2022-04-11 SOI Taskforce - Meeting #05

The call will take place on **Monday, 11 April 2022 at 13:00 UTC for 60 minutes**.

For other places see: https://tinyurl.com/2p94924k

ⓘ PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Review of proposed timeline (see attached)
3. Continue consideration of assignment questions (see https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mVupfkJF3e6S53oJb13XtyrqNuSt_8m/edit [docs.google.com])
   a. Consider any further input received on draft response to question #1 and ideas / suggestions in response to question #2
   b. Brainstorm two types of SOI concept (see mind map attached)
   c. Confirm next steps
4. Confirm next meeting – Monday 25 April at 20.00 UTC

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

✓ PARTICIPATION

Apologies: Olga Cavalli, James Bladel

Attendance

ⓘ RECORDINGS

Audio Recording

Zoom Recording

Chat Transcript

⚠ Notes/ Action Items

Action Items:

1. TF members to review the proposed timeline and provide comments, if any, by Friday, 15 April.
2. TF members to review the mind map and provide comments and suggestions on characteristics, types of questions, practical application, and any other thoughts in preparation for the next meeting.
3. Staff to check with TF members about the days/timing of meetings to confirm participation.

Notes:

1. Welcome/SOI Updates:

- Susan Payne: Update to SOI.
- Need to reconfirm participation at the meeting times as attendance has been very light.
- Sent out the request for input via the survey in the newsletter that goes to the SO/AC chairs. No responses yet. Reminder for TF members to alert the members of their groups of the request for input. Staff will also reach out to the support staff for the SOs/ACs.

2. Review of proposed timeline (see attached)

- High-level timeline of steps.
- A month for input on the SOIs, followed by the TF reviewing the input – timing will depend on responses received.
- Factors in potential updates to the SOI.
- Goal is to have a set of recommendations by end of June.
- Any changes to the SOI in the GNSO Council Operating Procedures would need to go out for public comment, currently anticipated for July. Also alert the Council to the changes.
- The proposed timeline is not set in stone and can be updated as necessary.
- Not anticipated for the TF to meet in the Hague with priority to policy work and room restrictions.
- TF members to review the proposed timeline and provide comments, if any, by Friday, 15 April, following which the timeline will be shared with the CCOICI for reference.

ACTION ITEM: TF members to review the proposed timeline and provide comments, if any, by Friday, 15 April.

3. Continue consideration of assignment questions (see https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-mVupfkJF3e6S53oJb13XtyrqNuSt_8m/edit [docs.google.com])

a. Consider any further input received on draft responses to question #1 and ideas / suggestions in response to question #2

Question #1: Is the original objective of the SOI, as stated in the BGC WG Report*, still valid? If not, why not and what should the current objective be?

- Question #1 – purpose remains valid but updates may be needed.
- Reminder: Action item for TF members to add questions to be posed to ICANN Legal.
- Background on Declaration of Interest – was briefly a temporary procedure but was abandoned as being too complicated/onerous and did not serve its purpose. Could be useful to consider that experience when considering changes to the SOI.

b. Brainstorm two types of SOI concept (see mind map attached)

- On the left-hand side, an SOI that is activity specific to be filled out when undertaking a new activity; right-hand side is a general SOI that is static.
- Define the draft characteristics for each type of SOI; TF members are requested to review these.
- TF members to discuss how these two types of SOIs could be practically implemented once the TF has settled on the characteristics and questions.

Discussion:
- How would this translate into technical requirements to change the existing form. TF members should think about the types of use cases. What would this look like in the real world. Examples: in currently working groups – would the questions be answered differently for different groups – RPMs Phase 1 PDP, SubPro PDP, EPDP? How often would the group anticipate the SOIs would change from one person's participation across a variety of policy topics.
- Do think there would be differences in how people would respond. Examples: If you have a brand owner who sends a rep/employee, there would be some circumstances when they would be wearing the registry operator hat (such as on SubPro), but other times when they would be wearing their brand owner/protection hat, such as in RPMs Phase 1 PDP. Increasingly people are participating in multiple ways.
- Multiple types of participation/hats could argue for having two types of SOIs, but need to think about what the questions would be for an activity-specific SOI.
- Do think that if there are more targeted SOIs that starts to help; perhaps some tweaking to language is needed, but could provide guidance that goes along with the questions.   There is a range of understanding of how much detail needs to be provided to the questions. People in similar circumstances may respond differently, based on their understanding. There is a lack of shared understanding concerning what is expected in answer to the questions.
- Could have a modified template that provides a couple of scenarios as examples and expectations.
- Education/guidance is a path to consider. In theory, the way the questions are of a general nature and the responses are free-form text, you could provide statements/details for each one of the policy initiatives in which you are participating – so using one form but allowing for responses for multiple activities – such as for RPMs, SubPro, etc. General = parent, specific = child.
- The other use case to think about is if a community member goes from being a registry to registrar, that could change the dynamics in the participation – so updating both the general information as well as the specific. Could be the potential for increased amount of overhead.
- Could be an automatic notification that if the general (parent) statement is changed then one is prodded to review the specific (child) statements for updates.
- Provide guidance on expectations for detail as well as for changes to general versus specific statements.

c. Confirm next steps

ACTION ITEM: TF members to review the mind map and provide comments and suggestions on characteristics, types of questions, practical application, and any other thoughts in preparation for the next meeting.

4. Confirm next meeting – Monday 25 April at 20.00 UTC

ACTION ITEM: Staff to check with TF members about the days/timing of meetings to confirm participation.