

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvements Call taking place on the 9th of April, 2025. We have listed apologies from Anne Aikman Scalese. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand now or speak up. Seeing or hearing no one, if assistance is needed with your statement of interest, 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 SCCI side chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Terri. Welcome, everyone. We're having a little bit of glimmer of attendance today, but that's all right. Things happen. People are busy. Let's move on to the next slide. First of all, we have the welcome and SOIs. That was my welcome. Anyone want to update their SOIs? Not seeing any hand, not seeing any chat in the chat, so I will move on to the next agenda item, recap of meeting two, which is last week. So, last week, we kind of brought through the proposed criteria of CIP, Continuous Improvement Program, for the GNSO Council, and that criteria was kind of reviewed by the CCOICI, which is the previous body of SCCI. But like we mentioned last week, there's still work to be

---

*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.*

done, so we were assigning homework to all of us for two weeks to bring the criteria back to your SG and C and see what you think could be improved regarding the criteria. And once we're finished with the criteria, we'll move on to indicators, but keep in mind that it might not be as quickly or swiftly as we will assume, because we are still waiting for guidance by the ICANN org. We also started to kind of review the PNI-PSR, which is the Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report, and in that PSR Policy Status Report, there were suggestions for EPDP, GGP, and GIP. Today, we will start with the EPDP, like we will go through more in depth of the recommendations and analysis of the PSR. So the key action item for everyone is still ongoing, which is starting last week. We are encouraging you guys to bring back the criterias to your respective SGs and Cs, and we will try to integrate the inputs by the end of the deadline. Can we go to the next slide, please?

This is also a recap. Just remind us every time we're having a meeting what our project plan looks like. And just to keep in mind, too, that this is not set in stone, because we really don't know when we will start with the Part 2, because like we always mention, we are waiting for more guidance from ICANN.org. But as you can see now, currently our main priority is reviewing the Policy Implementation PSR review. Next slide, please.

So we have kind of brought through the Policy Implementation PSR. We have also went through the background. In 2015, the Policy Implementation Working Group proposed three new processes for the GNSO. The first is EPDP, the Expedited Policy Development Process. Second is GNSO Guidance Process, GGP. And the third is GNSO Input Process, GIP. Can we go to the next slide? And also for the

---

implementation part, there were two new recommendations. That's the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework and the IRT Principles and Guidelines. Next slide, please. This is also what we have already reviewed last year. I think a great clarification that was brought to my attention by our great, awesome staff. We were talking about how maybe if we want to change anything about the three new processes, we might have to change the bylaw. But upon deeper and more in-depth study, staff realized that actually only the EPDP and GGP are captured in the bylaws. And GIP, alongside with EPDP and GGP, are in the GNSO operating procedures. But GIP is not in the bylaw. So if you guys remember, one of the suggestions from the PSR is maybe reconsider the purpose of GIP and if we still need it. So if we need to get rid of it, we don't need to change the bylaw. And I think I kind of tasked Steve to ask why GIP is not in the bylaws to Marika. And I don't know if you had a chance to ask Marika about this. I'm sorry to put you on the spot early morning.

STEVE CHAN:

No problem. Thanks, Manju. This is Steve from staff. I did get a chance to catch up and we're happy she actually validated our assumptions, which is that the GNSO input process is purely a council tool and mechanism. And what I mean by that is the other two, the EPDP and GGP, they have a component of board action, which is to approve the recommendations or adopt the recommendations. Whereas the GIP does not. It is all purely contained and limited to the council in remit and approval actions and all of those things. And for that reason, it is not captured in the bylaws. Thanks.

---

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Steve. So to just say very simply, it's not in the bylaw because it doesn't involve board actions. That's why it's not in the bylaw. And if we want to change it, it probably is much easier to. And yes, just confirming what Jen mentioned in the chat, they also said in the PSR that it has never been used. And so implementation guidelines or the implementation processes are owned by a cohort that we all know. So our task now is to review the PSR provided by staff and to see if we agree with their assessment analysis and if we agree or disagree what to do next, then we will have the recommendations to the general counsel when they're ready. Can we move to the next slide, please? This we have already reviewed last week, too, about the EPDP, they found that EPDP actually has a shorter time frame, but they are misunderstandings in the community. And I'm going to I'm not going to read through this because we are going to review, like, analysis by analysis starting next slide. So this is just an overview of what was in the report about EPDP. Let's move to the next slide.

So first, is this common misconception about EPDP? Misconception about EPDP. So. While in reality, EPDP overall timeline is shorter than the It's a PDP, but there is still this kind of misconception that expedited PDPs (EPDPs) will be faster than every single process. Or, how do I say this well? Just that it's going to be much faster in every single step of the process. But it's a misunderstanding. Actually, the steps themselves are not faster; it's just that one part of the process was eliminated. That's why the overall timeframe is shorter. So, if we can see from the diagram, maybe it's easier. You see, usually the whole PDP is a set, but the expedited one gets rid of the initial issue report process steps.

---

That's why it's shorter. They only left the great orange, and the last part, which is going through council, going to the board, public comments, etc. So, that's why EPDP, overall, is faster, but it doesn't mean that they are moving with, for example, deliberations at a faster pace. I hope I'm making sense. The EPDP name itself kind of gives this false expectation, probably, or conception for the community to imagine it should be faster in every step, while it is faster only because they eliminated some steps during the process. Let's move on to the next slide.

So, for this analysis, do we think it's a problem that we need to fix, or do we think, well, now we have two EPDPs, both of them have at least two phases, people should know better now, there's nothing to be fixed? This is the open discussion for our members on the side to decide whether we think this is a problem. So, I'll stop here and see if anyone has any suggestions, opinions, or input. I'm not seeing any hands, so probably we should brainstorm a bit. Still following the fantastic lead of our fantastic staff, our staff has kind of came up with what implementation could look like for us. That means that if we think people don't understand, well, the misunderstanding of what it means to be an EPDP is a problem, and we want to fix this, these are the possible ways that we can do to fix that problem. Sorry, I was distracted by the chat. I'll read through the possible implementations first, and then I'll go back to the chat. So, the first possible implementation is we develop talking points to the broader community. You know, probably infographics or just simple messages to explain the difference between PDP and EPDP, and as an effort to correct the misunderstanding: EPDP not in general faster, but only with a shorter timeframe. Or, we can also add a diagram to the EPDP process manual to show the difference

---

---

between PDP and EPDP. So, we don't rely on the original "Z" and just cross out the issue report. We create one diagram for EPDP itself to distinctively showcase the difference. Also, we can set expectations by including a draft timeline in the working group charter. Now that I've read through the implementations, I'll go to the chat and see what people have there. There are three possible implementations. I'm not sure what people are talking about. Which are valid, for finding the role of documenting the choice of either of these tools we're developing. Is there a value? As in, I think definitely there is value in distinguishing EPDP from other EPDPs. Is there a value? As in, I think definitely there is value in distinguishing EPDP and PDP, but I think the choice, as in when we're choosing to have a PDP or EPDP, is not—I'm not 100% sure—but I don't think it's a choice of the community. It will be a choice of the general council because only the general, well not only—yes, only the general council has the authority to start charting a working group for either a PDP or EPDP. So, I think it's definitely worthy to explain to the community why council is choosing PDP or EPDP, and that might require, while we're discussing, more education to the broader community on what's the difference between EPDP and PDP. So, I hope that answers the question, and it's really only me talking all the time. Now I'm hoping to see any hands. So, there's no hand? Could Jen, please? Thank you very much.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Manju. Jen, for the record, giving your voice a break, and I guess, speaking. I appreciate that. There are the three possible implementation items we can look at. Educating more of the ICANN community on the differences is always a good thing. I think not so

---

many—even now—everybody, I hope, knows what the "Z" diagram is generally in the community. If we have something visual for them, I think it's much easier to explain and for them to understand. The second thing is, of course, we can't really change the name of it, or we can change the name of it, but what is the impetus to change the name for this? Because I don't think, if we do that, we also have to do the same implementation steps. If we do all of the three points that are suggested in this slide, I think it could go a long way to dispelling the misunderstandings. Then, finally, more of a personal observation. I know we've had two EPDPs, and I think the second one—I'm biased because I was in it—the IDN EPDP was pretty fast. I guess comparing it to other PDP or other EPDP processes, it was pretty fast. It was pretty expedited. So, that's my two cents on this thing. Thank you, Jen. Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Thank you, Asteway Nagesh, for the record. I think it's probably a good idea to look at specific cases where the EPDP has been laid out in action. For example, if we could look at the case of the IDN EPDP, I think the issue reports—I mean the early input processes, like this—have been avoided because the issue has been pretty much defined very well between the community and the staff. So, I think that's a pretty reasonable reason why. The group or the community resorted to an expedited review instead of the regular IDN, so this is probably a question if we could have experts to involve in this matter, experts from particularly the case of particular cases or examples where a PDP has been resorted or chosen over normal PDP process. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. So I'm not sure, I probably misheard, but I heard you said that the early input process of the PDP-IDN was eliminated. I wasn't in the IDN-EPDP that early, but I think, I'm pretty sure it was not. I think we were, we cut short of the issue report process, which is what EPDP is about, but I think we still did an early input process, but I might be wrong. Rely on Steve to correct me if I'm wrong. Yes, we did have an early input process, but thank you, and I see Glenn, you're on.

GLEN DE SAINT GÉRY:

Thank you very much, Manju. Just to say that I don't think we should think of changing either the names of the EPDP or the PDP, the expedited policy development process, or the policy development process, because I think what happens in the council is that when there is a subject matter that should be treated either by a policy development process or by an expedited policy development process, there is a certain amount of discussion in the council which helps guide the group as to which type of policy development process should be used, that is, expedited or just ordinary, and this comes, of course, out into the community via the stakeholder groups and the constituencies, because after the council meeting, each stakeholder group, the intellectual property stakeholder group, the registrar stakeholder group, the business constituency, go back and they discuss with their members. So I think in that way, it is brought out into the community that is actually influenced by it or going to be influenced by it. There is this explanation which is given. Thank you, Manju. I hope that made sense.



MANJU CHEN:

Yes, thank you. So I think we all kind of agree that we're not changing the name, although it was confusing in the first place, but I think we also kind of agree that now we all kind of know better, but we also need to have extra effort to make it clearer to everyone that what EPDP really means, and I'm gathering from the feedback in chat and from people who have spoken up that the first two points of the possible implementations are a good idea. We should definitely have some education effort to let the broader community know the difference between PDP and EPDP, and it will be even better if something is visualized, and we can showcase them to the community. I hope that's a correct summary of what we have discussed. And I'm not seeing any objections to what I just said. I think that means we can keep these two points in mind and capture it and move on to the next slide. So the report has also identified this problem where there were instances where there are policy recommendations that will impact the pre-existing policies, but it was not made specific enough, or it was unclear that whether or how it should impact the pre-existing policies. So the suggestion was that we need more clarity during the policy development process, and to make the working group members aware of what recommendations they are making that's going to impact the pre-existing policies and counter requirements. That's the analysis, and we can move on to the next slide, which is to showcase, actually, in the GENESO, we already kind of dealt with this issue, because we found out about this issue too on ourselves. So this is what the Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group just did. Well, actually, this is what Council just did for the Latin Diacritics PDP Working Group Charter, because there were

---

incidents, as we said, that there are, you know, policy recommendations that might impact current policies, and it wasn't identified, or it wasn't specifically explained how and why it's impacting the current policies. So in the charter of this newly established working group, we made sure to text the working group that, you know, to make sure when they deal with the issue, they review and check if it will impact the current policies.

So in a sense, this slide is for us to explain to you that it has already been dealt with, and I'll move on to the next slide. So see, so the question, like, the issue identified in this PSR, in a sense, has already been dealt with by the practice now that we are chartering the new working groups for new PDPs or EPDPs. So the question to us is, is this still a problem? Do we still need specific steps or any measures to fix this? Or we think it's already been fixed, because we've already identified that problem, and we already tried to fix it or fix it by better chartering the working groups. I'm stopping here, because I finished my kind of questions to all of us, and I'll see if anybody has any opinion or suggestions. Do we agree that the problem has already been fixed? I'm taking silence as a yes, and I think that means there's no really further implementation or anything else we need to do. We just need to make sure we keep this in mind in the future, as the GNSO Council, when we're chartering working groups. And we'll also capture this, and I think, I don't know how it's gonna be written as a recommendation, but I think we'll capture this in our report to the GNSO Council, too, so they know that they have to keep in mind of this thing when they're chartering the working group in the future. If that sounds okay for everyone, because I'm not seeing any hands, we will move on to, oh, Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I can put my hand back down if you want to move to the next slide, but I do have a general question on this, right? This might be a question for staff. When we add elements to charters, PDP charters, EPDP charters, when there are requirements such as this, you know, adding Does this then form the basis of a template of future charters or do they always go back to a completely blank drawing slate? Are there elements that perhaps they must include in charters is my question.

MANJU CHEN: I'll wait for staff to answer this question because I personally don't have an answer.

STEVE CHAN: I'm going to share a link to the GNSO operating procedures page. In there, near the bottom of the page, you can see guidance for the GNSO work product templates. Right in the middle of that little section, it has a number of different things, but one of them is the working group charter. So if we want to affirm action item for this particular piece of analysis, we could actually amend the draft charter that's captured on that page to make sure that explicitly includes the question about any impact on consensus policies or existing processes. So there is a template and that could be a tangible action item for this group to request that it be amended to make sure it includes this question. Thanks.

---

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Steve. And Jen, I see your hand.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Steve. Really helpful. I'm supposed to know all of this by heart, but yep, that's me. I clicked on it and I already see that there is a section in the middle of page two that says impact on existing consensus policies. So it seems that it's already in this template, or was it just really very recently updated? Which means we don't need to do anything further. That's definitely a question for Steve, not for me, because I didn't do anything with the templates. Anyway, I'll take this off and take a look at the template some more, because I do see it there. So I'm like, whoa, did we already do this? Okay, thanks.

STEVE CHAN:

I do not actually recall when that got updated. We can take that as a different action, which is to investigate when the template got updated to include that specific element.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you very much. So I think we will check whether it's already in the template, and probably it is. And if it is, then yes, work already done, as Steve just said. Good job. Let's move on to the next slide. So this, we come to the eliminating the requirement for early improvement. I think this is only for EPDP, right? This suggestion is only for EPDP, it's not for PDP. So this is kind of, I guess, an effort to address the concerns or misunderstanding that EPDP should be faster, but it's not faster. But actually, kind of personally, me, I was a participant of the first EPDP,

---

only the Phase 2a, but still, it was the first EPDP. I was also participating in the EPDP IDN. I felt like we were much faster than the previous PDPs, but again, that was me, personally, my feelings. So I guess to address this concerns or misunderstanding, or whatever it is, that EPDP is not as faster as people expected, there is this suggestion in the PSR that probably we can make requirement of early input optional instead of mandatory. And what is this early input process? I think we can move on to the next slide to see where it is in the Z diagram. Oh, Steve, is that your hand raised?

STEVE CHAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Manju. This is Steve from staff, and when you're sharing slides, I don't know why Zoom removed the option to raise your hand, which I find it a little annoying. What I wanted to share quickly is that, go back to the previous slide, part of the additional rationale for why the GDS staff, and what we did too, also included this part in the PSR, is specifically related to the representative model, where you're not guaranteed necessarily, but all the community is invited to send representatives to a group, and presumably when you have those representatives on the group, the appointed members generally have that input from the groups. And so the suggestion for this one is, part of the rationale here is that you already have that input via the members, and it seems redundant to go specifically seek input from each and every of these groups that are invited to take part in the PDP. So this optional part could be conditional based on the membership group, if it's just an open process where you're not necessarily making sure to specifically invite every single group, maybe you still want the input process, but where it's a representative group and every group has a

seat at the table, that's the case, I think, where GDS staff and policy staff thought it might not necessarily be constructive to have this step in every single EPDP, and PDP actually, and GDP actually too. I think the input process is in all three processes. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Steve. So the option of eliminating the requirement of early input is a recommendation that applies to all GNSO policy processes, is that correct?

STEVE CHAN: My memory has already been proved to be faulty on the template, but I believe it is the case for EPDP, PDP, and GGP, and I think I said GIP instead, but I meant GGP.

MANJU CHEN: Cool. Thank you. Because most of the policy processes now, we do, we kind of tend to choose a representation model, and that's why in the PSR, they suggested if we already have the representation model, we, there's no need to further ask again to, to say our groups to provide their input, because they're already in the working group. So also here, we, the staff helpfully made the note of how long it will take if we have this input process. Huh? It will likely take up to maximum four months. That's like a semester. So yeah, like there's an early input process and a policy development process that will take so much longer. But, wow, there's a long, very long, very long message in the chat. Should I read that out? Oh, wait, I'll let Asteway speak first.

---

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Yeah, I'm just wondering where, for example, in the Latin Diacritics group, it was initially presented that early input process is not so mandatory, and the members of the working group might as well just forward their ideas on the virtual calls rather than taking that back to their groups and having their groups to report back. But then there was a discussion that, which, there was actually a discussion that the early input process, I mean, feedbacks from the early input process might actually change the project plan. So which should come first was actually a question. Should we actually initially raise the early input and collect feedback from that, and then come up with a project plan and submit that to the GNSO Council? Or should we collect, I think Steve was there. He might actually present this in a better way. So I think there is a chance that feedback from the early input might actually change the project plan. So this should actually be, should better be seen hand-in-hand with the project plan. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you so much, Asteway. That's great. Reminder to all of us, I think that's certainly something we have to consider. But yeah, like Jen mentioned in the chat, [inaudible] target is an open membership model, which means that it doesn't require or it doesn't specifically made the effort to invite everyone to the stakeholder groups, constituencies, ACs and SOs to participate. But yeah, I think that's definitely an issue that we have to take in mind when we are framing our recommendations per this particular advice in our report to the council. Should we move to the next slide? So currently, is early input mandatory? It's in the chat,

---

---

so probably it is. Saewon, is your comment related to the Latin diacritics?

SAEWON LEE:

Yes, it's related to the Latin diacritics. Just again, this is just to let you know in practice, just timeline wise, it's not going to affect the project plan because it's planned to be presented to the council before the early input comments are reviewed as a team. But again, this is just to share that that's how it is in practice, but obviously based on the discussions inside, we can definitely reflect what's decided here.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. So if we decide that it's a good resolution to make early input process as an optional thing to do, because like we discussed, one, it's representation model of the working group, probably there's really the need for an early input process from all the SGs and Cs and SOs and ACs is not as necessary because we already have the representative on the working group. But if the working group operates on an open model, like Lofting Target is, where we don't actively and specifically invite all of the SEORA groups, SGs and Cs and SOs and ACs to send representative on the working group, probably it's still better to have an early input process in place to make sure that the PDP is inclusive and has been informed by the broader community in the ICANN community. So make it optional. Seem to me a rational decision. I'm not sure if everybody agrees with this suggestion. And I'm not seeing any objections. So maybe we can capture this as a good, implementation suggestion, which is to modify the process manual to make early input



optional. And whether we want to further explain that, it really has to be depending on the model of the working group. I guess we will discuss it later when we see the real text of our suggestion drafted.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, thank you so much. You actually captured what I wanted to say because that would depend on the representative model of the EPDP. And my concern with that will be, how would that actually addresses the concerns and whether or not eliminate the purpose of the early input into PDP working group. If we make it optional, if we make it optional, how would that be addressed? And that would depend on the working structure of the EPDP, but we can make it optional and we should try or we should find a mechanism of how we get input of people because if we make it optional, people tends to not submit their comments or their input in shaping the PDP process. So that's just my thought on that. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Peter. We'll definitely capture whatever was discussed today. And when we're writing the recommendations, I believe by the end of this process, we will have to go through reviewing the text, drafted as our, that capture our discussions and as recommendations to your council. And by that time we will definitely check again if what was discussed were fully captured in the text, but I'm sure it will be fully captured because we have awesome stuff. And I will encourage people, if you are able to raise your hand and speak to speak because I don't

---

know why I cannot read when I'm talking, especially when it's not my native language. But yeah, so I'll just read out what was, John, please.

JOHN MCCABE:

Since you asked, I will do that. I just asked the question in the chat, is this something that we can come back, that can come back and bite us later on in the process? Or should we just go and get on it right away given that we are in waiting mode and allow the process to play out? In other words, start it and get the feedback and figuring it may take four months because at this point, I don't think we have so much that we're doing that we can't be analyzing feedback and getting it. That's just my personal thought on the matter. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Sorry, feedback on what?

JOHN MCCABE:

On what the SOs and the ACs have, if they have feedback, what has been proposed as opposed to making it optional, let's just proceed and see whether we get much back and anything that's worth dealing with. My sense is that right now we're not working at optimal, I don't know, we're not dealing with moving forward right now because we're waiting for input from above, let's say. Okay, so that was just my question is, should we just do it rather than making it optional? That's my question. Thank you.

---

MANJU CHEN: Now I understand, John. Thank you. So I think the way that we're doing it the reason why it was suggested in the PSR is because in previous PDPs or EPDPs, there were not much really early input when they did early input process. That's why they suggest of its representation model, maybe it's a good idea to eliminate that and that's why we're discussing it now. And Peter, I see your hand again.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks. So whether we make it optional or not, it depends on metrics of early input, whether that is a working group to understand the context and the perspective of different community or the subject of the matter. And if it does not help in any way and the procedure matter, then we might need to make it optional. But if it is helped to understand the context in different situations, so perspective of different constituency and have the PDP to understand the subject matter, then it will be critical to really look at that and see if we can shorten that or rather making it optional. So I want us to look at that and see, maybe staff can help and see whether they want us to look at that and see, maybe staff can help and see whether they want us to look at that and see, this is actually early input as a PDP to understand the subject matter or the scope of the conversation.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Peter. So I think what we mean by making it optional is now it's mandatory. So the, what we're saying to make it optional is that it's something we will decide. Well, not we, it's something GNSO Council will decide in the future with their charting or working group to see if

---

they need this process and the policy development process, either it's EPDP, PDP, or GGP. So that actually addresses your concerns, because optional doesn't mean that some will, like, automatically, some process will automatically omit the input process. It just means that whenever the GNSO Council in the future, when they're chartering a working group, they will decide according to, you know, the model of the working group and the issue that they're going to elaborate and the scope of the policy issues, that whether there is a need for the early input process. So I think that will, I think this could address your, the concerns you just raised. And I am aware that we only have eight minutes left in this call. Let's see what we have next and see if we can finish that.

Probably we won't be able to finish this, but we will try and we will continue whatever, whenever we are cut off at time. So the next point, the next potential ways of improving is to improve working practice. For example, lessons learned activities. So while the EPDP on temp spec did better, was that they, there was, well, not did better, or like, what they did to kind of increase their, improve their efficiency were, for example, they had a representative membership model that we have discussed thoroughly in this call. And also they have more frequent face-to-face meetings. They have extended calls. They have, I remember at the end, probably they were having two hours calls or like twice a week meetings. And they have external facilitations or outside legal advice. I also remember in the phase one of, well, which is temp spec, they actually had someone like a, like a person who were very good, who was very good at mediating or like facilitating conversations to kind of try to help to fix the, there were a lot of deadlock in the EPDP phase

one. So that was what they did. And they, that kind of things helped to improve their efficiencies. But I think what Steve was saying is that, that, that they had to pay a lot of money to get this external facilitation and legal advice. But yeah, that's what it costs to have global DNS policies, I guess.

And lesson learned activities. We have been doing this also, and this was actually the Working Group Survey self-assessment. The Working Group Self-Assessment, WGSA, was actually a product of the previous body of SCCI, which is CCOICI. And I think we started doing this for starting the IDN EPDP Working Group. And the survey results, I think, just came out and probably will be distributed later to the wider community when it's ready. So the second one is definitely something we're already doing. Next slide, please. I guess this part is also like, we've already done something good. And how do we do it better? Or how do we make sure that in the future we follow the great practices that we already had? And so for the implementations, improve working practice, like, you know, from our past experience, what worked, what doesn't, we have to keep the knowledge, we have to pass it on to the next Working Groups, next Council, those kind of things. And lesson learned activities. Ensure that the self-assessments include questions about lesson learned. This, I might rely on Steve to explain more about what this means, because are we asking Working Group members to share what lessons they learned from participating in the Working Group in the future?

---

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Manju. This is Steve. I think you got that, essentially. In the design of the survey that gets sent around to Working Group members, this line is just saying to make sure that there's some questions that are in the nature of lessons learned. So maybe as simple as that. Hopefully that helps. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: So do we agree that this could be some ways to make sure that we keep the good practice and keep the continuous improvement going on in the future? Does these possible implementation steps look good to everyone? I'm not seeing objections, so I think we can capture this also in our future report to the Council as our recommendations. And as I said, when the draft is ready, we will definitely review it again together to make sure it's reflected honestly what we discussed during the meeting. We have only two minutes left. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Hi. Thank you. I appreciate that. I wanted to ask a question. When we look at this that's on the screen right now, is this what we're doing right now, the improved working practices, ensure that Working Groups and Working Group leadership are aware of different working practices available where the timeline of our work might benefit from those practices? Is that sort of what we're doing in this today?

MANJU CHEN: I think no. I think this is a recommendation that we will forward to the Council and for them to kind of make sure it happens in the future.

Okay. So this is the page right now that we're looking at? And this is the page that we're looking at right now. Okay. So this is the page right now that we're looking at? And this is what we have already been doing. Today, right? Okay. And is that a summarization of it or not? Steve, please, you have your hand raised. I think he will have answers for your questions.

STEVE CHAN:

Okay. Thanks. This is Steve again. These listed options, they came about, as it says on the slide, from the EPDP on temp spec. And it's also captured in the PSR itself as potential working practices that could be utilized. What this looks like right now, this improved working practice, what it could look like in the future and what it looks like now really is that your staff teams are looking at the work plan, expected timelines, and helping to work with the working group leadership already to make sure that if we do need to move faster or move differently, that the leadership teams are aware of different ways to organize the work. So this probably does happen in practice already. It probably doesn't still hurt to make an explicit recommendation that this needs to be done. But in practice, this really does already happen when we see that there needs to be some pushing and pulling to maybe help a working group work more efficiently. Thanks.

JOHN MCCABE:

Thank you. And can I ask a follow-up question real quick? Do you think it's due to the nature of this EPDP? that it is more internally focused. It's really, you know, sort of a self-looking-in-the-mirror kind of thing for the

---

---

community, as opposed to something that impacts the broader community, that it's maybe not as controversial or whatever. I mean, it's easier to, let's say, for example, to skip certain steps.

MANJU CHEN: So far, Steve has dropped too, because we have another GNSO PDP right at the start of the hour. I will encourage you, John, to, can you bring this question to the list, so staff can answer you more in depth and more elaborately in text?

JOHN MCCABE: That's okay. I'm going to let it go. I'll let it go, and we'll see where things go. Thank you so much, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Sorry about that. I'm sorry for running over two minutes. Let's just quickly see like next step, which is like, I don't know which page. Yes, GNSO Council will confirm the project plan for SCCI this week in our council meeting, and also the assignment forms. Please remember to go to your agencies to seek input and feedback on the CIP criteria, and next week, we will continue to review the PNI PSR. Thank you very much, and sorry again for overrunning for two minutes. I'll see you guys next week. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**