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 16th of April, 2025. We do have listed apologies from Anne Aikman-Scalese and Chris Buckridge.

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 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 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 over to your chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Terri. Thank you very much. Let's move to the next slide. Just an overview of our agenda today. We did our work on SOIs, and next we're going to do the recap. After recap, of course, we'll continue the discussions. And then by the end of the meeting, we'll review Next Steps, then we'll see if anyone has any AOBs. Let's move to the next slide, please.

So for recap, last week we reviewed the P&I PSR, which is the Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report, and we only got to review part of the EPDP, Expedited Policy Development Process, part of the recommendations. And we have several key action items after the meeting. For example, staff has very awesomely captured the key outcomes of our discussions last week, and we definitely will continue to review the PSR. Also, we will ask our members with stakeholder groups or constituencies to continue reviewing the CIP, Continuous Improvement Programs Criteria. And we also, last week, presented the project plan and assignment forms to the Council, and it was approved. Next slide, please.

Just also, like a reminder, I guess we do this every meeting just to make sure we know where we are and where we're progressing our progress. We're still doing the Policy Implementation, PSR review. At some point, we're going to move on to this, CIP Part 2. As we have repeatedly said, we'll have to see. We're still awaiting more guidance from ICANN Org to see where we are and how do we start doing Part 2 work. Let's move on to the next slide.

So, an important note. Next week, we're not going to have a meeting because we're having some ICANN engagement event in Taiwan, and it's going to be a week-long thing. I'll be quite busy, probably not be able to chair the meeting. And also, I've checked with staff. We are on progress, and actually, we're a bit ahead of our progress, so it's okay that we take a week off. And on 7th of May, we know that the CP Summit in Hanoi, and also there's a concurring event, which is the APAC DNS Forum. A lot of us probably will be in Vietnam and won't be able to make the call. And as we've suggested, we are ahead of schedule, so

we thought it would be okay if we take two, well, not continuously, not consecutively, but we're taking these two weeks off, the 23rd of April and 7th of May.

And also, to note that on 14th of May, we're going to discuss the feedback of the Continuous Improvement Program Criteria. We've noted a lot of requests for extensions on the mailing list, so we gladly grant that, especially that, as we're saying, there's no hurry about this. We're moving slowly as we expect more guidance from ICANN Org. Let's just still have a goal. I think that would be better for us to have a deadline and know where we're going.

So just keep in mind that on the 14th of May, we're going to discuss the feedback from the stakeholder groups and constituencies about the CIP criteria. By then, please be prepared to share your feedback, your stakeholder groups and constituencies' insights of this topic. And I see Géry is noting in chat those people who haven't accepted their prompt. Please accept your prompt to become a panelist.

Okay, let's move on to the next slide. Let's see what we're going to do today. We are going to finish what we have left off. We are finishing the review of the PSR on EPDP. And then if we finish in time, we will definitely move on to GGP. There is just a small part of EPDP that we haven't reviewed. So we're most probably are going to do the GNSO Guidance Process thing. Let's move on to the next slide. And this is just a recap of what is in the PSR and what the Policy and Implementation Work Group in 2015 had done. Next slide, please.

Okay, this is a recap of what we have agreed last week. For example, in the PSR, it says that, although EPDP do contribute to shorter overall timeframe, the community still have this kind of misunderstanding or misconception of what EPDP means. And we last week agreed as a group that there's really no need to change the name of EPDP, just to make sure that the difference between PDP and EPDP is clear. And to make sure of that, of course, we will develop talking points for broader community, explaining that the only difference or like the major difference of PDP and EPDP is that the EPDP doesn't require an issue report.

And I think I did raise this in the chat last week too, like how to explain the distinction between PDP and EPDP, like how to explain why an issue report is needed or not. So, during the leadership discussion, we looked into this issue and actually in the, is it PDP 3.0, GNSO PDP 3.0 manual, there is explanation of when there's no need for an issue report. Of course, there are circumstances where it's more of like the decision of the GNSO Council at that time, that they feel like whether the issue is already thoroughly explored enough for them to already have the scope in mind without having to request for an issue report. And I guess our text here is discuss how do we explain this context in a more layman friendly way. And yeah, I think Ajith will correct me when I capture her meaning wrong. Please, Ajith.

AJITH FRANCIS: Thanks, Manju. No, I think you've got the gist of it. I just wanted to just provide an additional context of also. I think I was coming at it from the perspective of, since we are going to be communicating about the

distinction between the PDP and EPDP, I think it is also part of that communication should also be when is it EPDP or what are the thresholds when an issue report is not necessarily required. So also in whatever communication speeds to clarify that there are set thresholds for when an issue report is not required and only then is an EPDP trigger. So it's not also that it's largely based on a judgment call. So clarifying that, and giving some more context in the talking points would be useful.

MANJU CHEN:
Thank you, Ajith. Yes, I am sure we'll be capturing that in our report later. And Steve has helpfully put in the link where as we were suggesting, there are this applicability, well, whatever that thing that explains where an issue report is not needed. But of course, as I said, we try to make it more accessible to everyone for them to understand easily the distinction.

And for whether additional guidelines are necessary, we felt like since we have improved already based on a previous experience, it's not really necessary to add any additional guidelines, especially for the Latin Diacritics. If people are confused with the acronyms, LD means Latin Diacritics. Seeing the charter, we think we've already achieved this. So there's no need to take further action. I'll pause there and see if we have any more suggestions or questions. No? Let's move on to the next slide.

We also discussed whether to eliminate the requirement of early input. And we decided that to make it optional in cases such as when the

working group model is representative. And we also learned a sample of, for example, IDN EPDP is a mixture hybrid model where they have representative, but they also have members. And also Latin Diacritics, it's not a representative model. So there was early input process in place. And we thought it would be a good idea for the working group or Council at that time when they're chartering the working group to decide whether to have a process of early input to improve efficiency in a sense.

And then for the improved work practice, we agreed that we will ensure the working groups and leadership in the future are more aware of the different working practices available. Also just to reinforce, the lesson learned and of experience, we will ensure in the-- here again, as you're confused with the acronym is the Working Group Self-Assessment.

Nowadays, when the working group finish their work or in the middle of their effort, they will do a Working Group Self-Assessment just for the working group, and leadership, and also Council to get a picture of how the working group's going. Is there any problem to be fixed? Is there any concerns to be addressed? And this survey and this assessment, we will include questions about lessons learned. Pause here to see if any hands and questions. If no, let's move on. Oh, John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you, Manju. I just wanted to suggest that on this particular slide that's up, the bullet points, the second and third bullet points under each in the blue sections are not very easy to read. Like in the top one, it says, improved wording practices, e.g. lessons learned, activities, and

so forth. They're in gold on light blue and they just don't read very well. So if we could maybe change those, just for clarity. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Sure. Yes, we'll make sure starting next meeting we'll do better slides to make sure all the words are clearly readable.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Sorry, I can't raise my hand. Just a quick comment. This is actually an intentional slide design, believe it or not. And the purpose actually is to make it unreadable. What we were actually trying to do is to highlight which element of these three bullets were concentrated on each box. So the top one, we're talking about only the top bullet and intentionally grained out the bottom two. And then the second one is relevant to the middle one and so on. And in a moment, you'll see that we're concentrating on the third bullet only.

JOHN MCCABE: The focus tool.

STEVE CHAN: Exactly, exactly.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Let's move on to the next slide. So on the enhanced-- Oh yeah, this is a new discussion. John, is that an old hand.

JOHN MCCABE: Sorry, old hand.

MANJU CHEN: Cool. So we've already finished the recap. Now we're moving on new points to review and discuss. So this part is to enhance preparatory activities, for example, chartering and scoping. So in the PSR, they were, of course, suggestions to improve predictability of the working group and how to make chartering and scoping more efficient. For example, there were suggestions to have more robust use of charters and identifications and collection of data. And SME here means Subject Matter Expert Input. And these suggestions are to help prevent engaging in unnecessary work. They feel like if we do those three points, we will be able to prevent unnecessary work.

And also, there were suggestions to enhance structure and governance around EPDP objectives, just to help staff and community to, I guess, communicate better and to ensure that the policy work remains oriented. But just to note that also-- yes, on this slide, it's okay, it's the same. So these suggestions are actually not-- So if you read the report itself, the PSR itself, you will find that in the report, there were actually not only suggestions from ICANN staff, they are also capturing-- the

staff also try to capture what they see from the public comments to the PSR, which means that they will capture what the community feedback to the PSR and put it in the report as a suggestion too. In that sense, it means that these three suggestions are actually not from staff, but from the community and it's from the public comments.

And just to note that also, we have to remind everybody, we don't have to take every suggestion, as in we don't have to accept every suggestion and implement them. We can decide definitely as a group that is in charge of the continuous improvement of GNSO, that this has already been done, or this doesn't apply, or these suggestions is just not as useful as we want it to be. And we can develop our own new suggestions and discard these.

So with that caveat, let's review point by point what was suggested in the PSR about how to enhance the preparations of working group. Okay, so first, the robust use of charters. I don't know if you guys are as confused as I was when I saw this for the first time. But what does it mean to use the charters robustly? And we try to go back to the PSR to read through the text. We feel like it's suggesting actually to just ensure adherence to the charters better when the working group is doing its work.

So this leads to our question of beyond leadership and staff and the working group members, like working together to make sure they are adhering to the charters. Are there more to be done to make sure the charters is robustly used? That will be our question. Or we can also decide that, well, we think it's been used robustly enough. There's no

need to address this concerns whatsoever. And I'll stop here to see if anybody has any reflection on this or suggestions on this. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thanks, Manju. I think what I've noticed is in some of the comments that I've been reviewing is that some people who are well in the know, let's say, are citing to the charters for authorization. It's like a citation to a footnote, if you will. And the idea is, whenever it's possible-- I think this is what I understand, is that whenever it's possible, they're suggesting to cite to something in a charter that supports the proposal that we're putting forward. Somebody else may have commentary on that, but that's what I think it means. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, John. Any other suggestions, opinions, thoughts? I guess to answer a question to all of us, do we think this is a concern that we need to address? I'm not seeing any kind of support in the chat. Probably we can decide later. Well, I mean, I guess people are feeling indifferent about this, and indifferent, in this case, probably leading to no, there's no concerns. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: I think it's just saying that if you suggest doing A and you can say this is in keeping with the charter of such and so and at such and such a point, at 3A, for example, it bolsters the argument for that point. That's what I think it means by robust use of charters, but I could be wrong. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, John. I guess we can decide how to interpret this suggestion, and we can definitely also discard it if we don't feel like it's a concern. And I'm seeing a few, several agreements in the chat of no concerns.

We can probably move to the orange part, which is the identification and pre-collection of data. So they suggest we should be more, I guess, aggressively identifying and pre-collecting data before the working group starting work. But we would also like to note that currently in the charter, the resources are already identified. We can go to actually-- is it possible now we go to the charter template to see the exact paragraph section where we actually ask the working group to identify the data they need before starting work?

Thank you. We can wait. Yes, we patiently wait. We're all mature adult who has no problem waiting. So here in the charter, there's this section specifically on data metrics requirement, and it has four bullet points. Of course, I'm not going to read them all out, but basically it requires the working group to identify and make sure the collection of the data they need for developing policy recommendations. So I guess in a sense, we've already done that in the charter. So that thing, pre-collection of data and identifying data, is that a concern that we need to address still, or we think this already addressed the concerns and it shouldn't be a problem anymore?

Seeing no hands and no objections, I think we will agree that actually this part of the charter already addressed the concern and we don't need any further action on that suggestion. Let's move back to the

slides. Sorry to make you keep changing the screen. Whoa, so much faster this time.

Okay, so we've finished the blue part and the orange part, both of which we think we agree that actually the issues has been solved, or we have already improved to the point that these concerns are no longer valid. Let's move to the second part. Oh, I'm so sorry, the green part. It's the subject matter experts input. We might have to go back to the charter template. I'm so sorry, but I'll just talk when Steve tried to move us to the charter template again. So actually, in the charter template, when there's a section in the charter template which calls for the criteria of working group members, it already suggested in that section that if there's a requirement or if the working group identified the need, they can require for subject matter expertise. And I think we will see this text in here.

Yes, expert contributions. So it's not expected. The experts are not expected to participate in the consensus, but if needed, the working group can request, make a request to the Council and Council will be able to use an independent evaluation process to identify the experts and bring them into the working group to provide experts' opinion. So this in a sense, it's also already in place and it's in the charter template and the Council will, depending on the situation, context of the issues, decide whether to put this. And of course, the working group can also, when they feel the need, they can always make a request to the Council probably by the council liaison to request a subject matter expert and to bring in the expert opinion to the working group discussions.

So should we say that this concern is already addressed in the current charter template? Seeing no objections, I feel like we probably agree. Thank you, Prudence. Thank you, people, for echoing my opinion or agreeing of our assessment. So we can move back to the slides. Again, sorry if I keep changing the screen for everybody.

Just wanted to make sure that we know it's there in the charter template, and we know the concerns are being sufficiently addressed. So I guess the slides, we can agree that all three of these suggestions or community feedback has already been suggested, because we've already improved by past experience. Peter, please.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Manju. Sorry for bringing us back. Just wanted to, like, on the procedure for this subject matter. Do we have to, or we just said, there is no need to review that process? Or do we need? Is it part of the scope of this to review the process for the recruiting subject matter for working group? Just a question or clarification.

MANJU CHEN: Sorry, can you say the question again? I'm not sure I get it.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, the question's with regards to subject matter. You said there is a process in place if a working group actually needs a subject matter. So do we need to review those procedures that are in place, or we just know that it is there, and that is already taken care of? Or do we need to review the criteria for that?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I think I understand now. I don't think there's a specific procedure in place. It's in the charter, in the sense that, it says that if you need, or if the Council decides the working group, in events of the working group starting, they can already bring in the subject matter expert. But of course, if in the process, during the policy development process, the working group finds the need, they can also reflect this to the Council. And if they feel like it's more of the Council's role to use the independent evaluation process to pick the subject matter expert, they can request it to the Council, and Council can bring in the subject matter expert as requested.

But there's no written down in black and white kind of procedure about that. I personally think, it's my personal opinion, that this may be better, because it keeps the process more nimble, more robust to agile, to make sure that it's not too stood and shown when they can bring in subject matter, or if you move past this, you no longer bring the subject matter expert. They keep it as flexible as possible, whenever they feel the need, they can bring in. And Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Manju. This is Steven. Just to build off of Manju's comments, the subject matter expertise, I think, can come from a variety of different ways, which I think is what Manju is saying. So the members of the working group itself, you can see in the charter, it usually has a list of requirements, or I guess maybe expectations is a better way to describe it for the working group members themselves.

So the hope and expectation is that the members themselves have some of that expertise. But then that provision in the charter that we showed a moment ago, it allows to supplement the working group membership expertise with additional expertise, which can come from potentially within the community itself, external to community, and potentially even in the event where there is not existing expertise, we can maybe go out and procure expertise too. So, I think just to reinforce Manju's point, it can come from a variety of ways and that flexibility helps make sure that the specific needs of a group can be met. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Steve. Peter, please.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Manju and Steve, for the clarification. I would say that flexibility makes sense, but there's need for a procedure. I guess this is a gap that we can recommend. There's need for a formal procedure in doing that. However, I don't know, Steve, has there been many metrics where working group has requested for independent expert. Just wanted to know. So, to know whether there is need for a formal procedure, but I still think that there's need for some things that can guide why we still retain flexibility. Yeah, thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Peter. I think there was a question to Steve about whether we have metrics. Before Steve speaks, I'm just going to say in my past

experience when I participated in a working group, for example, IDN EPDP or the EPDP on Temp Spec, we were able to bring subject matter expertise when we needed it. The ways might be different. For example, for the EPDP on Temp Spec, we actually consulted a legit legal firm to provide legit legal advice. That cost ICANN a lot of money, but that's what we needed. So, that's what we requested, and the Council granted it.

And for the IDNs, of course, we rely heavily on our IDN expertise in the ICANN Org and in the ICANN community. I guess, there's definitely not that aware of metrics, but we never felt like when there's a need, it wasn't satisfied. But yes, I'll let Steve speak.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Meiju. I don't think I have much to add, actually. You're spot on with everything you said. We have not tracked metrics, and it's hard to proceduralize something like this because it's dependent on identifying the need. It's cascading in the way that we look at it. We seek to try to rely as much on the membership themselves and the staff support and the leadership, and then we can keep getting additional resources as needed. It's really hard to put that down in a checklist or a procedure. It's really up to the judgment of everyone involved. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Steve. I definitely agree. It really depends on the context and what kind of support the working group needs, because it really varies. It varies depending on, first of all, the issue. Second of all, the composition of the working group, because sometimes the working

group itself has sufficient subject matter expertise already. And third, of course, the resources and how they decide to communicate this need to whoever will be able to grant whatever they need. I feel like it's a good thing that it's now written down that whenever they have a need, they can request it and they'll get it. But to be too procedure-heavy probably will actually create more harms than benefits. But again, that was my personal opinion.

And I also note that in the chat, Saewon has pointed out that in the charter template, there is a section that states that to instruct the charter drafting team when they're drafting the charter, they have to specify if the GNSO Council will run the open call for expert. So this is a very lightweight but written down procedure for bringing in subject matter expertise. Okay, pausing here to see any other-- if no, let's move on to the next slide.

If you guys remember last week, we framed our discussion based on the how possible implementation will look like. But after that, I guess we felt like probably we're limiting you guys' imagination, because as there's a saying in Taiwan, imagination is your superpower. So we don't want to curb your superpower. So we decided to change the way we frame the discussions. We like to present you guys some discussion questions.

But I feel like actually we've already discussed pretty thoroughly in the last slide. Is there a problem to be solved? For example, I think reading through the charter template and reflecting on our experience of participating in the working group, we already felt like these concerns are addressed by the improvement during the past years. But are there

any other mechanisms or improvement processes that we should consider? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing comments in the chat. Probably we can move to the next slide.

Again, before anyone complains that it's hard to read, I guess we all know now the design of the slide is to bring us focus in on what we're going to be paying attention to. And I'm not saying people, sorry, I shouldn't say people complain. I should say people brought up the concerns of this issues. And I'm glad that we clarify there was an intent to design a slide this way. So we're moving on to the GNSO Guidance Process, the GGP. This is our focus now. Let's move on to the next slide.

This is a slide with a lot of words. It's basically an overview of what a GGP is. So in terms of process, GGP follows all required steps for PDP or EPDP. But it is very important to know, and this is a vital distinction of GGP than EPDP or PDP, is that GGP recommendations don't result in any new consensus policy or contractual applications. And when or why the GGP will be required or be initiated is for when the GNSO Council feels like there's a need to provide clarifications or advice on existing gTLD policy recommendations. So simply put, it's just to provide clarifications or more thorough explanations of an already existing gTLD policy recommendations. And then these explanations or clarifications will be sent to the ICANN Board for them to approve.

So just as EPDP or PDP recommendations, the GGP recommendations will be adopted by the Board if they consider it to be, or if they feel like they are able to adopt them. And if they want to reject them, or as the Board prefers to say, if they decide to non-adopt the recommendations,

there is a threshold to be met for them to decide to non-adopt these recommendations.

There is so far only one GGP has been invoked. That's the GGP on ASP, which means Applicant Support. It was initiated in 2022 and it was finished in 2024. It was a very narrowly focused GGP. It's only for developing, I think, indicators or metrics for how to evaluate whether the Applicant Support Program is successful. So in a sense, successful metrics, success metrics, success indicators for the Applicant Support Program. Pause here to see if there are any questions or if I missed anything and staff wanted to correct me or supplement. If not, let's move on to the next slide.

So these are the PSR analysis on the GGP. I think we will go through one by one starting next slide, so we won't be reading through them now. Is that correct? Yep. So let's just move on to the next slide. We start with the first one.

So the PSR finds that the first GGP, which was the one we discussed, or I personally explained, the GGP on ASP, Applicant Support Program, they find it to be effective in providing clarification and advice on policy recommendations, which is what the GGP is supposed to do. But they also suggest that probably you can set more comprehensive targets and ensure better communications between the Working Group Council and the ICANN Org. At the bottom, we capture what was written in the PSR, what their analysis were. They feel like, as we said, better communications are probably needed. And feedback from the ASP GGP Working Group were that-- might be valuable in helping to evolve the

process. I'm sorry, what feedback? Probably I'm wrong. I'm asking staff to jump in and help me on this feedback line.

STEVE CHAN: This is Steve. I can try. I don't think we did a survey for the GGP. I might be mistaken. But essentially, it's just saying that feedback from folks that participate on the GGP for applicant support, the one and only one that's taking place, the input from the Working Group members might be helpful in identifying issues and helping to evolve the process.

MANJU CHEN: Cool. So basically, suggesting that maybe they need to do a WGSA too, like a Working Group Self-Assessment. It will be good if in the future, we can have the Working Group of GGP to do a self-assessment too. Probably you can understand it that way. Okay, let's move on to the next slide.

So questions for discussion. Is there a problem to be solved? For example, is it necessary for GGP to have more comprehensive targets? Also, in what way were expectations misaligned? If there's an issue? So how do we align on expectations? Do we think it's good to have more comprehensive targets? And what do they mean by more comprehensive targets? How do we understand this kind of suggestion? If we just decide that-- oh, this doesn't make sense at all. What do you mean by comprehensive targets? If you want to make a suggestion, make it clear. This is unclear. We don't know how to act on it. We can decide that too.

But while guys are still thinking, let's move on to the second point. Beyond internal. Well, actually beyond what we're currently already doing, for example, Org is collaborating with the working group. They have liaisons on the working group. They communicate a lot. And also in the Council meetings, there are a lot of open deliberations.

How do we even, besides this, on top of this, are there any more we can do to align on the expectations? Are there any more we can do to make sure at the outset that GGP knows what the working group knows exactly what they're expected to do and they deliver what they're expected to be delivered, or all the procedures and discussions and the communications in place are already sufficient for them to know what they're supposed to do? Do I agree that current procedures and discussions, communications happening are already sufficient for the GGP working group to know what they're supposed to do?

I guess we can, if we find it hard to decide, we can leave this for you guys to go back to your stakeholders group and constituencies to ask your representative on the GGP whether they feel like it has been clear. And if it was not, what did they expect to know more about this to make sure it's clear. I'm still not seeing any kind of reflections yet. And noting that we only have eight minutes left, let's finish this last point on this slide and we will move on to the next steps slide.

While the GGP on ASP was determined to be overall effective, the GGP has been seldom used, perhaps in lieu of other mechanisms. Is this an issue? What we're trying to communicate here by this line is that, the GGP on ASP, we thought it was successful, effective, but then still, if it was so effective, why is it so seldom used? It was only used one time.

Is it because it's too procedurally heavy, or is it because actually there's not much need for a GGP? And, or is it because there are actually other mechanisms that will serve this purpose with the more effective and just efficient ways? Or is it, is seldomly used itself a problem or not? Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS:

Thanks. I think on the last point, I was just wondering like, maybe the GGP being seldomly used is not necessarily a bad thing. I think where what might be interesting is to see within this group, if there's value in something or in a mechanism that is probably not as extensive as the GGP, but still addresses some of the things that the GGP likes to, particularly, like the small teams.

I look at the small team, the GNSO small team that was put together for some of the pending recommendations for SubPro. And I thought that that group was very agile, very task focused, which might have not been the same way as the GGP. But I do know that there were concerns about how these small teams are being structured and things. So it might be valuable for this group to have that conversation.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Ajith. So I guess one of the reflections we can have is GGP is for clarifications of policy recommendations. So the fact that it's not being used very regularly, maybe a good thing, because that means the policy recommendations is clear enough that doesn't need further clarifications, right?   We only have GGP on the applicant support program because in the recommendation, it specifically requested a

specific IRT to deal with this special piece of recommendation on the Applicant Support Program. That's why there was an initiation of GGP.

But also, to keep in mind that, well, there are other SubPro recommendations that need clarifications requested by the Board. And the Council in the past decided that instead of initiating GGP, a small team would have been a more sufficient or effective, efficient way to address these recommendations.   But of course, it's like a unique situation. Because usually Council small teams are only for counselors, but on SubPro recommendations, they do this small team plus thing where they include community members.

So I guess procedurally, there's value to keep the GGP in place. But yeah, just something for us to think about, because I guess we all see this for the first time. Probably we all need some time to digest and to have opinion on this. And noting that we only have three minutes left. I'll, just encourage you guys to come back to this and think about this and see if there are any new reflections we can start with for our next meeting. It will be next, next week. And we can move on to the Next Step Slide, just to kind of conclude this meeting.

So again, as we've said, next week, we're not going to have a call. We will reconvene on the 30th of April.   And please encourage your stakeholder groups or constituencies to review the CIP criteria and provide their input or feedback. We will be reviewing your input and feedback on the 14th of May. In the meantime, if you have time, go read the P&I PSR so we can have a more engaging discussions during the meeting. Aside from me talking to all of you, I feel very tired of my own voice already. But yeah, these are the Next Steps. Let's see if

anybody has any AOB. Not seeing any hand. I'm happily giving you back two minutes of your life. It's not much, but still it's 120 seconds. Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS: Sorry, I know that it's on the screen, but I just wanted to also recognize that we're extending for two weeks the criteria, right?

MANJU CHEN: Yes.

AJITH FRANCIS: Just wanted to vocalize it. Thank you very much.

MANJU CHEN: You're welcome. Thank you for reminding us. Okay, now it's 60 seconds. It's still 60 seconds. Make it worth. Bye. See you on the 30th of April. Thank you very much for attending.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]