
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 14th of May, 2025. We do have tentative list of apologies from Jennifer Chung. 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 no one, if you do need assistance, please email the--

HONG-FU (TOM) MENG: I apologize. I've updated my SOI recently. Just some minor updates on the working groups and those updates on some of the interests of reflecting registrar interests that Netrunner is operating. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Hong-Fu. That is all noted. All right, seeing or hearing no further, 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. 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.

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. Hello, everyone. Let's get started. Move to the next slide, please. Welcome and SOIs. We had the SOI update. And today, my welcome, I'd like to remind everybody, drink your water, eat your protein. And here's our agenda.

We're going to do a recap of the last meeting because two weeks ago, probably we all forgot what happened. So, we're going to do a short recap. After that, we'll continue on the Review of Policy and Implementation Policy Status Review. And what is left is the review of the PSR Analysis on GGP and on GIP. And after this, we'll look at next steps. And at the end, we will have AOB.

Next slide, please. So, for Meeting 6, we reviewed the P&I, which is Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report and its analysis on GGP, and we did discuss several analysis. But for the key action items, the first two ones has been the standing ones, so we're not going to repeat that.

But the third one, we updated it too in the last call, which is we're going to pause on working on the criteria indicators of the Continuous Improvement Framework or Continuous Improvement Program. Because the CIP-CCG, which stands for the Continuous Improvement Program Cross-Community Group, they are reviewing the public comments they receive for the CIF, I guess, because it's Continuous Improvement Framework. And while they're reviewing it, there's no point for us to work on the criteria indicators because anything might change during the review.

So, we're waiting on more guidance from both the CCG and ICANN Org. But in the meanwhile, as we have been doing, we will review the P&I PSR, and hopefully we will wrap up the review in this call or before last call. Let's move on. This is the updated timeline. CIP has been moved a little bit towards the later part of the year. And we were expecting to do the whole review all the way until quite late, but we have been making great progress. So hopefully we'll finish the PSR review a bit sooner than expected.

Next slide, please. And for the next two calls, so we're having this Meeting 7 now, and next meeting will be next Wednesday at the same time. And hopefully by next meeting, we'll finish all the discussions so we can have a break or taking some time off starting the 28th of May. And we won't have meetings because expecting that at least like at worst, we're going to finish at 28th of May. And so, we won't have meeting on 4th of June and 9th of June. 4th of June, we were not planning to have meeting anyways. And we're expecting to wrap up before the end of May. So, we won't have meeting when we're in Prague either. Stopping here to see if any questions.

JOHN MCCABE:

I have a question, Manju. It's not the 9th of June. I think it's the 11th of June. It's Wednesday, correct?

MANJU CHEN:

Because we're going to be doing Prague, so like the original slot we have applied for is 9th of June, which is like the first day of the policy forum.

But since we're expecting to wrap up our work by the meeting of 28th of May, we are not expecting to have meeting on the 9th of June.

JOHN MCCABE: Okay. So, it wouldn't have been on Wednesday during ICANN. It would have been on Monday. The allocated slot was Monday in Prague, yes?

MANJU CHEN: Exactly.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you so much.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. So, I hope that also answered your question too, Anne, in the chat. Because we are wrapping up, so there's no work for us to do while we're in Prague. Okay. Seeing no further questions, let's move on. So, we have already finished the review of EPDP. We have one last piece of analysis of the GGP and hopefully we'll finish it today and move on to the GIP, the GNSO Input Process.

Next slide, please. So, these are the agreement thus far, but these are not the agreement. These are the analysis from the PSR. Next slide, please. This is our agreement achieved from reviewing the PSR analysis. So overall, we think there is supposed to be a clear message on all processes because people just generally are not as clear as those who are totally super process-oriented about why PDP is a PDP or why EPDP

is an EPDP. So, we thought it's worth our effort to try to clarify what are the differences and why certain issues, the Council would choose certain process for certain issues. So, that's a clear message on all processes.

And on GGP, we found the analysis that there needs to be more comprehensive targets for GGP, not an issue to solve. But as explained in the first item, we definitely think that a clear message, clear explanation of what GGP is and what it's supposed to do will help to clarify this, let's say, misunderstanding of what GGP is supposed to be doing. Again, for the timeline and rules, we are expecting the clearer explainer of what GGP is and what it's supposed to do will solve this issue instead of trying to fix whatever is mentioned in the analysis.

So actually, all of the four messages on all of the four items, I think in this team, we all agree that instead of addressing issue per issue, it's just easier and it's more comprehending if we just do a clearer message explainer of what all the processes is. And hopefully that will actually, from the root, resolve all the issues that have been raised because some of them I believe we also see them as not really issues, but just a misalignments amongst parties within ICANN. Okay. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

All right. Thanks, Manju. Sorry to miss the last call. There was a great discussion on communication in terms of creating a misalignment. The only super concrete thing that I wanted to say about communication is that I think we should be recommending that the GNSO liaison guidelines, we need to add GGP to that because I think it's not in there.

And there's a strong role for the Council liaison to the GGP to be involved in this communication to avoid a misalignment of expectations and to keep Council informed of anything that's going awry. And so, I believe when I looked at that liaison, right up that, it specifically addresses working groups separately from IRT. And I think we need a GGP section because we had liaison. So, that would be an improvement.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Anne. Great suggestion. We can definitely capture that in our recommendation report. Yes, like you said, I believe we actually had a liaison on the GGP on Applicant Support. I believe it was Paul. So, we actually did it, but it's not mandated in the process in a sense. And it's good that we add this and have it on paper, so in the future people will know they actually need to assign a liaison to the GGP.

Next slide, please. So, for this agreement thus far, because we were trying to clarify what processes are for and what are the differences between them. And to do that, we have this table that try to create a more comprehensive visual thing, which is next slide, please. Well, I said "we". Actually, of course, it's always our awesome staff who did it. So, thank you very much for your hard work.

And this is the current draft to showcase the differences between different process. Just to know that this is a very draft. This is not the final version, of course, because it's for our discussions purpose. And although I think they look already very nice now, I think they are going to do a more beautifying process on this to make it more, I don't know,

visually impressive. But this is just for discussion purpose. So, let's just, I guess, go over through each process and see if we think there are adjustments that can be made.

So, if we start from the left, you can see that only GGP, EPDP and PDP are captured in the bylaws. That's why there's this tiny bylaws at the super left-hand side. And then we move from bylaws to this policymaking. So, we can see only EPDP and PDP are considered a process for making policies. And then we can see the PDP has the most comprehensive steps. If you can put it that way.

It starts with a preliminary issue report. And then there will be a public comment on this preliminary issue report. After that, there's going to be a final issue report. And this part, after receiving the final issue reports, the Council will make a decision to initiate a PDP. And the tool, in a sense, the Council use to initiate the PDP is the charter. So, they will have a charter for the PDP. That's why I can see this little slide thing on the initiation part.

Once they start the PDP, the working group will request for all inputs and then they'll start doing their deliberations, which is not really captured here because these steps are actually another, I guess you can say, another attempt of visualization of the Z diagram. That's why here we're only capturing what is in that Z diagram. So initial report. And of course, there will be a public comment period, for the initial report. And then after that, long period of deliberations, which is not captured here either, because again, this is just another way of presenting the Z diagram.

The Council, GNSO Council will make a decision on the final report. And then they will send a recommendation report to the Board. Before Board vote on the final report, they will open a public comment on the final report. And then if they approve the final report, then the policy recommendations will go into implementation. That's PDP.

And you can see for EPDP, you really just cut short of the issue report process and starts directly with the Council initiating PDP with a charter. So, these are the policy making process, policy development process, like we always call it. I'm stopping here, pausing here to see if we have any questions. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Thank you. It's Anne. I just wanted to distinguish that maybe it makes sense on the chart to separate one and two from three and four because GGP is not a policy making process. And sometimes people don't understand that. And certainly, GIP is also not a policy making process. And so, it could be a bit confusing if there's just one chart that gathers those all four together. The top two are policy making and the bottom two are implementation, questions only or questions from the Board. They're not policy making processes.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Anne. Definitely, we can make that change. And just to, again, to remind all of us, this is actually for discussion purpose. I think we are expecting in the future, they're going to look quite different and definitely we'll take this, we'll note this and remember to keep the

policy making processes and the non-policy making processes separate so just to avoid confusion for readers.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. So, I think another reason why we chose to do this as a four parallel track is to just show there are some parts that all of the processes have and there are some steps that is not necessarily in the process because for different purposes of the processes. And that's why we thought this gives a clear impression of what is and what is not in each process.

And just to note that—I forgot to mention this—if you see on the EPDP track, the request for early input is in this dotted line instead of a solid line. It's because I think we discussed this in our previous calls that saying depending on the issue and depending on the formation of the working group for an EPDP, we are suggesting that these steps should be not mandatory. When the Council chartering the working group, they should be able to have the freedom to choose whether to include this in the EPDP. That's this part.

And for GGP, as Anne has pointed out, it's not a policy making process. And the initiation will be, I don't know if you guys can see it, but it says "initial requests" in that super little red flag thing, or yellow flag with red text. So, you can already see the difference now between the GGP and the PDPs. I'm saying PDPs to include EPDPs. It's initiated by an

initiation request, not a charter, but then it also has to have an initial report of public comments, final report.

And another thing is that when the final report is done and delivered to the Board after the GNSO Council approves it, the Board doesn't have to open it for public comments again. So, it's a shortened process in a sense. But again, it's not a policy making process, so it make sense that it doesn't have to go to public comments again. And the GIP, GNSO Input Process, is a process that has never been used. And you can see the difference between it and GGP is that it doesn't go to the Board. It only has GNSO Council decision and then it goes straight into implementation. So, this is the visual that we're working on now and appreciate all of the suggestions until now. But also, just pausing here to see if we have any more suggestions or questions. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE:

Thank you, Manju. I put it in the chat. I just suggested that because, yes, those policymaking and the notation of policymaking and bylaws are in the left, in the horizontal, on the vertical and the policymaking refers to the top two and the bylaws refers to the top three. So, it might make sense if we want to just emphasize that the two top ones are policymaking is perhaps to put a, instead of that, just the fine line, like a bold broken line between the EPDP and the GGP. But that's just a suggestion. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, John. Well noted. Anne, please. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Manju. I was having trouble coming off mute. So, I see the Board vote over under GGP. And, of course, there are a lot of very specific provisions regarding what applies to the Board vote in the GGP, and we don't need to get into those here. I'm curious on GIP, which we've never done. I certainly don't think there's any assumption that a GIP automatically moves to implementation.

That's where I'm hung up a little bit on the chart because I do think a GIP, one of the main reasons for it would be a Board request for input. We haven't really been using it that way because what happens is the board writes to Council and says, what do you think? And it's a bit of cumbersome process. I mean, the GIP is, but I don't know if the chart's right because it doesn't go directly from a final report to implementation. So, I think we need to look at that.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne. I personally I'm not the expert of this. I guess I'll rely on staff to clarify. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Manju, and thanks, Anne, for the question. This is Steve. I think it's probably just maybe a stylistic thing where we're lining up the vertical steps as implementation. So, some of these descriptions might be a little bit generous for the GIP in that sense. So even describing the initial report as initial report is probably also a little generous. I think it's a GNSO input is the way it's described in the manual. And the public

comment is discretionary. It's not required. So, that could probably be in maybe a dotted line. And then that would give rise to a final GNSO input rather than a report.

And then, so I think it's helpful what you just mentioned about what sort of things would go through a GIP. So, one of the things could be, as you mentioned, a request for input from the Board. And another example, I think in the manual is the development of public comment on the GNSO Council's behalf. So, if you think of those things as what would be the implementation, it could be the formulation of a piece of correspondence to the Board. It could be a response to public comment. That's what the implementation would be in the case of a GIP. Hope that helps. Thanks.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, thanks, Steve. As we understand implementation, that's a very different reference. And so, it probably should say input in that pink box at the end rather than implementation because all the things that you described, and I agree that the boxes should be re-labeled in the ways that you described. I think the end box on the right has to say input, not implementation.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne. Thank you, Steve. I think we can definitely brainstorm more on what to say in the end box. I was going to suggest in chat to say outcome, which is probably the same as input. But, yeah, it's just a result of this process. I guess input is a good word because it's

in the process name already. Yes, let's take that into consideration. Peter, please.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Manju, and thanks for staff putting this together in a simplified manner. Just wanted to clarify, is this for our own internet conversations for us to understand the process and see where improvement or we're recommending this, this will be part of our recommendation? I just wanted to get a clarity.

MANJU CHEN: I guess what we're planning to do is to show this to you guys first and discuss improvement. This will be provided as an example or a visualization in our recommendation to how we suggest to improve further communications. So, this is not going to be the final product, as in it's not going to be the one we use to communicate with the community. But it could be possible that we are including this in our recommendation report to the Council as an example of this is what we think that should be done and you can do it better, but it should at least follow these visualizations or these clarifying messages. I hope that helps.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, that helps. Then what other colleagues have pointed out that we need to actually separate the PDP stuff from the other non-policy making process. We can have it in one image, but we need to sort of have a demarcation for people to understand what the EPDP and GGP

and GIP is and if we can have a notation also explaining that, that will be good. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, thank you. Thank you very much, totally. We have been having a lot of valuable suggestions so far. I believe our excellent staff will be capturing all of them. And again, this is for our discussion's purpose and as I suggested, if we have it in the recommendation report, it's not going to be saying that this is what's going to go out. This is simply a way for us to demonstrate to Council that we think these are the parts that are supposed to be clarified or we need to explain further.

So yeah, I'm not seeing any new hand, so let's move on to next step. So, like I said, we still have a final piece of analysis from the PSR on GGP. And this is to discuss whether the GNSO Council might consider providing more direction on the level of detail and guidance appropriate for the GGP as well as encourage more direct community involvement in the GGP process to help refine the GGP process in the future.

So here, the bottom of the slides are texts from the report. Probably a bit paraphrasing, but mostly just honestly copy and paste. The first one is suggesting the initial request to be changed to require the requester to vote by supplementary information. And this, the second bullet point is in general, comments suggested. So just to know that when it says comments suggested, it means that these input, this analysis did not come from the org, it comes from public comments. So more direct community involvement came from public comments. There are people from public comments suggest that GGP needs more direct community

involvement. But the first bullet point, like a clearer request and the initial request is from the org. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you so much, Manju, for distinguishing there. The question to staff on the first one is about how we can make this change. I recall the GGP process and one individual councilor can initially make a request and has to supply certain specific information. Are we suggesting something here that means that these additional information or further expansion of the detail of that information? Is staff thinking we would be amending the GGP process to do this? And would that need a bylaws amendment?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne. I think this is a great segue to the next slide. Because we are actually-- This is what is now included in the initial request. And looking at this, I think for us, the question we have to discuss, or the issue we've discussed is like, is this comprehensive enough and do we think we have to make it better according to staff's suggestions in the PSR? How can we improve it?

And one of the suggestions—I guess we will see on the next slide too, but we'll move to that later—is probably instead of an initiation request, we can actually do a charter for the GGP, just so everything is more clearly written down. So yeah, that's a great segue for our further discussion of this analysis. Thank you, Anne, again.

So, let's just see through, like read through quickly what is included in the initial request of GGP now. First will be the name of Council member or SG or C that initiated this request. And then there's going to be the origin of the issue. For example, the Board requests some clarifications on some issues, or for example, IRT is having problems regarding some recommendations in the policy recommendation report.

And then there will be the scope of the effort, which is a detailed description of the issue or questions that the GGP is expected to address. And then there will be the proposed GGP mechanism, for example, working group, drafting team, or individual volunteers. And then there's the method of operations. I guess it's all whether there's a chair, there are two vice chairs, those kind of things. And then the decision-making methodology, how consensus is assessed. And then at the end is the desired completion date and rationale for this date. So, this is what is currently in the initiation request.

And how do we make it more comprehensive or add more detailed description under each title? I think that's a discussion we can have. Let's move on to the next slide first. So, should further detail to be added in the initial request? If so, what more information other than those suggested, like already in there? What do we think? But yeah, let me see Anne's comment in the chat first. So, the major recommendation change is to add a charter. That was not there. This is in place of what is now described as scope of effort question to be addressed.

I think staff will be in a better position to answer why they think-- Well, I won't say they think because I don't want to put words in their mouth. Why we suggest using charter instead of an initial request might be considered by the team. But yeah, can I rely on our wonderful Steve, please?

STEVE CHAN:

All right. Thanks, Manju. And thanks, Anne, for the question, which will help clarify. This is Steve from staff. And I think we usually try not to distinguish staff. Staff is all here to help support the community and the multi-stakeholder model. But in this case, it's maybe helpful to distinguish. It was primarily the GDS staff that provided the analysis in the PSR versus what is on this page, which primarily comes from your support staff that's on this call.

So, with that in mind, they helped identify the issues. And what we as your support staff for the GNSO identified in preparing the, oh, I guess helping prepare the GGP initiation request for the one and only time it was used for the Applicant Support Program. What we found ourselves doing was basically putting all the components that you would normally find in a charter into the initiation request, which for us felt like it was overloading that form.

And so, from our experience, it seemed like it maybe made more sense to keep the initiation request a little more clean and simple, but then capture all the essentially the governance and mechanisms for how the GGP would operate in what is usually used, or in other words, a charter. So, I guess to answer your question, I think what your GNSO support

staff would recommend is actually keep the initiation request at more or less as is, but separate out the charter and have that as a standalone document that's inspired by the initiation request. I hope that helps. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Can I try to understand it? Are we saying that so we're going to have a simpler and shorter, more succinct initiation request? And after the initiation, there's going to be a more comprehensive and detailed charter for the GGP.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Manju. Saewon, can you go back a couple of pages to the list for the initiation request? Maybe this will help. All right. So, by way of example, let's say it talks about method of operation, if different from GNSO working group guidelines. For the initiation request, something like this could be same as GNSO working group guidelines. It could just be a yes, for instance, here in the initiation request. Whereas the charter, you would potentially detail out what that means.

And then maybe same for the decision-making guidelines. It could just be a yes initiation request. Whereas in the charter, you would actually lay out what that decision making process is. So yeah, the idea that's floating around, at least in my head, at 5:45 with way too much jet lag is keep this form simple but then elaborate in the charter itself.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Steve. I think it makes sense. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks. Yeah, it makes sense. The question there, two questions, I guess, in relation to this proposal. Again, the GDP and how you initiate one and the steps that are taken, those are codified in the bylaws. And so, I think, Steve, we would need a very specific proposal regarding when the charter process and charter approval process, how it fits in these steps or later steps. Because I think you're going to have to, one, we will have to get public comment on that. And two, we'd have to amend Annex A2 to the bylaws. That's what I think. So, initially, I was looking at, well, is there a way to add a charter without having to amend the bylaws? But I think staff is going to have to take that back and see, because I think each of these steps is codified in Annex A2.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne. There was only one question.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Well, the two questions were public comment on the suggestion.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, okay, okay.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. And the second was amend the bylaws. I see why it would be useful. I do see why it would be useful. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, yes. So, I guess our question now is whether we can do this without changing the bylaw. I don't know if we just-- And I think by public comment you mean that if we're changing it, that means we're changing the bylaw. We need to have a public comment on this, right?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Well, whether or not you have to amend the bylaws, I think you want a public comment on it. And definitely if you have to change the bylaws, yeah, I think the bylaws lay out these steps. I'm trying to remember in Policy and Implementation Working Group, why staff advised us that GDP would have to go into the bylaws. There was a specific reason for that. And so, now that it's in the bylaws, if the process changes, I think the bylaws might need to change, but that's a staff and a legal question.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne. I see, Steve, you have your hand up.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Manju. Steve again. I was actually part of Policy and Implementation Working Group, but I confess it was like one of the first things I supported. And I really don't remember exactly the precise reasons, but I would guess that the reason why the GDP needs to be captured in the bylaws is because it requires Board action. And that's primarily, I think it's why it would need to therefore be captured in the bylaws.

As to whether or not the addition of a charter would require an amendment to that section of the bylaws. I don't think it actually

would. Section 2 of that annex talks about a GNSO Guidance Process manual, which is developed and stored on the GNSO's site, or it's developed by the GNSO and stored on the GNSO's website. So, in other words, I think that addition of a charter could just be captured in the GNSO Guidance Process manual, which is managed by the GNSO Council itself. So, that all said, I see your hand up again. I think what we can do is take some homework and make sure that my very quick analysis is correct. But yeah, thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Steve. It's a tentative good news, I guess. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. Steve, annex A2 of the bylaws is the specific process. So be sure to take a hard look at that. Annex A2 of the bylaws lays out step-by-step, as far as I know.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne, for the reminder. Seeing now we only have nine minutes of the call, I guess we are-- I'm not seeing any other strong objections or whatsoever to now the suggested path forward, which I feel like is that we add a charter. We made the initiation request shorter and more succinct. And then we do a charter for the GGP that clearly lays out the details and expectations of this GGP.

And of course, one of the key action items for us or for staff after this meeting is to check intensively whether we need to change the bylaw to that. And I guess we're hoping that it wouldn't require a bylaw change.

We can just add it because it's going to be more about adjusting the GNSO operating procedures rather than what is in the bylaw. And if we all agree that this is a path forward, can I see if any last-minute objections? Oh, okay. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, please don't forget the step of public comment.

MANJU CHEN: I think it's for the Council to decide whether they're going to have a public comment, right? I think you're suggesting that after we have this recommendation report to the Council, the report itself will have to go through public comments. Is that why you're--

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Well, I mean, I don't know if-- Well, maybe that's the answer. I don't know if recommendations that come straight out of something that's already had public comment, if we want to distinguish those in any way. I'm just saying that, for example, a recommendation, a good recommendation like this coming from staff, if we all like it, it still is something that has not, as far as I know, seen specific public comment. Just take "add a charter phase to the GDP". Well, everyone thinks that's pretty non-controversial, but process-wise, it hasn't had public comment, as far as I know.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, but I guess, in a sense, I will think of this as a decision to be made by Council because this will be our recommendation to the Council, and it depends on the Council if they see fit to open this to public comment. In the past, the CCOICI report to the Council has never been open to public comment. Were there? No, they were asking, I might be wrong. I'm waiting to be corrected, but I'm not seeing hands raised.

I believe they were input, but it's input from the holder groups and constituencies because our representatives here are supposed to go back and deliver their whatever is discussed here to their SG and C and come back with input of their SG and C, and in a sense, it's fully representative. But yeah, like I said, I think this is a decision to be made by the Council, not for us, and we can definitely have this discussion again once the recommendation report is ready, and when we're reviewing it, we can discuss again, I guess.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Yeah, I think that this team would have a role in whether or not we recommend public comment. And because of the fact that there are suggestions that are coming straight from staff and that have not had public comment, I think we need to be saying that public comment on the report is in order.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. I think we're four minutes to the end. Probably won't have time for GIP after all. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE:

Thank you, Manju. I just dropped something in the chat about asking Steve if perhaps he would volunteer to look up the GGP Annex A2, I believe Anne mentioned, and let us have a little bit of debriefing on that when we next meet. But I would also like to request if anybody-- I'm a little bit weak in my referencing, researching, and going back into source documents, so if there's somebody who would be willing to tutor me in that, I don't know whether it would be Steve or somebody on staff or somebody in the group, I would appreciate it. Because I'm not very sure about how to get into the ICANN, the bowels of ICANN documentation and find certain things and look at source documents, so I'll put that out there for a volunteer at some future point, please. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, John. Yes, we note that Steve will take a good look at Annex A2. With three minutes left of the meeting, let's get the GIP part. We'll deal with that in the next meeting, and let's move to next step. So, next step is really we're just going to continue to review the P&I PSR in next meeting. In next meeting, hopefully we'll only deal with GIP, GNSO Input Process, and hopefully we'll be done by the end of next meeting. And Next. Do we have any AOB? I'm not seeing any AOB, not any hand up. And with that, I'll gladly give you two minutes of your life back. Thank you, everyone, for attending this meeting. I'll see you next week, and be prepared to finish the work next week, please. Let's get on with it. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
