

---

## ICANN Transcription

### Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement

**Thursday, 25 May 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/34OCDg>

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, and welcome to the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement Call taking place on Thursday, the 25th of May 2023 at 12 UTC. We do have listed apologies from Desiree Miloshevic and Susan Payne. Statements of interest be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, 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, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process to comply the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

---

*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.*

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Terri. Welcome, everyone. We see we're still a few people short now. Not much anymore. Welcome, everyone. I guess, well, just some update from my side. Totally irrelevant to CCOICI, but yesterday and the day before yesterday, we had ICANN APAC engagement forum in Taiwan, which was a great success. So just sharing this engagement effort of ICANN, applaud to ICANN to try to engage everywhere. But, yeah, let's get back to CCOICI business.

I don't know if that we all bring back the middle ground Thomas, proposed last meeting to your group and consolidate an input. If you don't remember, we discussed that. For those who want to invoke the exemption language, they might not be allowed to participate in the consensus call. I don't know if anyone—Well, yeah, sorry. I just moved to agenda 2B. Sorry. Because I thought I'd jump into that but we could probably go back to 2A and see, does anyone has any comments or question about current requirement and existing safeguards as we shared during the last meeting? Terri, please.

TERRI AGNEW: It was not on that, but I did just allow in the Zoom room a telephone number. If you could just please identify yourself who just joined via the telephone ending in 175. Please?

MARIE PATTULLO: Terri, this is Marie. I'm guessing that's Susan because it starts with the UK number? I can't promise but it's UK number.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes, it's me.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. All right. Oh, welcome, Susan. Thank you. We confirmed you're connected. Thank you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Would you mind just telling me how I mute again? Because I didn't get any of those instructions, so I was just guessing.

TERRI AGNEW: How to join the Zoom meeting?

SUSAN PAYNE: No, no. How to mute.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, you were muted automatically.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Okay. Don't worry. I'll look it up.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. No, I'll mute on your side as well. So, on your telephone, you can just mute on your telephone side as well. Thank you, everyone. Back to you, Manju.

---

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Terri. What if Susan wants to raise her hand? How do we--? She just says, "I want to raise my hand?"

TERRI AGNEW: Yes. Correct. She'll just verbally--

MANJU CHEN: Okay.

TERRI AGNEW: Yeah. You got it.

MANJU CHEN: So, Susan, if you want to raise your hand, you just say it out loud that "I have my hand raised". Okay?

SUSAN PAYNE: No problem. I'll just interrupt really rudely. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, Payne. Thank you, Marie, please.

MARIE PATTULLO: How lovely it's Susan interrupting. Thank you, Manju, and thank you, again, for all the work that went into this. I, as requested to this back to the BC, had a conversation with a few people. My

---

---

take on what my colleagues have told me is that we all think-- well, firstly, we all think it's we were discussing last week that this is a problem that doesn't actually exist in particular based on the statistics that Staff shared with us. So, we seem to be going down a rabbit hole and spending a lot of time to discuss something that's a theoretical possible maybe.

That said, for somebody just say "I can't disclose and here's the reason why", ethical consideration or professional, I think that's fine. I can't imagine anyone having a problem with that. I understand where Thomas is coming from, I really do and I appreciate the middle ground, but the concern we have there was again going back to the balance that bearing in mind we know that this is going to affect such a tiny minute proportion based on the stats we've got. Is it going to have some kind of practical counteraction? What I mean by that is working group chair has decided to exclude me from a consensus process and I am now going to sort and complain to the ombudsman. I'm being deliberately-- I can't think of the word but excessive here. So please don't think this is what I'm saying is going to happen, but we all know how ICANN can get when one personality comes up against another personality.

So, to go back to the what are we trying to solve? We're trying to solve a problem that we think might happen, but we haven't actually seen it happen yet. And we're asking people to say "yes, I am here on behalf of someone else", which is already a big jump and a lot more transparent than we are at the minute. So, I think we're already closing that gap even further. I hope that makes sense, Manju, and thank you again for all the work. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Marie. I'm just stopping here to see anyone has a quick reaction to this. Well, first of all, I think, yes, these are valid concerns. I understand the fear or the unwillingness to be excluded from a consensus call, but I don't know. I think I can-- Oh, sorry, Marika. Well, just let me finish my very short sentence. I think we have stressed this many times before because under the GNSO/PDP 3.0, most PDP working groups are operating in a representation model, which means that you only represent your stakeholder group or constituencies.

And for those who are operating on the representation and open model, which means you can participate as a participant. Well, in this particular group that's operating in this model right now, they already don't allow the participants participate in the consensus call. So, well, in a sense, the others I can argue also that you have fear of being excluded from the consensus call is fearing a problem that's not going to happen, but yeah, I'll stop here, and it's Marika and then Thomas. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. Thanks, Manju. And I think you made a really good point from the perspective of that indeed. I think what we've seen most recently is that most groups are representative and indeed do already specify who can participate in a consensus call. Of course, that doesn't include possibility of having participants participate or not having a representative model. But potentially one way around this could be-- And again, jumps a little bit maybe

---

---

already to the next conversation of how would this look like in practice.

One potential approach if Google does believe there could be value in exploring that option, which I said is already available to the council would be to just incorporate in the report or explain in the report that the council already has the ability as part of its chartering to specify who can be part of a consensus call, so that if the council believes either based on membership applications or the topic that is subject of the PDP that there is potentially a high risk that-- Because again, I think what we're trying to cater here for is some kind of stacking the deck, someone hiring a bunch of people that then don't disclose and they're all working for the same entity who then could potentially sway the outcome of consensus designation.

So again, if such a circumstance would happen, the council does have the ability through chartering to make that clear. So that to a certain degree would maybe move this conversation to the chartering conversation, because it means that you don't need to do that as part of the SOI itself, but you still spell out very clearly how the council has the ability to take certain additional measures above the ones we've already spelled out in the last meeting if it really believes that there are certain issues. And obviously, this could be something that council could do at the outset as it develops its charter, but the council also of course, has mechanisms throughout the process.

And I think as we already pointed out during the last meeting, it's also the role of the chair of a working group to make an assessment on whether there's over or underrepresentation. So

---

---

again, if a chair would have a sense that there is overrepresentation because there's a large segment that has not declared who is representing them, and they have indicated that someone is definitely asking them to represent them there, the chair can go back to the council. And at that point the council can still intervene and basically say, okay, in that case, if you're not able to disclose who you're representing, we're going to put some additional measures in place, which could include at that point indicating that those participants wouldn't be part of a consensus call.

And again, I think that's probably in very extreme cases, because based on what we've seen so far, and we don't seem to have a large group of working group participants invoking that exemption. And with the tightened language, as Marie noted, I'm even curious if those have previously invoked it would do it now as well, but at additional clarification or explanation of what it means to be a representative. So, again, that might be a possible path forward. And maybe in addition to that, you can also build in a review. So basically, we took, for example, the numbers from, I think, RPMs and SubPro. Maybe in a couple of years, you want to check back on the efforts that have taken place during that period and see how often was the exemption invoked. Do we believe that there's an issue or the issue is increasing, and we need to have another look at this?

So, again, I think there's various ways in which further safeguards could be built in or considered that hopefully will reassure those that believe this is a problem or a problem that needs to be avoided without indeed building in something that now would

---

potentially exclude people from participation or excluded from the conversations.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Marika. So, I guess to summarize. For existing safeguards, we also already have the working group or the council, we have the right to charter working group, and we can already put in the safeguards we want. And secondly, well, if we don't think that's enough, there's still a review mechanism we can use to just check every now and then see if people have been invoking this essential language correctly and if we think this exemption language is working and people, please think of it. Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks everybody. Hi, everybody, and thanks, Manju. All good points. I think that to Marie's comment, we are just preparing something for council and I think that we won't get away with just declaring that you are working or representing an unknown entity and then still have full participation and consensus call rights. Having heard the discussions of the council, that's probably not sustainable.

I think, Marika, you're making a good point with the charter versus SOI. I understand. And I don't know how this is going to be implemented exactly, but I understand that with ICANN join the SOI and the various groups that you're participating in is going to be more intertwined because I think that your interest can be different depending on what groups you're in. So, it may well be

---

that you will represent a company in one group and it's a different company in another one. So maybe in fact, SOI is not the ideal place to locate this, but I think we would then need to discuss a little bit more where the information can be disclosed.

But I think that the most important point probably is that as low as the chances of this causing problems might be, we should remove ambiguity and also, I think we should try to remove discretion or the burden of discretion for the chair because then the chair might be or the chair's decisions might be challenged. So, I think that it's important to point out that, yes, we have the option to not allow people to the consensus call in other areas that we want or that we recommend such provisions to be included in the charter, and that if someone is not able to disclose, they can't participate in the consensus call.

That this needs to be specified in the in the charter because then there's transparency for the participants from the get go so there shouldn't be any surprises towards the end of the process and also, the chair has something to lean on and by that, we can reduce the risk of actually getting the ombudsman involved, for example, or the consensus call decisions being challenged. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Thomas. I agree that we don't want to add more burden to the chair because you see me, I'm chairing this tiny small group and already crashing. But, yeah, definitely. And also, I wanted a quick reaction to your comment about how-- You're saying, people might be representing different companies in

---

different work group because of all the merging and joint company kind of style, but I guess that's why we are now proposing two SOIs. One is the general one, which you just identify anything, you identify with and then this exemption language, which I think specifically we're talking about is in this activity-specific SOI, which is when we're doing a working group or any kind of policy process, we have this specific SOI for those who are signing up for this policy making process.

So, it's going to be two sets of SOI. One is the one, I guess, you can apply for any job and the specific one is when you apply for, well, a specific job. So, yeah, that's a small clarification. And anybody else have any other--? Oh, Marika, your hand is up.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. You made exactly the point I was going to make. So, thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Yeah, thank you. So, any other reaction from other people, the contracted parties? Do you have any reaction? Did you consult your group? Susan, did you forget to say you have to raise your hand?

SUSAN PAYNE: No.

MANJU CHEN: Sorry, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Is it okay for me? Yeah, I'll quickly comment. So, I did consult my group. I confessed I didn't get a huge amount of reaction. I do think this the fact that it's been the INPA annual meeting has been a bit of a challenge to getting engagement on things just because everyone has well, not everyone, but many of the IPCs members have been away at that annual meeting for which I think has taken up a bit more than a fair amount of time over the last couple of weeks.

One we actually did get was more or less along the lines of, well, wouldn't be very comfortable with that kind of chair discretion unless there's some very clear criteria for when there should be exclusion and when the chair should actually exclude and when they shouldn't and what the criteria are. I mean, I think that was the main reaction, and I think that's sort of the subsequent agenda item in a way, isn't it, about if we were to do this, what are the terms? In thinking about it myself, it seemed to me that my assumption has been, for example, that if there was an exclusion because the SOI didn't identify who someone was working for, it would be that kind of exclusion would happen across the board. It wouldn't be like a particular participant would be excluded from the consensus call. It would be all participants who haven't disclosed would be excluded.

I think that's a given, but there seem to be some question about that from the feedback that I saw. So, I guess that would be one thing that we'd want to make really clear assuming that that's a shared understanding. I think it's helpful in a way to have to maybe have this thought about the chartering, but I do also think

---

---

it's probably quite challenging at chartering when you don't actually know who the participants are. Until the group is underway, you don't necessarily know that half of the working group has limited information in their SOI. But I guess that as Marika was saying, that's when it would be that would be where the chair responses. He would kick in and coming back to council and saying, I could use some guidance from you here. I'm sorry. I don't have more fulsome feedback from my IPC colleague, but hopefully, that's some help.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Susan. Yes, I guess I understand. I know a lot of people are attending that meeting in Singapore and I also think it's reasonable that you raised questions about how people feel excluded. That's why at the first place, we couldn't even agree exemption language, right, because people are like, well, if you don't fill in, then you don't get to participate. But I guess like Marika has proposed, other than SOI, we still have the tool as council to have the charter. We have the chartering responsibility and I feel like maybe I'm just thinking it's too easy, but I feel like the worry about not enough clarity, not enough predictability can definitely be solved, well, at least 90% by having a very good charter. And that would be the job of the council, which is us. And I think I'll trust us to do the best we can to have a clear charter and so we don't invite any confusion when we are opening a working group to people who want to participate.

And I think we also stressed this in the last meeting, that the whole SOI, it's really, it's honor system in a way that we don't really have any enforcement in a sense to punish people when

---

they don't be honest in their SOI. And we don't check regularly with people. We just ask people to update, actually, and then when we're meeting, "Do you have an update on your SOI?" So, it's really an honorary system, and I think to work together, we at least have this degree of trust with each other. Maybe I'm too naive, but yeah, I guess that's kind of a full discussion of the Item 2.8. Do we have any other reaction to 2.8, as in any further questions, comments about current requirement and existing safeguards? Not seeing hands. I see Sebastien say it's good.

So, I guess we can move to agenda item 2B, which is discuss alternative proposal. I think we were doing it also already, but wow, this would even-- it's small, even for me. So, the other proposal is working group members who choose the exemption might not be eligible to participate in consensus process. Is this still possible? Path forward. Yeah, I think we discussed this. I think gathering the reactions from people, people were not super steadily, strongly against this. So, I guess this is probably a possible path forward. If I misunderstood, anyone, please raise your hand now to tell me I'm wrong.

No? So, I guess we can go to the if yes. If yes, what would this look like in practice? For example, this is something that would be captioned the SOI in the charter operating procedures and I guess we discussed that too. I'm still not seeing any hints or any comments. Marika, please.

MARIKA KONINGS:

I'll give this a try or at least maybe make some suggestions on the potential past that the group could consider with regards to the

---

report that would go to council. So, I'm guessing, first of all, that we would probably need to document this conversation and probably also bring in some of the data that we've shared, maybe also making clear that the exemption already exists. Because I do have the impression from, I think, some of the conversations that took place at the last ICANN meeting, that some seem to think that this is something new that's being suddenly introduced, and while it is already there, that is actually a practice used on rare occasions

And I think the point you made as well, at the end of the day, whatever we come out at, this is an honorary system. It's really dependent on people sharing this information and self-policing. So, whether there's an exemption or not, if someone on it is not sharing true information, there's nothing that an SOI would do about it. But then, of course, are various ways in which this alternative proposal could be further worked out. And one thing could be to add, for example, a footnote to the exemption that would say something like council may decide as part of its charter or part of its instructions that those invoking an exemption and not declaring on whose behalf they're participating because they're not able to disclose that for professional and ethical obligations, which someone is also expected to document, which again is an enhancement from the previous exemption. And so that as a part of the footnotes have these spelled out, and that is an option.

And again, I think if that would be the case, unless the group wants to make it a blanket exclusion so if you say if you don't declare here, you're automatically excluded, which I don't think I'm hearing at least from the feedback so far. So maybe it could

---

include a footnote that explains that this is an option that the council has available. And then maybe in the report further on, we spell out as well that as part of council's chartering of a group, it may want to look at that.

And again, it's something that we may also want to call out that in the charter template, that there are certain instructions in the charter template when it comes to membership, consensus, designations. So, there we can definitely include as well some language that says here the council has the ability to consider if it wants to take specific measures in the case of those that may invoke an exemption under the SOI. And then, of course, I think we will spell out as well some of the other measures that exist because, as Susan also noted, at the start of a working group when you charter, you may not know what the situation is afterwards, but again, the council does have the ability to review and take measures if they really believe there is an issue that's hampering a working group progress.

So, those might be some of the ways of doing this. Again, it could also be something maybe something worth to further look at. There's, of course, also language that would go into the operating procedures. That may also be another place where something like this could be called out. But again, I think it depends a little bit on how firm the group wants to be on this or more, put it on council to say you always have the ability if there are concerns to take additional measures, to have additional requirements in place, also to ask additional information from participants.

I think I mentioned this on the last call as well. You may recall, for example, the option proceeds cross-community working group,

---

their participants were asked to provide a declaration of intent. So, they were asked to state, are you planning to apply for option proceeds? Again, honorary system, so you had to rely on people sharing what they knew at that stage, and there were no, I think, consequences attached to that. It was again, just knowing that as background. So, council always has the ability to ask for more or put in certain declarations or commitments that it may want a working group member to comply with in place, in addition to the SOI.

So, that might be an essential approach and I think this is maybe also where everyone may want to see what this could look like before being able to really give a thumbs up or a thumbs down. And as I mentioned as well, the group may also want to consider whether a review period is built in because, obviously, in addition to this part, we are trying something new here that maybe other feedback that comes back that may require adjustments or rethink of the approach. So, it might be a good thing in any case to build in some kind of after ex-new SOIs have been used ex-activity, specific SOIs have been created, maybe have another look or ask those that have used the new SOI for their feedback.

So those are some ideas on how this could potentially look like in the form of a report. Obviously, if people have other ideas in mind or think there are other ways in which this could or should be done, of course, I'm more than happy to hear and discuss that. And from the Staff side, I think we're happy to see if we can create a draft based on today's conversation that at least everyone can have a look at and mull over and check as well with groups,

---

whether that would be something everyone would be able to live with.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Marika. Do we have any initial reaction? So, I guess, the three main options we have so far, the first is, of course, to add this language to the exemption language. I actually think it's okay to be a text, like formal text, not just for no. I don't see the difference between text and footnote. I think it will be better to be a formal text, to explain that while this council reserves the right in a sense when chartering the working group, that if someone involved exemption, they might be excluded in the consensus call. So, either a footnote or a text to the exemption language explaining council might want to exclude those who are invoking the exemption language.

That's the first option we heard. And second, I actually didn't really understand, but we put something in the general operating procedure. So, it's like even more formalized in a sense that we assert or clarify the right that council always has more methods than exemption language to ask clarifying questions. For example, when the activity itself is sensitive or controversial, we always have the right to be more mindful of who are participating in the policy process, and we are allowed, we have the right to ask more questions.

And the third is the review mechanism. So, I think, should we just go through one, two, three and see if anyone has any reaction? The first is we add a test to the report that if you built both the exemption language, council has the right to determine when

---

chartering. Well, probably those are invoking the exemption language will not be involved in the consensus call. Do we agree to add it to the report and see how it reads and then decide, do we like it or not?

I take no response as yes, we can see the language written and decide. And there is also a fourth option. Thanks for the reminder, Marika, but we go to the second first. Second is the working-- well, the GNSO operating procedure. Sorry, Marika. I wasn't sure where we'll have to add what thing to the procedure as an extra safeguard. Could you please?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Manju. And I'm not really sure if that is going to be the right place, because I think if I recall well, the current SOI requirements, I think actually have the specific questions in the operating procedures, which has, at the same time, meant it has been very limiting in enhancements that can be made or explanations that can be added. So, I think what we're currently proposing is taking it out of the operating procedures, but putting it clearly in the hands of council to confirm any changes to the questions and providing as well a link of where those can be found, but having more general language around how someone is expected to share their intent.

So, we can have a look at what that language looks like, but I'm not really sure if it's going to fit well in there, because again, I think we're trying to keep operating procedure language at a fairly higher level, and not dive into details that maybe change or may get adjusted to not tie our hands or every time I have to go

---

through changes to the operating procedures, but basically, instill in there, the concept of an SOI and the requirement to participate or to state your interest. It includes, of course, also the escalation process. So, if people do have concerns that someone has not shared their correct information, have not updated their SOI, there are ways in escalating that. But I think we can have a look and see if it would fit somewhere there, but I'm not a 100% sure based on, I think, the changes that are proposed to be made if it would be a good fit there.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes. Thank you, Marika. That was what I thought. That's why I was kind of confused. So, I guess it was just example of how we have existing safeguard in a sense also in the operating procedure. So, we can move to option three, which is on top of this footnote explaining that council has a right to, I'm not going to repeat, to when they involve essential language etc. We add still review mechanism to just see every, I don't know, five years, every three years to see whether this exemption language is working well if anybody, when they're participating in the activity, has invoked this is exemption language, and we try our best to check if they have been honest in a sense. We will see when it's in a formal text, right? So, do we like this idea on top of the--? No, we also have this review mechanism added to the report. I'm not seeing--

SUSAN PAYNE:

Manju, can I get in the queue?

---

MANJU CHEN: Of course. Susan, please.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. I think we should. I think we should have a review mechanism. Given the strength of feeling that this topic has generated, I think perhaps we ought to think about reviewing sooner rather than later. I'm not quite sure what that timing would be, but I'm feeling like five years might be too long. Obviously, we need to have something to review. So there needs to have been some use of this process, but I feel like somewhere around about two years or maybe, yeah, two years or maybe in two PDPs or something, because I do feel whether I agree with it or not, we know this is a real hot button issue for some people and so I don't think they would be happy to feel like this is being counted for, and won't be looked at again for five years.

MANJU CHEN: Yes. Thank you, Susan. Actually, yes, I think it's a good idea. Instead of years, maybe we just say after three PDPs, we do a review so it's not locked into years. Can we have that? Do people like this idea? Instead of years, we have a review mechanism after every, I don't know. What do you think? Three or five PDPs? I guess, you can type in three or five in the chat. Or maybe you have to go back to your group. That's understandable too. We'll just have that number in mind. And five, Thomas five, please. Thank you. Sebastien is five too. So, I guess we can have five, and then-- We're having a lot of fives. Very nice.

So, I guess we can have five for now and, of course, I know we always have to go back to our group. So, we bring these five

---

ideas back to our group and see how it goes, how people are liking it. So, I guess now we have a buy-in for the exemption language, what the council's right to charter, and then the review mechanism and the work of charter thing. But I thought that it's like a combined thing with the footnote. So, I'm not sure if it's like a four kind of independent option in a sense because I feel like if we are adding this footnote, probably we have to change the working group charter. Anyways.

Oh, yes. Definitely. Thank you, Marika. So not five PDPs, but five processor activities where this activity specific SOIs are used. So that's actually, what I thought, but I'm always not saying what I thought probably. But, yeah, I guess we have a rough agreement on those things. Do we have very strong disagreement, strong objection of staying out, the texts, and see if we feel like accepting it? If not, I guess, then we will really have to rely on Staff to produce the text for us to review. And I guess it is time to ask a question. When we will have the text? And, Marika, please.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Manju. My suggestion would be that we basically take the whole report and already transform that into a potential CCOICI report to the council. So, I think that would also allow as part of the introduction to talk about what the group discussed and how it arrived at this potential, compromise in addressing this issue and then I think in combination with the specific changes or to the existing recommendations there. Well, and hopefully give a quick picture to everyone what this could potentially look like, and we could then use that to discuss further whether that accurately reflects where this needs to head, or whether further changes or

---

additions that would need to be made. And that could then, of course, also be something that you can use to have further conversations with your respective groups.

So that obviously will take a little bit more time than just purely adding a sentence on what this would look like, but maybe we can try and aim to have this to the group before ICANN77 so you then have something to take back to your groups. And obviously, the sooner we can share it, the sooner you can also already provide comments and input. Just need to see a bit, of course, how much time we'll take to rework the report, but I'm confident we should be able to deliver that before everyone gets on a plane to ICANN77, if that is all right for everyone.

MANJU CHEN:

I think we're all very happy. I mean, it means you have to work a lot, but for us, we're always happy to see it before ICANN77 so we can bring it back to our group to see how they feel when we're talking to each other face to face. I'm not seeing any other comments or suggestions to this proposed next step in a way. So, I guess if we are only having the new reports before ICANN77, do we have to have a meeting before ICANN77 too? Because I feel like probably it will be better if we have it after where we already consulted our members and know how they feel about this new report and the new language.

Is that all right for everybody that we have a meeting probably after ICANN77? Because we will be expanding the report before ICANN77. I'm expecting a conversation within our stakeholder groups about the report. Marika, please.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Manju. If I may make one suggestion and maybe it's not possible, but it might be nice if there's a way maybe towards the end of the ICANN meeting if you can see if it's informally possible for this group to get together too. Maybe you already have some initial feedback, because that would potentially allow if there are indeed specific suggestions or certain areas of concern, if there needs to be some further work on the language, it's something that Staff could already do then ahead of the next meeting.

So, if members are open to that suggestion, we can maybe see if there is potential as well, I think on the last day where maybe in a half hour, we could just come together and share, if there's anything the groups have provided feedback on and whether or not we should be expecting a lot more work on this or whether there's actually a sense of comfort with the process being taken.

MANJU CHEN: Yes. So, I see Sebastien says it sounds like a good idea. I'm not seeing anyone else opposing this idea. If you really don't want to see us by the end of ICANN77, please voice your strong disgust to us now. If no, I think, yes, please send out a Doodle poll, I guess, for people to see what time they are available. Probably the last day if ICANN77. And I guess some problems I've encountered when we did this poll before a meeting happens is that the time zone is all messed up. So please probably, if you can, could you also do a time zone converter stuff so we don't mess up our time, Terri, please?

TERRI AGNEW: I just took a quick look at ICANN77 IDN/GNSO draft schedule. So, in hopes to avoiding a poll, I did a quick look, and I may have missed somebody's name, and I apologize in advance. Maybe Thursday at the 9:00 local time or 1300 UTC. It would be against the IDN's EPDP 404 or the RPM IRT. I'm not sure who on this team is also on the RPM IRT, but I didn't see any member conflict from CCOI against IDNs. So, again, it would be Thursday, the very first slot, the 9:00 o'clock local time, or that converts to 13 UTC.

MANJU CHEN: Which one is IDNs and RPM? The 13 one?

TERRI AGNEW: Correct. They're both at the same time. IDNs and RPM IRT at the same time.

MANJU CHEN: And the 9:00 AM one is no conflict at all.

TERRI AGNEW: So, no. That's where IDNs and RPM is also taking place.

MANJU CHEN: What? [crosstalk 00:47:33].

---

MARIKA KONINGS: I think Terri is giving the two time zones. So, it's 9:00 local time and 1300 UTC. So, it's at the same time.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, okay.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Marika, for interpreting for me. Yes.

MARIKA KONINGS: I believe there's also, the last slot of the day, I think also doesn't have any GNSO meetings if I'm not mistaken. I think there's some wrap ups, but not from the GNSO, so that could be also an alternative.

TERRI AGNEW: You are correct. There was another small team trying maybe scheduling in there, so that's the only reason I didn't say that one, but that one is currently open. Correct. So, it would be the same time. I'm just doing the conversion, so it'd be 15:30 local time, or if you converted it, it would be 1930 UTC, the last slot of the day on Thursday.

MANJU CHEN: So, it's either we see each other the first thing in the morning on the last day, or we see each other the last thing in the last day. What do you guys think, the first or the last? You guys can type in F or L.

SUSAN PAYNE: Could I just ask a quick question? Do you happen to have the full schedule? Do you know when the IRP IRT has been scheduled for? Because I know that's on Thursday, but I can't remember when it's been slotted in.

MANJU CHEN: I'm refreshing my schedule, Susan. One moment.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you so much.

MANJU CHEN: You are welcome.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's that first slot, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. Then not that one.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, I guess that, as a solution, we need to meet on the last slot of the day, because otherwise, Susan can't attend.

SUSAN PAYNE: That's correct. Sorry.

---

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Susan. Just so you know, everybody was typing last in the chat too, so you're not alone. We all want to see each other as we finish ICANN77. I'm very happy that you guys feel the same to the scoop. And Terri, please.

TERRI AGNEW: I will go ahead and enter that now and not send out a Doodle pull if that's okay, but just as a reminder, this will be a sign-up room and there will be no services available. You actually just get the physical room. So, I just wanted to remind everybody of that, but we'll send an invitation when sign up rooms open, typically a day or two before the actual meeting starts with the physical room it'll be in.

MANJU CHEN: Okay. Thank you very much, Terri. From the chat, I'm guessing everybody is planning to go. And sorry for those who will not be present that we're not going to have Zoom. And I think this is wrapping up for our today's call. We will be expecting the report before ICANN77. We will also be expecting to see each other on the last day, last session for ICANN77 to discuss the report we have brought and discuss with our groups during ICANN77. Does anybody have any last thoughts? If not, I happily give you back eight minutes of your life today, and thank you very much for all of you who joined the call and I'll see you all in Washington, DC. Thank you.

---

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks so much. Bye, everyone.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Thank you for joining. Stay well.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**