TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvements Call, taking place on the 21st of May, 2025. We have listed apologies from Prudence Malinki and Asteway Negash. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

HONG-FU MENG: I've updated my statement of interest to update a few typos, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, Hong-Fu, congratulations on the new title.

HONG-FU MENG: No, a few typos.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, typos, I thought you said new title, I'm sorry, typos. Thank you. If anyone does 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 SCCI chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you very much, Terri. Hello, everyone. Let's move on to the next slide. This was our meeting eight. We had our SOI update, welcome, which is now, and then afterwards, we'll do a recap of the meeting last week, and then we will continue on the review of PSR. I really hope that we're going to finish today, so there will be no next steps. Let's move on.

The key reminders of the last meeting, first of all, we don't have a meeting on 4th of June, because it's the week where people travel to Prague for the ICANN 83. We are not going to have a meeting on 9th of June, which is going to be in Prague, either, as we are hoping, and we are expecting to finish before the latest next week. The major discussion last week is that we reviewed the comparison chart. We will see it again later. It will be updated according to our discussion last week. Also, we know that last week that we had one GGP in the ICANN history, and that GGP actually had a GNSO Council Liaison, but that role is not captured in this GNSO Council Liaison Manual, and AMS suggested that we should capture it in this manual, and that's a great suggestion, so we're capturing it.

Action items, because last week, we were discussing whether we need to change a bylaw, whether we need to initiate a public comment if we change a bylaw, all this kind of discussions, read the changes we wanted to make to the GGP, and we will have an explanation later. Others are just, we're going to keep reviewing the GGP and GIP this week. Please, next slide.

This, we've been seeing this for many times now. We are moving faster than we were planning. Hopefully, we will start a break in a sense in June for the policy implementation PSR, because we will have to leave time for staff to draft the report that we're going to send to council. Of course, when that is done, we will review it before sending to council. Also note that the CIP Part 2 is still on hold, because we're still waiting for the CCG, the cross-community group, to do their review of the public comments, and still awaiting ICANN or more guidance on this. By the end of this year, probably we'll start the PDP 3.0 review. Next slide, please.

Again, we have said this before, 4th of June, 9th of June, no meeting. I really hope this meeting will be our last meeting, and we can all take a break for next week. Let's see how we're doing. We'll just charge through. Next slide, please. Next slide, please.

This is the continuing review of the policy implementation PSR policy status report. We finished the review of the PDP a while ago. We are still on GGP. Today, most hopefully, we're going to finish the last item on GGP, and then we'll start with GIP. Hopefully, we'll finish GIP, too. Next slide, please.

This chart, we've seen it before last week. You can see we made a little bit of the change just to remind everyone that this is indeed a preliminary version. It will be changed. I think, artfully or whatsoever, you know the word I want to pronounce, but I cannot, the one start with A-E and with a T-H in it. Anyways, and we did try to reflect some of the discussions, some of the points that was raised in the last meeting, for example. Now, there's a double line between the policymaking

EN

processes and the non-policymaking processes. Also, we changed the text for GNSO input process. You can see that the outcome, it changed to, it was implementation. Now, it changes to, oh, what happened? Sorry. I actually see a hand raised. I'll finish and I'll let Anne speak. You can see the change of implementation to outcome input response, etc. Also, the public comment for initial input, it was a solid line, but now it's dotted line because it's not necessary. It could be omitted if it was deemed unnecessary by the GIP mechanism or structure. Also, requests for early input are both dotted lines for GIP and GGP. I think that's the major change that we made. If I missed anything, I believe that will help me. First of all, let's let Anne speak. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, thanks, Manju. This is looking better and better. I just had a brief suggestion for the next iteration that it's cool the way you got the policymaking delineated in the top two sections. What I'm thinking is it'd be even better down by GGP to put one of those little things and write the word implementation because GGP can only be implementation. And then GIP, if we keep it, would be something else. In other words, suggesting one of those red where the policymaking is to put one in the GGP section that says implementation and maybe one in GIP that says input because it'll make it really easy to distinguish.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, sorry, I forgot to unmute myself. I'm trying to understand. You mean that we kind of signify that GGP will be only based on whatever implementation and GIP will be input?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, it's that it's good. It's easier to see now that the top two are policymaking. And GGP is only implementation. And so that little red thing that's right by the policymaking, if you have a little red thing that's in GGP and instead of policymaking, it says implementation. And GIP, it's neither policymaking nor implementation. And so you would have one of those little red things that points to the word input.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, understood. Yeah, that makes sense. I agree, we can definitely add that. That will clarify what the processes are for, definitely. Thank you for the input. And is there any other questions or suggestions? Just to know that, again, this is a preliminary version. It's going to be more prettier in the future, but this is for our discussion's purpose. I'm not seeing any hands. Let's move on to the next slide.

We discussed whether we have to open public comments if we, for the report that we're going to send to council, because we are indeed going to suggest some changes to the GGP. I think last week we kind of all agreed that it won't be helpful to add a charter to GGP after the initial request. The GGP can have a charter to base their work on, and we were not sure that this will be changing a bylaw and if that's the case, do we have to open for public comments? This is what in the bylaw of initiation of the GGP. It says that to initiate a GGP at a minimum, it has to include this. This is basically what we've seen as what is in the initial request. Adding a charter doesn't change anything because it's not regulated in a sense in the bylaw. We won't have to change the bylaw.

EN

Next, and I probably will have the answers to your questions after these three slides. Let's go through them first and I'll come to you.

We were discussing, because if we're suggesting to change the GNSO guidance process, that means we're changing actually the GNSO operating procedures. Does that need to open for public comments? The answer is yes, but it's when we change the substance of the GGP manual, then these amendments will be open for public comments for 21 days. This approximately the same thing is also captured in another section in the bylaw, which we can see from the next slide.

We can see this is the article 11th. It also says that GNSO operating procedures shall be affected upon the expiration of 21 day public comment period. That means, in a sense, they both mean that if we're making changes to the GNSO operating procedures, which contains the GGP manual, it will be open for public comments. I think that means that, so the report itself, we don't think will be going to public comments, but because in the report, it actually suggests that we change the substance of the GNSO operating procedures. Once GNSO Council adopts our report and changes the operating procedures, that operating procedures, that updated version will be open for public comments. We think it makes more sense to open for public comments by then, instead of open the report to public comments. I think that kind of addresses what we discussed last week.

Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Manju. If we could go back two slides to the bylaws, what is required to initiate a GGP. I just want to make sure that what we're talking about is that we are not in fact saying that we're going to amend the requirements for initiating a GGP, because what we're really saying is that we're just adding a charter requirement in the operating procedures versus adding a charter requirement in terms of what it takes to initiate the process. Because if we're changing what it takes to initiate the process under the bylaws, that's a different question from changing the operating procedures.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Anne. We're not adding charter as a requirement to initiating a GGP. We're simply saying that it will be helpful for GGP to have a charter, and that's why we're going to add to the operating procedure to suggest that once the GGP is initiated based on the minimum request and the bylaws, it could have a charter and be helpful for GGP to operate.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Perfect, thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I think we can go to slide 13. We've seen this many times. This is the PSR. They feel like there should be more details in the initiation request. Our proposed solution, and that's to have a charter once the GGP is initiated, initiation request. We can see the next slide. Probably it will be clearer of what we're going to talk about. There's

already, no, this slide. Just to capture what we discussed last week. For the further details part, we think it will be helpful after the GGP is initiated. We will have a charter. We're seeing more details of how the GGP will operate and what are the expected outcomes. I think that addresses the first two bullet points of the discussion.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Manju. This is the same question regarding bylaws though, that when you modify the initiation request, you're actually modifying what the bylaws say about what it takes to initiate the request. If you're just operating, if you're modifying operating procedures, then that's different. You're saying, well, here's what we think should happen once it's been initiated. But if you actually change the requirements for initiating a GGP, that's a change to the bylaws.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, but I don't think we, did I say it wrong? I don't think we suggest that we change any to the initiation request.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: The sentence says, should further detail be added to the initiation request? I don't think you mean that.

MANJU CHEN: That's a question for us to discuss. I think that's a question to kind of like a, initiation point for us to start discussion and our discussion per this question, our answer to this question is no, right? We don't need

further detail. We think a better way to address this problem is the initiation request. But after the GGP is initiated, we add a charter in the operating procedures to have more details. Does that make sense?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: If you're saying the answer to this is no, then it does make sense. Because what you're saying is, further details should be added, but it's to the operating procedures, not the initiating, initiation request.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, so again, those questions are for discussion. It's not an answer. We as a team, we're providing answers to these questions.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I just didn't know that you were going to say the answer to that question is no. So thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Well, it's not me, it's our collective decision, I hope, to say no. to this question. But yes, I think we're saying no. We're only adding things to the operating procedures. Public comments also say that it should be open more widely to the community or get more community involved. This, again, is a question to provoke us to discuss whether GGP really needs to be more open to the community. Is that a valid point to make? In a sense, we've all witnessed the GGP on applicant support program. It was open to the community already. It was representation model. Not only GNSO had their representation in the GGP on ASP. I believe At-

Large also sent their representatives. I don't remember if any other SOAC sent their representatives, but it was definitely invitation was sent to all the SOC. GAC definitely was on the GGP on ASP too. Do we think it's a valid point that it should involve more community involvement or we think the current way we do it already encourages enough community involvement? That's a question we're trying to answer now.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Is there direct public comment on the GGP that says additional direct community involvement should be added? Or how does this question arise? Because there was public comment on the GGP. Did the public comment say, we should have direct community involved, more direct community involvement?

MANJU CHEN: I believe so. This is captured in the PSR. In the PSR the analysis, some of the analysis will be from the GDS. Some of the analysis or suggestions are only GDS staff capturing whatever they receive from the public comments of the first version of PSR. This part, more direct community involvement, is from the public comments to the PSR and PSR the updated version simply just captures it and updates.

UNKNOWN: Thank you. I just wanted the clarification. I don't have an opinion.

MANJU CHEN:	Thank you. I think there's any other way to have the community directly involved. I personally feel there's no more way to directly involve community in the GGP than having them in the GGP. As in, the last GGP, we already had the representation of whoever they wanted to send to the GGP from the community. I thought that would be enough. I'm open to any other suggestions or questions. Of course, we can also simply say no. Currently, there's really no other way to have additional direct involvement. I'm not seeing any hands. I'm taking you agree with me that current methods are enough. There are enough direct community involvement. The PSRs are just our in person meetings, we all know, that's not something on the table for ICANN, since we're even considering less in person meeting for the whole community. That's not what we'll be suggesting. I don't think this is really a problem. I think they try to honestly reflect what they receive for the public comment. I see a [inaudible], we have the authority to decide that, received, but just received. Nothing, any objections, we're going to say no to this question, too.
	I see [inaudible] your question, is there anyone who was on the GGP on ASP? I think the only one was probably Julie, who was the major supporting staff for the GGP. Steve, I mean, you're on everything. If you want to share your observations, please feel welcome. I take it you don't want to share your observation, or you can type it in the chat. That's more if that's easy. I personally also feel the same way. The entire community was well represented. If they were not there, they declined the invite to be there. It's not like GNSO rejected them or blocked them from participating. Let's move on.

Finally, we're on the GIP, GNSO input process. This process is meant to deal with non-gTLD policies. It's when GNSO Council wants to provide non-binding advice. Sometimes, probably just a letter to whoever they're addressing, or drafting a public comment to whatever is open for public comments. This output of the GIP process, GNSO input process, doesn't need the board to do anything. It could be a letter addressed to the board, and the board will not do anything because it doesn't have any recommendations to be adopted by the board. The note is that non-binding advice means advice that has no binding force on the party. It is provided to, I think, what I said applies to this too, if it's a letter to anybody, and that somebody who receives that letter can decide to do nothing to the letter. If it's a public comment, of course, it will be reviewed, but the party will decide on the description to whatever is in the output of this GNSO input process.

Let's move on to the next slide. In the PSR, it finds that GIP has not yet been used at all. Since ever, it's kind of developed or invented. The public comments we see in the PSR suggest that GIP is theoretically valuable. It's better to keep it and just in case in the future it will be needed. There are also public comments noting that there are these small teams happening in the GNSO now, and it looks like sometimes their functions are interchangeable. Probably we could replace GIP with small teams, but this is a question we have to answer, or we can discuss, and we can decide no to whatever is suggested. Let's move on.

Again, this is an initial request of the GIP. I think it's largely similar to the GGP. It has the name of the initiator, origin of issue, scope of the effort, proposed mechanism, method of operation, decision making methodology, and a schedule timeline.

EN

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Manju. I just want to mention that it seems to me that we have more than one informal mechanism of providing input. I'm mindful of the recent council meeting where there was a session on reviews and what the board's considering doing with reviews, and I think that what Greg said was that they were going to draft a letter that councilors would agree to. It seems like there's the small team process, but there are also other even less formal processes than the small team. I don't know if others agree, but sometimes we just say, let's write a letter to the board.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, and I believe what was suggested for that review issue is the leadership will write a letter to the board. We've been trying to be more flexible and nimble of the approaches that we do things, because one of the major criticisms to ICANN committee probably is that we're too product heavy. I'm not sure. Definitely could be used, we could use a GIP for that, but then probably sometimes we will just feel that it will be better if less work is bestowed to us, in a sense. I believe also, I remember when we were talking about small teams, and when there were objections to small teams, Thomas from ISP, who has raised a good point that I remember until now, is that he was saying, because he was on council several years ago, too, he was saying in the past, there was no small team, there's that one person, they will just be like, you, this councilor, you raise your hand to write the thing up, and you'll do it, and we'll review it once you write it up. Now we're using small teams, which is a collective effort to do things, and it still goes to the council.

Probably that's something we can keep in mind, too. Let's move on to the next slide and see if we have more discussions.

Because they have been this kind of comparison of GIP and small teams, we tried to do this comparison of GIP and small teams. We can start with the GIP. The scope of GIP is when it's mostly when it's not involved in gTLD policy. Suggested use case and operating procedures are responses to a board request or development of public comments. Initiation will be initiated request, as we've seen from the last slide. The membership of GIP, though, it's open to GNSO and most probably beyond, because it's like any other procedures, processes that we have seen, but only in terms of membership. The final GNSO will be allowed to council, or by the council to decide whether to accept this as a party or a mechanism.

The scope of teams, according to the small team, I think there was this kind of assignment form or a kind of write out and everything about small teams. In that document, the small team is for events in the world, but it doesn't substitute any of the PDP, EPDP, or GGP. Initiate small teams via an assignment forms. The membership of the small team is usually limited to GNSO councilors. I think this is the main thing. Also, considering small teams are more nimble. The small teams are defined by the assignment forms, but generally core of some form. There are also other more lightweight small teams. For example, after every ICANN meetings, we usually have a team of councilors that write up a response to communicate, and that usually doesn't really have an assignment form, because it's just a two-week kind of thing. But that also illustrates how we can use small teams as a tool in the council. It's important to know that small teams are not decision makers. All of the

decisions or all of the deliberations outcome of the small teams will be considered by the council before any further actions or considerations. That's what we try to illustrate of the differences and similarities between GIP and small teams.

Pausing here to see if any questions or reflections.

Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. I have a quick question regarding membership, and I know it says small teams there, but I think, if I'm not remembering incorrectly, the small team plus, especially to do with the supplemental recommendations, they included members that were outside of the council. Is that correct?

MANJU CHEN: Yes, I forgot to mention that. I personally think it was one of the kind of unicorn small team, because it was not really a small team. It was a small team plus, and it was only there. I think that was because, well, there's a Chinese saying that there's the benefits of the sky, benefits of the time, and benefits of the ground. It's a once in a long time kind of a unique circumstances that required that small team plus, but I will say that's an exception. That was the only small team also they opened for other committee members, and it's named small team plus because of that. I also know a document. I still don't remember what document it is, but that aligns all the requirements for a small team. It does say that topics require, or when issue requires, council can decide to invite

expertise, external expertise to join the small teams to share their expertise, but in general, small teams membership will be limited to GNSO councilors.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I appreciate that very much. I actually understood your translated proverb. I just wanted to mention this because this is another illustration of the flexibility of the small team, so I understand why we, space limited on this slide. We won't put that in there, but an asterisk illustrating the flexibility of the small team would probably be a plus in this case.

MANJU CHEN: Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, I think actually if we want to get rid of GIP, that Jen is raising a really good point that the comparison in the membership is kind of telling us that we might want to add a section to small team procedures that talks about that option, that flexible option of adding the community because there were super good reasons, for example, in SubPro for extending it to small team plus, and if we want to particularly want to eliminate GIP, which is open to GNSO and beyond, I think we should maybe add something to small teams that shows that flexibility that Jen has raised.

EN

MANJU CHEN: Thank you and I will also point all of us to the text Saewon just posted in chat. In the small team guidelines, it says that the membership of the small team may be supplemented by the broader community as warranted by the subject area. I feel like it's already captured in the guidelines. But it's a decision also, or a suggestion, we can make whether we should keep or go GIP. My personal two cents was that the small team on SubPro, it was a small team plus in a sense because there was already a small teams by only the councilors and all, very tight timeline of the next round and all those things. We kind of just decided to make small team plus because it's easier and it's faster than initiating a GNSO process. I personally will feel like in the future we should actually suggest GNSO Council [inaudible] GNSO input process for convenience using small teams, because it's there. Might as well try to use it and see [inaudible]. But that's also definitely my personal reflections. I think we probably can move to the next slide to see a discussion questions.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: It's interesting on SubPro small team plus, the real reason I think we did it, and maybe Steve can correct me if I'm wrong, is that to add community members and get their input beyond GNSO was more efficient than pursuing a section 16 process, which would require almost a reconvening of the PDP or getting other representatives that way and it was felt that it was a good idea to include, and it wasn't really about acquiring expertise per se, it was about having more community involvement in the small team process and making it more open. I don't know if what we are currently saying in a small team guidelines actually addresses that issue. And I don't even know if what

you're saying, Manju, is that you kind of disagree with that approach, that you think it makes more sense on a small team that would only use it to acquire expertise versus to acquire broader community involvement. I don't know if that's helpful to clarify what you were saying about that.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. [inaudible] understood me correctly, I would say, as I've been saying, I feel like the small team was at the time kind of a unique existence and I actually think we should be creating, like, having that as a precedent and feel like it could be replicated in the future. As I said, it was due to its special circumstances. As you were saying, because we thought, the other process, the other option we had was to [inaudible]. That's why we offer a small team plus. I do feel in the future we should follow whatever has already been written down as a process, either if we're using small team we will follow the small team guidelines. Or if we're using GIP, we will follow whatever is written in the operating procedures for the GIP. But that's, again, my personal take, and I welcome any other opinions.

I'm not seeing any hands. Peter, please.

PETER TAIWO AKINREMI: Yeah, Manju. Yeah, thanks Manju and Anne for that conversation. I just wanted to know why is it that GIP has not been used. I might have missed that conversation. Just for us to know if there's still relevance for it. Like you said that we need to keep GIP, we need to, just in case, but how long has it been in existence and it has not been initiated. I know

that it has a purpose and its relevance, but since it does not be initiated. Are there a kind of a forecast that in the future that that will still be needed because, this is what we're supposed to have this conversation and see if there's a need for it or not. Will there be any kind of a need for it in the future. We just don't clog, because we have so many processes and, and this is one of them, and just thinking out loud.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Peter. I might be wrong, but I think it's starting since 2015 that we have GIP. Again, I might be wrong and staff will correct me in the chat if I got it wrong. The thing that hasn't been used, I guess, for me personally, again, I feel that people just forgot it. They just forgot there's this thing that they can use. Sometimes they offer convenience. My rationale of keeping it, I think it's also just in case and you know how we developed the small team plus, it's like a special circumstances, then we're like, but what do we do, oh, probably we just do this. In the future, I think it's worth reminding, making the decision that there are options that you can use, and there are, I'm not saying it's appropriate of GIP, but I'm saying, sometimes we forgot, and sometimes, in retrospect, this actually could have been used by, could have applied to GIP or whatsoever. In the future, there are issues people feel like, but how do we address this? Are there tools in our toolbox? Maybe GIP is the tool. I feel like that could happen if we keep it in our toolbox and remind people that there's this thing in our toolbox. Then there's no harm in keeping it. As I said, this is my personal take, and I'm welcome any other suggestions.

Peter, please.

PETER TAIWO AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Manju. Thanks for clarifying that. So there's no harms in having that in our toolbox. However, maybe the issue is that we need to, like, councilors need to understand, leadership needs to understand the tools that they have in the toolbox. So like you said, it may be that they forgot to use it. So I guess there is a kind of need to constantly remind that these are the tools that we have and this is how it can be applied because sometimes we can have the tools and we don't know how to apply that. So maybe this might be a kind of an objection or an opportunity to say, this is why GIP exists and these are the relevant problems that can be applied to or they can be used. So just thinking around that, thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, I think I'm agreeing with you. I feel like we kind of had this small team, people are questioning the purpose of small teams or the usage of small teams and we had to count the whole guidelines of small teams to justify its existence. In the future probably, there are times we'll be like, there are these existing tools that we can use that just addresses whatever we want to address and GIP probably will be one of it and people won't have questions about it as much because it is written down as a process and it's there for us to use.

Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks. It's a super interesting discussion because I know there's been some concern about the transparency in relation to small teamwork and if just raising that hypothetical of the input on the review process and board suggestions with respect to not doing ATRT4 and reevaluating the entire review process, there was kind of this informal thing in council where they said, well, we'll write a letter and then we'll see if the councilors are going to endorse that letter. I thought, that's going to have to go back to all the constituencies for endorsement of a letter like that. I know there's been some discussion in the IPC about delaying once again ATRT4. Now that you guys are bringing this up, I'm really kind of wondering, why hasn't anybody talked about GNSO input on that whole reviews question? Maybe it's because the input process itself appears to be a process that takes a long time, but is it a process, for example, that could be used in connection with the board's initiatives relating to reviews and how they should be conducted? Is that a tool that could be used for that? It's a super interesting point that you guys are raising.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Definitely, actually, the more we talk about it, the more I feel that IPC is actually the best way that we can write about the GNSO input on this review kind of, but I don't know if we have missed the boat. I don't know if it has sailed or have left the shore, but in the future, I think probably in the report, we can also, in the council, I mean, we can probably also kind of capture that, just to remind the council and I don't know what way, but we kind of have to stress that there are instances that we think actually GIP will be a good tool to use.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: There's going to be an ongoing process by the board on revising the reviews. So maybe GIP is a useful tool for that.

MANJU CHEN: Oh, definitely. We will definitely, because I'm on council when we reach that point, I'll definitely raise that point when we're discussing it, or I'll rely on both of you who are still on council by the time to raise it to [inaudible] and whoever on the council to remind them that this is process in place that we can use to provide input. Do we feel like we can wrap it up and call this the last meeting before we can come back and review the report right up by the staff? Not seeing objections. Let's just quickly move on to the next slide. Well, these are just reminders of whatsoever. So it's not important. Yes, next step.

That's, oh, actually I thought, I think we successfully had a fruitful discussion today and actually finished all the review of the PSR analysis. Do we all agree on this assessment? I'm seeing support and plus one, but I don't know if it's true, this comment. Oh yes, yes. Great. Oh, thank you. Thank you all so much. We did a good job. Thank you all. So there's going to be no next step because we have completed the deliberations and we'll probably all see each other still in Prague, but we won't have a meeting. We'll just see each other in the hallway or in the toilets or wherever. When we see each other, we say hi and we can have a conversation, but not about SSCI.

Great. Thank you very much, everyone. We will finish here two minutes before the official end of this meeting. I'm happily giving you back.

Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: I'd like to wish you, and I guess hopefully the team will also wish you an early happy birthday because we won't be meeting before your birthday. It's next Monday. And Manju, all of the happy birthday wishes. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jen. Thank you all. I'm growing one year older, like all of us someday in our life. I don't think it's going to make any difference. But thank you. Thank you all for your happy birthday wishes. Actually, I had a perfect lunch today, again, with my sister and my mom. It was so, how do I say, luxurious. My sister was buying. Thank you very much for reminding me of that lunch. Thank you. Thank you. I'll see you probably in Prague. I'll see you again once the report is drafted. Thank you all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]