICI would have to cancel, but the Council… There's no other way around this. So I wasn't sure of the intent of this question, I guess. But maybe it's just me. I don't know. Because I was like, of course, what are you planning to do? What are you going to do? I don't know. I'll hear from anybody else about this question.

I'll probably try to explain more why I feel confused. Because I guess, like this question then will be like, okay, the CCOICI with the Council. So the responsibility actually lies on Council rather than the CCOICI. I don't know. That's the only next step the CCOICI can take regarding its work. So I'm not sure what this question if for. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:	I put it in the chat. But I kind of assumed that this question was saying is really going to, should the CCOICI keep going? Is the CCOICI—and I guess the Task Force structure—the way forward? I only really thought that when you were asking your question. And that's why I'd actually taken the Task Force reference out in that Question 16. Because like you, I was thinking, well, of course the CCOICI has to consult with Council. But maybe that isn't really what the question is. Is the question really do you agree that using the CCOICI Task Force structure in consultation with Council is the way forward? Is that the question really, Berry?
BERRY COBB:	Again, I'm not a survey designer, but I think generally speaking, yes. Maybe the other set of instructions that we provide when we deliver the survey is that they should read all the questions first before responding to any one of them. But as I noted earlier, the real takeaway here is do you like the structure or not? And by the way, we still have remaining work to do. If this isn't fit for purpose, how are we going to get it done? And exactly how we word that I think is probably in better hands with this group than me.
BERRY COBB:	Thank you, Berry. So I guess for Question 16, we're actually asking, do you think CCOICI should continue to work on assignments after consulting with the Council? Is my understanding correct? Because Question 17 is for probably the implementation of the ATRT3. Okay. I guess we will try to reword Question 16. Perhaps there should be a freeform text there and revision.

Yeah, Susan, I like your suggestion. We can probably just try to edit and then try to wordsmith a bit more later when we are all reviewing this document again later after this meeting.

I'd like to go back to, actually, Question 10. I remember I made a comment and we kind of skipped it after Berry typed this. So for Question 10, there's actually that's the problem we had when we were considering the SOI recommendation report, there is actually no decision-making methodologies specific written down or prescribed in the CCOICI Framework document. That's why we were actually having problems, like how do we deal with this when we're disagreeing? So I guess I had a question of should we keep these questions? Or shall we just delete this one? Or should we ask what do you think is a better decision-making methodology for the CCOICI? Those kinds of questions. That's my comment. I'm opening the floor to anyone who wants to voice their opinion.

BERRY COBB: I think the original kind of drafter of the four rough questions that we had to outline this assignment, I believe that was mostly influenced by Marika. I might be mistaken, but I seem to recall, though, that the CCOICI and/or the Task Forces were pretty much operating under… When the framework was being put together, I don't think that it made sense at the time that it follows the same consensus level structures that are policy development working groups do, that the idea here is that anything coming out of its Task Forces or the CCOICI itself would be pretty much full consensus, and any objections against that of what was ever packaged up to the Council would be noted. But I do agree that if this model is to continue forward, it's very likely that this group is

going to be dealing with much more contentious types of issues. And therefore, I could even see that coming out of this pilot, assuming that this parent-child structure is workable, where a more formal charter will need to be defined and not necessarily just the kind of framework document for the purpose of this pilot.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Berry. So I guess this question, actually, so it will be methodologies in practice and not as described in the Framework document. Because I guess that was the problem. Like I said, when we were deciding how to deal with the recommendation report from the Task Force, we couldn't decide how to make the decision because unlike the Task Force which has the decision-making methodologies prescribed in the document, the CCOICI part was actually missing these methodologies. I guess I don't know. Do people agree to keep this? Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, I think this is a really interesting point, Manju. I think we do need to ask something about this. It's a bit sort of leading, but maybe we need to ask something that kind of acknowledges that at the moment the CCOICI doesn't have a sort of decision-making methodology set out and get some input on whether there should be one. I think everyone would probably say there should, wouldn't they?

MANJU CHEN: So I guess… I'm sorry, someone else is speaking?

SUSAN PAYNE: No, it's just me. I was on mute, I'm not sure.

MANJU CHEN: Sure. I guess while we're discussing, I kind of think of some ways of rewording this, probably split it into two questions. Then I'll try to do that I guess after the meeting, because being aware of time, I thought this was going to be short. Sorry, guys. Only three minutes left for this meeting. But I guess we still successfully went through the whole document and agreed where to work on in the future two weeks, if you're not doing Christmas. If you are, do it after Christmas, I guess.

Berry, do you have any other thing you wanted to specifically note about this? Then we can decide to work on this.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Manju. Apologies if this kind of sounds like an executive decision, but I encourage this group to try to complete your input by today or tomorrow before everybody goes or lines down for the holiday season. I'm going to take whatever questions that are in this document probably starting early next week and migrate them into Survey Monkey. That doesn't make that final. We can make edits over in Survey Monkey, but that's the only time I'm going to have to get it out of this form and into the delivery mechanism by which we're going to conduct this survey. So I do encourage final decisions and text to be made here. There are a couple of open actions that I'll be working on as well today.

	But I'm going to start accepting some of these changes so that it's a little bit easier to read and we get to this next version.
MANJU CHEN:	Okay. So, guys, you heard Berry. We have to finish this by tomorrow your time, because I guess for Berry it's going to be the latest, I guess, because the Americans, they always arrive to the time the latest. So wherever you are, by the end of tomorrow, hopefully you have already put your input and make your edits as you see fit. I see Terri very helpfully… I see survey going to group participants. I think both to the group participants and the SGC leadership, I think we agreed to this in the last meeting.

The next meeting will be the 10th of January, the same time, same day, Wednesday, 12:00 UTC. If nobody disagrees with this designated time, hopefully we will meet next year.

I wish you all happy holiday. Enjoy the food, the atmosphere, your family. If you don't enjoy family, just for you. But it's family, right? Thank you very much all for our meeting. Thank you for staying with us. If there's no any other business, we can conclude the meeting. Thank you all very much. Bye.

SUSAN PAYNE:	Thanks, Manju.
BERRY COBB:	Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]