

---

TERRI AGNEW: For the recording, this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvements call taking place on the 2nd of April, 2025. 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 assistance is needed, 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. Please note, all chat sessions are being archived and participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With this, I'll turn it back over to the Chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Terri. Hello, everyone. Welcome to our second meeting. Should we move to the next slide? This should be our agenda. So it's our welcome. So to welcome you guys, I'll share with you some fun facts, which I used to do when I was doing CCL-ICANN meetings. The fun fact is starting tomorrow, it's going to be national holidays for Taiwan. Tomorrow is the kids' day, the children's day. And the next day of the children's day is the day where you visit your ancestors. So first, you look in the future, then you look back to whoever made you here and blame them for giving you no money and have to work. But yeah, that's my fun fact for today. And that concludes my welcome.

---

*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.*

---

I think we'll now move to our second agenda item, which is we'll recap the work of last week. And I think before we move to the next slide, I like to say sorry to all of us, because I think we left the meeting last week all a bit confused. And I think we didn't organize the meeting in a way that's more newcomer friendly. And that's really something we should be always keeping in mind. Because in ICANN, we always need more people to join and join our work to work with us. But we try to fix that by this meeting. And hopefully, you can make everything clearer and less confusion after this meeting. But yeah, so let's move to the next agenda item. And next slide, please.

So we have reviewed this timeline, I think, in the kickoff meeting, but I understand there are not a lot of attendance in our kickoff meeting. So probably good to look at this again and see where we're at. Now that we're in April, you can see we're starting the policy implementation PSR. PSR means Policy Status Report Review. And we'll explain later what this PSR is. And the reason why we cut off CIP, which is the Continuous Improvement Program, is because there are a lot of uncertainties regarding this program. We're still waiting for guidance on a huge part of this program from ICANN Org. That's why sometimes we're not sure how much we can push forward in terms of this work. And I'll pause here to see if anyone has any questions about this proposed timeline of our work this year. If no, we can move to the next slide.

So just to recap what happened in last week's meeting, we actually looked through the criteria of Continuous Improvement Program framework. There were five principles and there were work criteria according to each principle. And this CIP framework, it actually envisions three things after the framework, well, the principle was

---

---

established. And we expected the criteria to be established. There'll be this survey that identify areas of improvement.

And I think this is where we're not really sure. Should we establish the criteria first and then this survey will be established by the ICANN Org to send out to everyone to fulfill the survey or is it like we develop the criteria and we develop the survey ourselves too? This is where we really need more clarity and guidance from either the CIP community group or ICANN Org. And that's why it's been quite confusing for us where our next step is regarding this program.

And of course, after the survey, we will be identifying where areas of improvement and we can start improving whatever needs to be improved. And last week, as I said, we looked through the criteria of each principle. And we mentioned briefly in the call that actually CCOICI, which was the previous body that do the same work within the GNSO Council, they actually look through the criteria. But so, because ICANN Org is still working on this, so we're not sure how much we can push forward on this work. And this is our proposed next step. But before we explain why this proposed next step, I think we can move to the document where we see what CCOICI has done with the criteria.

So, we know what to expect or what we expect our members on site to do regarding the criteria. So, thank you, John. I saw you already edited what was, I guess, grammatically not correct or you think those kind of small edits to the principles. But these are the principles and were already developed and reviewed by the CCOICI. So, can we move to, for example, the criteria for Principle 1. The CCOICI actually has reviewed this and there were not really a lot of edits, but there are, I think, more

---

---

edits for later principles. And just to keep in mind that we won't be reading into these criteria now, and we will not be discussing in details how we think it should be changed.

I think it will be most effective use of our time if we look through it. And if you find, like, there needs to be substantial changes, you bring it back to your stakeholder group and you can make these edits in the next two weeks. Can we move to the-- just scroll down very slowly when we see comments. So, yeah, you see, I added this comment to reflect what was discussed during the CCOICI. But then, I guess, we were all very busy during this stage when we were doing this work. So, most of my comments were left no echo by itself. So, it will be very helpful if you guys come to this talk later after this meeting. And if you see something to add, and if you feel worthy to respond to my comments and add things to this document, feel free to do it. And we will be discussing any new edits in two weeks.

So, can we scroll down? I think these are just format edits. And yes, another comment of me that has no response. So, I think this was also a reflection of what was discussed in CCOICI. And if you agree, please, you can reply. Or if you don't agree, you can reply why you don't agree. And please share this also to your stakeholder group and constituency so we can make sure that we don't go back and forth all the time that people will be like, oh, I have to go back to my stakeholder group to see if these changes are valid. No, and that doesn't mean we don't have meetings. It just means that next week we're not going to discuss this particularly. We're going to discuss the PSR next week.

---

And this is principle three. I saw John did quite a lot of edits, but mostly probably also just grammatically or like not super substantial edits. Again, in the meeting in two weeks, we will be delving into details regarding these. So, I definitely encourage all of us to go to this document to see the changes or suggestions made during the CCOICI stage and provide your input. Can we go to the next page?

Again, you see these comments, me talking to myself, I suggest deletion, nobody replied to me, those kind of things. So, please, after this meeting, go to this document, bring it to your group, discuss whether to keep the criteria and what we should do or how do we enhance each criteria. Next page, please. This is the last page because there are only five principles. I don't think we have any suggested edits for these criteria for principle five. But yeah, that's the criteria. Does anybody have any questions? What we should do or what we're going to discuss or what are the next steps?

The homework is for us to suggest, I mean, you can suggest edits and then consult your SG. I don't mind how you manage your time, just make sure that your SG is aware of this and aware of if any changes you made at a SG position and then we will come back in two weeks. Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS:

Sorry, maybe just a very procedural element. I was wondering if it makes sense to, given that we take this back to our SGs, that we have one point person from each SG to like add the comments so that we

---

limit the amount of people that are commenting on this, but at the same time reflect everybody's views. So, it's much more manageable.

MANJU CHEN:

That's a great idea. I actually don't mind if multiple people comment, but I think I will leave it to SGs to decide whether you have a point person or you just let everybody free. So, because I personally feel like NCSG, well, speaking, taking my hat off as the chair and speak as an NCSG person, normally we will refrain from this one person speak for all situation. So yeah, I'll leave it to the SG to decide whether you want to have a point person or anybody can reply. Thank you. And if no further questions, I think we can go back to the slide.

So, yes, this is the proposed next steps. You go back to your SG and you suggest edits to the document. So, we're actually not in a super hurry about this. As you can see in the previous timeline, we will be working on PSR before come back to this. So, I'm here asking you if two weeks is too short for you guys. If it is, we can extend it because as I said, there's no hurry about this. We only set it for two weeks because I feel like we're all busy people. We forget things in two weeks. It's totally another world. Probably nobody remembers what SSCI means or what CIP means anymore. That's why we set up for two weeks. Is everybody okay with this two-week timeline that we come back after two weeks to reveal the edits? Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Yeah, thank you. Asteway Negash for the record. If I remember correctly from our last meeting, we have agreed for staff to come up

---

---

with a Google Doc to share to our groups about these points. And then someone, I think Chris suggested that we present the entire survey. I think it has now become a survey and we enter the whole thing for the group. And so, they will have an understanding of where we are as a group. So which one are we following or are we just following our structures to present to the group and collect their views and points on the entire idea? So, what do we do? What kind of presentation, what kind of way are we going to follow? So, I think it's a good thing to clear up this. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, thank you, Asteway, again. I'm very sorry that we made everybody very confused during the first meeting, and that's all on me. So, I think last week we went in too deep too fast. That's why we proposed this survey thing, which I guess we were talking about forms where we have two columns and we have one that is existing indicators and one is, suggested more indicators. But after a leadership meeting this week, we agreed to take a step back because we moved too fast during last week.

And also, as we explained earlier, because we are still waiting a lot of things from the ICANN work, we cannot push too much on this work. So, we decided to take a step back in the sense that we don't look at the indicators yet. We focus on the criteria, which was the document that I showed everybody. Because it has been reviewed by the CCOICI. But as you also can see, it was not finalized. It was not stabilized yet. And I think it will be a good pickup point for us to pick up the work and finalize the criteria. And as I said, there's not really hurry about this, but

---

just in case everybody forgets too soon, we set this two-week deadline for this so people can bring this document that we reviewed just now back to your stakeholder group and discuss whether there are edits needed per each criteria, per each principle.

But also, I would suggest we keep in mind that unless it's extensively substantial change or else just try to stick to whatever it already is without coming up with totally out of the blue new criteria, that would be my suggestion. And I hope you guys follow. But I hope that's clear. If not, I'm happy to explain again because sometimes my English is confusing. I don't see any hands, so I assume you understood what I'm saying. And good job for you.

So once the criteria are stable, we will shift review to indicators. But as I said, it's not going to be a very continuous, in a sense, movement because we really have to wait for guidance from the ICANN Org. So this is the recap of last week's meeting. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE:

Thank you, Manju. I just wanted to ask, could you give a brief recap because I wasn't part of the CCOICI, what the things that the Board is looking at? And specifically, I ask you because there's only one thing that talks about timeline and I think it's that more or less once things are decided that they get implemented on a timely basis. And is there any other-- is timing part of what ICANN is looking at the Board or am I off base on that? Do you understand what I'm saying? Just what are the things that left open that ICANN is still considering?



---

MANJU CHEN: You mean for the CIP, or...?

JOHN MCCABE: Yeah. Oh, what you were just talking about, okay, in the context you were just speaking of, that they're still looking at things that are slowing us down. I just wanted to know if you could give us a snapshot of what those things are. And if things like timing, a time element, there's only one thing, it's a number four at the last point as a time element. Is there anything else like that, or is that not within our remit? Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: If I understand correctly, you're asking why we have to break down the work to wait for the guidance and in case there are changes on the CIP framework. Is that correct?

JOHN MCCABE: Yeah, just a skeleton view of what those things are, the points, if you could say.

MANJU CHEN: I'm sorry, I can't because I've been told, been told to me by staff. So I will count on staff, whoever can jump in to save me and explain why it's still so many moving pieces that we have to wait. And I'm sorry to put you guys on the spot.

JOHN MCCABE: I'm happy to withdraw the question.

MANJU CHEN: Nobody wanted to? Oh, Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Manju. This is Steven. It's very dark out here, so hopefully I'm awake enough to answer this. The answer about why our timeline is impacted is essentially because the part of Org that is responsible for implementing the Continuous Improvement Program are still working on setting that program up. And so identifying the way in which the criterion indicators will impact that first step, that satisfaction survey, it's still being worked on.

And so from the staff and the leadership perspective, we thought it would make sense to at least touch on the work that the CCOICI had already performed to try to define and modify the criteria and not lose that work. But also, we realized we couldn't actually finalize it. So all we're seeking to do is stabilize it for now and make sure that we don't fall behind once that further guidance is gained from the Org. So we're playing a balancing act of not losing and falling behind, but making sure we don't get ahead of any finalized guidance from the Org.

And so I don't know that we have precise timing, but I think we can maybe commit to going back and try to get approximate timing for us. I think the approximate time is built into the timeline of the slide that Manju had gone through previously, but we can see if there is maybe additional precision we can get for that. Thanks.

---

JOHN MCCABE:

Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Manju.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Steve. Sorry to make you speak at 5 a. m. You'll get used to it. Let's move on to the next slide. So if we didn't have any questions for the previous slide, we can move to the overview of policy and implementation policy status report.

So before we start to look at the report, the content of the report itself, we thought it would be good for all of us to know a bit of background of why we're doing this and what is this about. So in 2008, from 2008 to 2011, which is like super before me knowing anything about ICANN, and also the 2012 round of New gTLD programs, apparently there were issues that people were like, is this a policy issue or is this an implementation issue? Because we all know in ICANN, if something is a policy issue, you have to deal with it using a policy process. And you cannot change policy during implementation. And I guess that probably caused a lot of fights during that year, which I'm happy to not be around.

And to help answer these questions, and also just to make sure that in the future, they have proper tools, which is us now have proper tools to address this issue, the council at that time, I assume council here means GNSO council, convened the policy and implementation working group. And actually, I checked the wiki of this policy and implementation working group, there were actually several of us who were on this working group now still here and on site. So if we need any context, I

---

will call on them to provide us more context in the past, but I will not reveal their names yet, just so they don't feel so pressured.

So at this time, this work group concluded that instead of saying, oh, this is policy, oh, this is implementation, it's actually better if we have the tools at hand to properly address whatever issues that we face. And that's why actually, they came up with several processes. The first, I think we all are pretty familiar is the Expedited Policy Development Process, EPDP. I guess we can all remember when we first used this process. And also, the GNSO Guidance Process, short name GGP, we also have used this process. It's for the Applicant Support Program, ASP, and it has finished its work. And there's another process called GNSO Input Process, the GIP. This process has never been used since it's invented. But yeah, these are the three processes that were recommended by the working group.

In addition to processes, they also coordinate with the ICANN Board to develop implementation-related recommendations. And that's where this consensus policy implementation framework came from. Some people call it CPIF, that I think is not very easy to say, but I guess, I don't know, CPIF, CPIF, it's weird. But yeah, there are this policy framework and also the IRT principles and guidelines. So we have processes for policies, and we also have processes for the implementation. I'll stop here and see if there are any questions. If not, we can move on to the next slide.

And after the final report, it was approved by Council and also approved by the Board, and they changed the bylaw to reflect these changes. And then in this final report of this working group, they actually

---

---

recommended that in five years, you should review these recommendations to see if they work. And this review was conducted by the GDS, Global Domain Strategy something department in ICANN Org. And after reviewing, they write up a report, that's the policy status report, the PSR. So that's why this long name of policy and implementation PSR came from.

In this PAR, the GDS analyzes the various outputs and identifies areas for potential improvement of the processes that we just reviewed. Oh yeah, and this report from the GDS also undergo public comments. So there were feedback from the community also. And when the Council got this PSR from the GDS, they decided that CCI will be the best place to review the PSR and determine if the improvements suggested by GDS are acceptable and are implementable, or should there be changes? Are they just not valid at all?

Those kind of decisions will be made to us after discussing and reviewing the PSR. So as you can see, the task of CCI is to review the areas flagged by staff in regards to the EPDP, GGP, and GIP, and determine what should be pursued. Until here, do we have any questions, comments, problems? If no, we can move to the next slide.

And thank you, Anne, to reveal yourself as one of the previous members of this working group. So guys, if you have any questions, we just ask Anne. So we will move on to the overview of these proposed changes from staff in the PSR, the Policy Status Report. Do I have to read out everything? So on the EPDP, the staff actually they-- I think the initial purpose of EPDP was to just cut short one of the, how do you say that?

---

One of the processes, in the process, in the policy development process, which the issue report part of the policy development process.

But I think in the review, staff have found that this expedited kind of naming, naming it expedited gave false expectation to EPDP, thinking the whole PDP will be expedited. But actually, the whole expedited only means that they got rid of the issue report to shorten the overall timeline. And that was the misconception that we need to fix. And so that's actually what gives us the first two lines that while EPDP has contributed to shorter overall timeframe, people have wrong expectation because of the name. And that's why it says that there are misunderstandings in the community over the true nature of what expedited means.

And then I think these initial guidelines are necessary to clarify when policy recommendations are intended to impact pre-existing policies, but also issues that raised during the EPDP on registration data. I feel like we have experienced some, but we dealt with the better in the EPDP internationalized domain names too. But like I said, we dealt with it better because of the experience of the EPDP on registration data. But this issue was definitely identified and there were suggestions by the staff to fix this or to try to mitigate or improve this in the future too.

And that leads us to the final three points. These are the suggestions from the GDS of how we can improve EPDP in the future. So the first one is eliminating the requirement of early input when appropriate. I don't know if it's easier if we can see the Z diagram because or else probably people don't know where early input is and why to eliminate this. Can we pull out the Z diagram so we know what it means? I'm

sorry to ask this so spontaneously. You might need some time to find it. But while you guys try to find it, does anybody has any questions for now? And if not, I'm seeing the chat. I thought it meant eternal. Yeah, I had the same feeling when I was in EPDP phase 2A. I felt like it would never end. Beth, please.

BECKY BURR:

Yeah, just because I don't want Manju to have to stare into the void of silence and pain. I think that something else that maybe we could consider is there's been a lot of talk, especially around like going into new DNS abuse PDPs is the concept that GNSO, the things are eternal because the scope is humongous. So I think maybe one of the things we can think about is encouraging reasonable scoping of projects and not just saying, well, we're going to make it phase 64, but still each scope is enormous.

So maybe we can just keep that in mind as we go through these things. Because I think that less the process and more just the simple volume of things that are meant to cover. I mean, look at the IDN PDP. It's just enormous. So sometimes that is the cause. And I think not necessarily the process, but I'm all for thinking of ways to make that process smoother and more concise. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you very much. Totally agree. Ajith, please.

---

AJITH FRANCIS:

Yeah, I think just building off on what Beth is saying, I think there's also-- this is not for now. This is just while we wait for the Z diagram that it's shared. I was just also wondering, I think at some point we'll also have to consider, because part of the scope of the work for this side team is also PDP 3.0, is the distinction between EPDPs and PDP 3.0. And when is it an EPDP and when is it PDP 3.0? And shouldn't everything be EPDP if that is a model that works? Or how do we balance those two when defining the guardrails for when it's one instrument and when the other is probably something that maybe CCI could also have a way in on.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Beth and Ajith. And now we're seeing the Z. This is the snake of the PDP. This is the PDP. This is not the EPDP. So when we're talking about EPDP, which will not be the Z, will be like this. Because the whole upper part will be eliminated because they didn't need to have an issue report. And as you can see, the early input process is after forming the working group. It's a request for stakeholder group consistency and statements and SO/AC input. That was where early input process is at. And that's where what the PSR is suggesting to omit when it's appropriate.

So I guess probably we can in the future meeting, we can incorporate this diagram into our presentation so we can easily go back to this every time we need to check which stage is where and how to think about this. But yeah, that's the first suggestion from the PSR. And we'll go back to the slides. I'm very sorry to make you change, keep changing the slides, yes.



---

And I actually don't know what this means, Improved Working Practices. For example, lessons learned activities. The staff have more background on this. I know we heard this before, but I don't remember specific examples shared regarding this point. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thank you, Manju. And thanks for going over the history. I think that's super helpful. I'm assuming based on your current format today that you're not looking for any input on these slides really right now. It's just explaining background. Right, thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Oh, I thought you're going to explain to us what Improved Working Practices means. Okay. Let's move to the third point. I think this definitely speak to what Beth and Ajith has already raised. We have to do better in chartering and scoping the issues to make sure everybody is aware of what we're working on and make sure the whole work is conducted effectively. So this can probably apply to both PDP, any PDP. And while we are when we're reviewing the PDP 3.0 in the future, we'll definitely have to keep this in mind as well. So this is the EPDP part. And we can move to the next slide.

On the GGP, which is a GNSO Guidance Process. The PSR think the first GGP on Applicant Support Program was effective in providing qualifications and advice on policy recommendations. I'll just briefly explain probably what GNSO guidance process, what GGP is in case some of us forget. GGP does not provide policy recommendations and only explain what policy recommendation meant. It's not supposed to

---

develop or create any new policy recommendations. As we saw before, people were confused by what is policy, what is implementation. And that's why it was very clear in the charter or in the guidance of GGP that it's not supposed to create any policy recommendation. And it's only used when there's no new policy recommendations required, when they needed guidance or explanations on existing policy recommendations. That's why GGP will be initiated.

And I think the reason why GGP on applicant support was initiated was because in the SubPro, I mean, people will know better than me on this, but in SubPro, there were suggestions that there should be indicators developed to evaluate whether the ASP, the Applicant Support Program is effective. But it didn't really spell out the indicators. And in the final report, they suggested that the IRT should be doing this work. But I don't remember exactly whether it was the IRT or staff. I mean, staff is in charge of implementation.

So in a sense, staff feel like this developing indicators are beyond the scope of IRT. And they bring this issue to GNSO Council, and the Council decided that it's actually better to initiate a GGP to carry out this work instead of throw it to the IRT. And that was why the first GGP was initiated. And they did develop the criteria, oh no, sorry, the indicators for the future ASP to evaluate its work. So that was a little bit of the background of the first GGP.

So back to the PSR observations, they found although it was effective, it also, I think I heard this from our representative on the GGP also, I think most of them feel like their scope was very limited. They wanted to do more, but they cannot, or sometimes they were unsure to which limit,

---

---

to which kind of boundary they can touch when they're developing the indicators. That's why they suggested that probably more comprehensive targets should be established. And there should be more communications also between the working group council and ICANN Org.

To the second point, it proposed that when a GGP is initiated to provide guidance on existing recommendations, a step could be considered to coordinate on the expected timing with any active or planned implementation work and manage expectations around the GGP scope and outputs. I think this actually reflects to what I already said, like they were discontent about what they could have done within their limited scope. I think the community definitely discussed this a lot about, they feel like they could have done more, but because of the limited scope of GGP, they couldn't. But this is something definitely we will look into in the future.

The timing, I think it's very a separate thing because we were like, oh, we have to launch the New gTLD rounds and it should not impact any implementation. But also keeping in mind that we were saying that we have to keep the scope narrow to make sure the work is conducted effectively. But is that also the case for GGP or should it be a change? That's something we should consider probably. Yes, and a limited scope of GGP, some purpose to stay away from policymaking. I think that's probably the issue we will have to discuss in depth when we are reviewing GGP in the future, because there's this very thin line where we have to maintain.

---

And the last point is whether GNSO Council might consider providing more direction on the level of detail and guidance appropriate for the GGP. I guess this all, everything speaks to one point is GGP members felt like they could have done more, but they couldn't because of the limited scope. And they couldn't develop, they are not in the power or they're not supposed to develop any recommendations and they felt like they couldn't do more. And I think everything is actually describing this, but we can definitely get into this deeper when we are discussing this in the future. Let's pause here to see if there's any questions. If not, let's move on to the next slide.

So for a GIP, my impression without reading this is that PSR was saying nobody used this. Maybe it's not useful at all. Probably we can just erase this. But yeah, I think that's actually what is suggested in a very polite way in the PSR. But public comments also said there are people who think there's value in keeping it. I think probably we will also discuss in the future whether we should keep it or we can just erase it from the manual or bylaw. And more substantive suggestions whether to replace it by another things, that will also be a lot for our discussions in the future. Any questions regarding this process? If not, we can move on to the next slide. Yes, Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Manju. Saewon, do you mind going back to the-- Yeah, thanks. This is Steve from staff, and I thought it might just be helpful to reiterate a point that I think is probably apparent from what Manju said. But I just want to make sure that it's clear that all the recommendations from staff that are in the PSR, which also include some public comments,

---

which are more of a conveyance of what the comment said rather than staff recommendations. All of these things that were in the PSR, they're non-binding on this group. And the requirement for the CCI, or sorry, the CCI, pronunciation issues, for the CCI is that we consider all these recommendations duly, but the CCI is not bound to agree and implement all these recommendations.

And so what that implies for the future is that we're going to have to delve into these recommendations further. And that's probably quite clear. We need to know why these recommendations for change were made and evaluate those reasons. And then the other piece of that I think is going to be making sure we understand the level of impact versus the type of change that might be required. And so this is just a very hypothetical issue, and I don't know if this is going to happen or not. But for instance, a change could be very minimal in impact, but the change required to put that into effect could say require change to the bylaws.

And maybe this group could determine maybe that requested or suggested change is maybe not worth the rate of return, I guess, is a way to describe it. So just thought it might be helpful to provide some overall expectations and guidance where we're headed. This is obviously an overview, but maybe that helps folks consider each of these recommendations. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Steve. It is very helpful indeed. And I also note and put in chat that EPDP, GDP, and GIP are all codified in the bylaws. If we are

---

raising GIP, it will involve changing the bylaw, like Steve just said. And yes, none of these suggestions are mandatory. We will discuss them in depth and now understand, learn more about the context of each recommendation when we delve deeper into these in the coming weeks. And yes, I'm not seeing any hints or questions, so probably you can move on to next steps.

Yes, so next steps are actually the first two are not, like they will not be done by us. It's the GNSO Council. GNSO Council will confirm our project plan and will confirm our assignment forms. I think we already received our project plan, but we haven't seen the assignment forms, but we will see it before the Council confirm it. It will be a simple one-pager that just briefly introduce what we're doing. And that will happen in the next week's GNSO Council meeting. But we will circulate definitely the assignment forms to the site mailing list before we send it to the Council.

And the last one, as we discussed in the beginning of this meeting, we will go back to our group to discuss the CIP criteria. And again, we are not moving to indicators yet because as we learned, there are a lot of moving pieces. We don't want to rush too quickly, but please bring that document that we reviewed in the beginning of this meeting to your group and discuss if there are edits needed. And please, like I suggested, refrain from creating out of the blue, not so relevant criteria under each principle. But yeah, that will be our next step.

I think we all met very important next steps here, which is next week. We're going to, I think, delve deeper into the PSR and start to understand more context about the recommendations. We will

---

probably start with the EPDP, the Expedited Policy Development Process. We will try to share the slides before the meeting, but depending on how much we can work on it. Just know that we will continue on reviewing the PSR in our next meeting. Yes, this is over. Is there any question? Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Thank you. Asteway Negash for the record. I remember that we said in our project plan that some of the processes will not be overlapping with one another. And today I can see that the CIP part one in the process that we just started today, which is the CIP, they have just overlapped. Does this mean that the processes have just overlapped? I'm just trying to clear out that. I think I'm clear with my question or do I need to explain it? Are we in an overlap?

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, yes, yes. I think it's a good question. Personally, I don't feel like it's an overlap because we won't be able to discuss anything next week if we just doing CIP criteria, right? Because we're waiting work from our members to bring it back to your stakeholder group and constituencies. And every stakeholder group and constituencies need their time to review and provide feedback to the criteria. If we wait for this, it will mean that there's nothing to be discussed in the next week. So I think we're multitasking. But yeah, I see your hand.

---

AJITH FRANCIS: Thanks, Machu. I think I just wanted to add to the question that Asteway asked, was also like, I think I see this more as the pre-work that is needed for us to get started on the work on the indicators as well, particularly on finalizing the criteria. And I think it came predominantly from last week's call where there was a bit of ambiguity whether these criteria were closed from the CCOICI process or whether they need to be finalized. So I see that as the pre-work that sets up the work for CIP.

And on that note, I also just wanted to thank both Manju, Steve, and Julie, and Saewon for really digging into the context and the framing of the work that we wanted to do, because I think that's extremely useful and gives me particularly a lot of interesting nuance and lens with which to approach the work that we're doing. So thank you very much, guys, for doing that.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Ajith. And thank you, Asteway, for your question. I hope we answered it.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Yeah, yeah, it's answered. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you very much. Should we move to AOB? We only have one minute. If there's no other hand, I will gladly give back one minute to your life. I know it's not long, but it's still 60 seconds. Does anybody have any AOB? I'm not seeing any hands. Yes, we're finishing on time.



---

Good job, everyone. I'll see you next week, and be ready to go deep into the PSR. Thank you very much. Thank you, bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**