

TERRI AGNEW:

For the recording, this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Standing Committee on Continuous Improvement, SCCI, taking place on Wednesday, the 26th of March, 2025.

For today's call, we have received apologies from Prudence Malinki. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, if so, please raise your hand and unmute your mic. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

Members will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view the chat and have a listen-only to audio. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. All chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. With this, I'll turn it back over to Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Terri. Welcome, everyone. I guess we have gone through the update of SOIs just now, and left my welcome. So I hereby welcome you guys. Our first meeting at the SCCI, which we have collectively agreed to name as SCCI. You can see now my hair is light pink, but because there's light of my room, it doesn't look as pink as it looks under natural white

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.

light. But yes, that was my welcome. Before we move to the Review Project Plan, which will be led by Julie H., do you have any questions, opinion, that people wanted to—Anne, please?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Manju. Can you hear me? Hello?

MANJU CHEN: Yes, we can hear you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. Thank you. I asked because I have inserted the headphones because it's very early. I had posed two questions on the list. They were process-oriented questions. The first question related to the overlap in projects in the timeline. If we are on the Review Project Plan, I would like to ask those questions, but I don't know if you've gone to the Review Project Plan bullet point yet.

MANJU CHEN: We have noted questions and we are planning to answer it during the Review Project Plan.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Perfect. Thanks so much.

MANJU CHEN: The second one is the process question about membership, right?

ANNE AIKMMAN-SCALESE: Yes, because it looked like that in the charter, the number of members was actually 21, but we're listed at 17. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Staff could probably answer better than me. But for me, my brief answer will be that we were expecting 21, but we cannot force people to join if they don't want to. But if they're not listed as member in the roster on the Wiki page, they won't be able to participate, of course, in the decision-making process because they're not present as a member. We understand when stakeholder groups or constituencies have trouble appointed members that fulfill the expected slots. That would be my answer. Also, I believe that during the decision-making process, the decision is counted per SG. So it doesn't matter how many representatives are representing the SG or C in this committee. But of course, Julie is ready to correct me. Please, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Manju. Actually, I don't need to correct you. You are correct. That's a perfect answer. You covered it exactly. We can't force people to participate.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Great. Well, thanks so much, both of you. What I'm wondering is whether we should send out some kind of deadline message regarding if people are just not tracking as they should be and saying, "If you want to appoint your member or if you want to participate and you're listed

as a member, please do so by X date.” Because people sometimes do have a tendency to know that some issue gets raised later, and then they tend to want to come in and sometimes be quite vocal. I honestly would suggest that we give some sort of warning deadline for joining the deliberations.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Any follow-up, Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND: Yes. I believe we have issued reminders. Terri, can I ask you if that’s correct?

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, everyone. Julie, you are correct. Several reminders were sent out to each group with the deadline noted clearly.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You’re welcome. At this time, we are short two folks of the total of 21. RrSG only put forward two parties instead of three. And on the NomCom, one person declined in joining.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Terri. Very helpful. I see John’s hand is up. Ask away.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you, Julie. I just wanted to ask, Manju, I had proposed a change in pronunciation of the SCCI and we went back and forth a little bit on that, but you had said you wanted to... you would enjoy, I think, the debate you said. Anyway, I just wanted to see. I presume that you have a full agenda here. I don't know whether now is the time to bring it up, whether that's what you were queuing for. If it is, fine. If it's not, I will put it off until later and we can have the discussion at some time as the group decides to think about it or talk about it. Okay? Thanks. Bye.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, John. I think because we have a full list of agenda, like all of us are seeing on the screen, if we have time for AOB, let's do that during the AOB item.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I also see your hand, Asteway.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Thank you. About the people who are a no show, these are people who have already confirmed it about their participation. I think there has been some confusion about which e-mail to send apologies to. It's

probably a good idea to send that out again and make sure everyone is on the same page on that. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Noted. Thank you. Terri, please.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Instead of burdening the entire list with apologies, and I put it in chat as well, if you'd like to send your apologies to gns-sec@icann.org, what we do from there is we actually add it to the Wiki Agenda page for that meeting, so you'll clearly see your apologies listed for the upcoming meeting there.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Thanks for that, Terri.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Asteway. You might have to put your hand down if you don't have follow-up questions. Thank you.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Sorry. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you very much. Let's move on to our agenda item number two, which is the Review Project Plan. I'll trouble Julie to lead us through this.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thanks, Manju. Hi, everyone. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. You can see the project plan here. To note Anne's question on the list relating to the overlap of projects, we do show that here, but keep in mind this is expected to change. This is not a final project plan. In fact, we need to take into account the fact that as we get into the implementation of the various projects, it's going to change the timeline. Also, keep in mind that the CIP Part 2 timing isn't confirmed with ICANN Org. That's still up in the air. So there may not be an overlap. And in any case, the timing of the project isn't urgent. At this point, we're not anticipating needing a task force to do the work as we anticipate that the timing will change. We're also unsure of the timing of the various reviews, the Board readiness and the PHR, and those Organizational Reviews and the five-year plan. At any rate, to answer your question, Anne, there's some play in the timeline that is anticipated to change. But I see you have your hand up. Go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Julie, are we saying that it's quite possible either that, one, there would be no overlap or, two, that we might spend half a meeting on PSR Review and half of a meeting on the PDP 3.0 Review? Because I appreciate clarification that you're not anticipating a task force in 2025. That's very helpful for me to understand, especially in terms of meeting loads. But are we saying that if we maintain an overlap, that we would address both topics in the same meeting?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Anne. We certainly could do that. We're not anticipating them there being an overlap, though. Or it might be that staff is doing the work in the background to help prepare the group. Like say, starting work on the PDP 3.0 while the group is still working on the PSR for possibly implementation. So, there could be a number of scenarios and hope we can address the work, but we are not anticipating meeting a task force at this time. I hope that's helpful.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: If you could just clarify for me where the CPIF falls in this work? Because that's really important and shouldn't just be less to something happening behind the scenes. Where's the CPIF?

JULIE HEDLUND: Well, we're starting part one today. We'll be looking at the criteria and thinking about indicators starting today. The timing of part two is somewhat up in the air because we're waiting on guidance from ICANN Org for the timing. Sorry, you are asking about the CPIF. Well, the CPIF is part of the Policy and Implementation PSR Review.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry to misunderstand. I think we can go to the next slide unless there are further questions. Next slide, please. Here, I'm going to read everything on this slide. We did cover this in the kick-off meeting. But

this is the background of the CIP. Any questions? Let's go to the next slide.

Here is the Policy and Implementation PSR Review. As just mentioned, this includes the CPIF as part of the PSR. Any questions? Next slide, please.

The timeline of this upcoming review is yet to be determined and need to be according with the ICANN Org as well as the CIP team. Any questions? Anne, please?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Julie. For some reason, I thought that I saw on the orange one there that the Board had approved this five-year strategic plan. Am I nuts?

MANJU CHEN: I see Chris answering your question.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Absolutely not nuts. That was a resolution passed at the general Board meeting a couple of weeks ago.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Chris. We'll have to update this slide accordingly. Thanks for raising the question, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Great. Thanks, Chris. Thanks Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND: Next slide, please. Today, we're starting on the CIP Criteria and Indicators, and then we'll move to the Policy and Implementation PSR. Then there'll be homework from the CIP for you to take back to your groups. We'll cover that next in the forthcoming slides. Next slide, please.

This is a snapshot of how the CIP work is envisioned to happen in the SCCI and where the bulk of the work happening in SCCI at this point. And not anticipating the overflow into the task force. Next slide, please.

This is the overall plan for the CIP framework. The Criteria and Indicators will be in a survey to work over here and out in Year 2. Then now, it's in Year 3. Next slide, please.

Work has already happened in the CCOICI. As you may recall, all the SOs and ACs worked out of the principles that you see here. I won't read them until after you can read the slide. The text does get pretty dense on forthcoming slides. I'm wondering if someone from staff could put the link to the slides in the chat room for us. Next slide, please. Anne, please, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Hi, Julie. Thanks. Could I go back one slide?

JULIE HEDLUND: Of course.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I'm sure it probably lacks some background here on number four. But I have a recollection that some of the accountability issues in relation to SOs and ACs in particular are addressed in GNSO Operating Procedures. Is that right or wrong? Are we going to be looking at those here in this group?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks for the question, Anne. No, we're not looking at groups. Each group's accountability mechanisms, they're internal procedures. But there are some procedures that are incorporated into the GNSO Operating Procedures, whether the SOs and ACs are subject change. The Operating Procedures would go over Public Comment, but those sections of the Operating Procedures that are pertaining to the SOs and ACs are completely under their oversight, not the Council's so the Council won't review them as such. This group will not review changes. They're presented to the Council as done. I don't know if I'm explaining it very well.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay. Thanks, Julie. I guess my question is if this group does work on the accountability of SOs and ACs, it seems like that that could have an effect on the Operating Procedure's provisions that address SO and AC accountability. That's all. It would seem that they would need to be consistent if this group does work on that but—yeah.

JULIE HEDLUND: I don't think it's a scope for this group to weigh in on what the individual SOs and ACs do for their accountability. I think that Manju had her hand raised.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Julie. Thank you, Anne, for the question. I think the same kind of discussion happened during the CIP discussion when they were deciding the principles. The stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO were kind of confused. If we should do it on an SO basis or SG and C basis. Actually, we had some coordination calls during that period to make sure that we're all on the same page. I think in the future, if we have concerns that we are reaching beyond our scope or if the stakeholder groups or constituencies have concerns that they think should arise at the GNSO level, we have members across the SG and C so we can definitely do our coordination and discuss and see if it's appropriate to deal with it in this group. But I think in the charter, we specifically say that we only deal with GNSO-level issue. But we also have a line saying that only if some SG and C considers that this issue should be dealt with SCCI and they could raise it. Of course, the ultimate decision will be made by Council to decide if that goes to SCCI. But I think that's how I envision if any issues arise and we have to discuss in a sense the jurisdiction of issue and how we review these things.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Manju. Does that answer your question, Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Well, to be honest, I do understand that these accountability mechanisms are up to the individual SG or C. I was really more focused on the GNSO Operating Procedures, which talk about the need to have such mechanisms and whether there could be an impact on the Operating Procedures at the Council level. I mean, I'm getting ahead of this here. I don't need to raise issues that may not exist. But I think it's something that, based on our work, we would have to check our work against the Operating Procedures per se at the time.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Anne. That's clear. Certainly, in the course of implementation of any of these, any of the work that comes out of this, the SCCI should be coordinated with the GNSO Operating Procedures in that this group has to participate, whether changes need to be made. And if they do, they would have to be reviewed by Council. Next slide, please.

This is the determination of the criteria and how the indicators fit with the criteria. This is an example of the principle and you can see the example of the criteria. The principles, the operations of SO, ACs are efficient. The criteria is each structure has a process of planning the same priorities. The example of the indicator is yes or no. If not, then there should be a process that is SMART. The first task of the SCCI is to formalize the criteria and indicators. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: I would like to propose, I don't know whether—I think it would belong right in here. I'm not exactly sure where, but that if any of these resolutions, methodologies involved contracting with outside parties, that those parties would have to be accountable to ICANN. In other words, I believe at this current time, when companies, organizations are given prerogatives by ICANN, they're not necessarily held to accountability to ICANN. I think it should be articulated here in the Continuous Improvement framework.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, John. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, John. I think that's something for discussion. But an example that I'll raise quickly that makes me wonder about the scope of that is that, for example, in the IPC, where I'm a member, but of course, they don't represent the IPC, and I need to be very careful, but we've always had a lot of problems with MemberClicks. The MemberClicks are something that's provided, I think, by ICANN and maybe paid for by ICANN. But if it turns out that as a constituency that IPC decides to separately contract for a more efficient member mechanism for renewing dues, etc., are you saying that that type of what I would call almost just really practical task-oriented contract would need to be directly accountable to ICANN?

JOHN MCCABE: No, I'm not suggesting that. I mean, when you say MemberClicks, this is a stakeholder group initiative. Internal, right?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: No, it's ICANN-wide. MemberClicks is ICANN-wide as far as I know. We just have huge problems with accuracy with respect to MemberClicks in terms of who's paid dues, who has not paid. Actually, Glen might be able to say more about this than I can, if she's available.

JOHN MCCABE: Wonderful. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

JOHN MCCABE: I would be content to say we should look at this issue. Sorry, Glen, I didn't mean to interrupt. Go ahead.

GLEN DE SAINT GERY: No, John, please finish.

JOHN MCCABE: No. You talk.

GLEN DE SAINT GERY: I was just getting off mute. In fact, at the last IPC meeting, there is talk of going away from this MemberClicks. I think the point you bring up and is very important and I think that perhaps if we dig deeper, we might find other such examples in ICANN too.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

JOHN MCCABE: Very good. Thank you. I appreciate that input, Glen. What I basically what I'm talking is about downstream. When it gets out, it gets past ICANN if you will, but those things, they have to be reportable to ICANN and accountable. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. In the issue of time, I'm going to move ahead. Next slide, please.

Now, here you might want to follow on the slide yourself because the text is quite small. Here's the first principle that the GNSO Council is fulfilling its purpose. This is the criteria for that principle, TBD. Then we have to discuss indicators for those criteria. If you take a moment to look at these. I'm not going to read them off. Any comments on these criteria? Manju, please go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: I'm not having particular comments, just probably a clarifying question. If we answer yes to each criteria and we provide examples of why it's a yes, we don't have to particularly develop indicators for this criteria, correct?

JULIE HEDLUND: Right. The answer is yes. We could point to the indicators that already exist though, but we don't need to say new ones are needed. Thanks. Any comment? Go ahead, Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Julie and Manju. Would indicators include past work already done? I'm thinking of things, like, for Criteria 1, the DNS Abuse Small Team and things like that. I'm not sure. Based on, again, Manju's question, what part of indicators relates to stuff that's already done and what part of indicators we're talking about that would be future measures of meeting criteria? Or whether we need two columns like work already done and indicators for the future?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Anne. I know that Manju said in chat yes to your question. I think the intent is we could look at work already done, work proposed or where we need to develop indicators and where we don't, where they already exist. It might be useful, as you said, just to split this into two categories. Asteway?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: I'm wondering where we consider substructures in this portfolio. Because do we actually see their work as part of the bigger picture where they would be contributing to the work of the GNSO Council in general, or is there a chance where we actually assess their principles and their criteria in particular? This is what I'm wondering. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Asteway. I'm not sure I understood your question.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Let me try to make it clearer. Because one of the things we particularly stressed is the issue of substructures within the GNSO. For example, the Contracted Party House has its own substructures and the Business Constituency actually falls within the Non-Contracted Party House. Are we actually assessing the principles and criteria of the BC, for example? Because I look at it as a substructure of the GNSO. How far does the work we do here consider the work of substructures?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. I understand. I think the structure of the SCCI, the fact that we want the groups to consider how their substructures feed into the Council. In fact, our homework for this section is to have you all take these criteria and indicators back to your groups and we expect you to bring feedback back to us. But that being said, the SCCI at the side is not

evaluating those substructures and the mechanisms they're using, but they should be considered consistent and supportive to these criteria and indicators. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Julie. But I had a different question.

JULIE HEDLUND: Asteway, go ahead.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: Sorry. Before your question—for example, if we are about to consider if the GNSO Council is fulfilling its purpose, the work has to derail down to the work of substructure somehow. If we are about to, for example, bring a criteria, then are we to bring out a criteria performed by substructure, or are we actually going to consider the work of a substructure as part of the bigger criteria? I think we can clear that out in the process, but I just want to know that out from the get-go.

JULIE HEDLUND: I would think that the work of the substructure to be contributing to that of the Council as a whole. That is the substructures shouldn't be complacent.

ASTEWAY NEGASH: That's interesting. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Any other questions? Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Julie. I may need to call on Chris. I don't want to put Chris on the spot. But on the second criteria, how the GNSO Council contributes to the global public interest as described in the ICANN articles of incorporation, and it's the 2016 version. It seems like that we have something more recent on that, that there's—I don't know whether it's a checklist or something that came out from the Board that helps to measure, how we measure public interest goals. Maybe Chris can help.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: You're pretty much there as Jen's comment here in the chat. There's the GPI framework checklist, which was developed in the last couple of years. Both Becky and I have been part of that effort. I think we shared it with community in Istanbul. It's certainly still there. I'm sure I can turn my camera off again and go find a link and share it with you. But it would certainly be a useful tool, potentially, in establishing this. There you go. Thanks, Manju.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Well, I'd like to thank you for that. Thank you for the link in the chat, Manju. Peter, you have your hands up.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thanks, Julie. Just still on the GPI, that hand raise, I was sort of... because there were questions pertaining to GPI frameworks and how that has been applied. I'm not sure if that has been really adopted by the community. I guess there's still ongoing conversation around GPI. Is it that we're trying to use the tools to assess our GNSO Council's fulfilling purpose to see how applicable the frameworks actually apply to GNSO assessment?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Chris?

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: I think it's a good question and it's just important to note really that the framework is just that it's a tool. It's not necessarily something that is— well, it has certainly been developed with very close and lengthy consultation with the community and work with the community, but it is simply a tool that groups could use, can choose to use, to do some self-assessment and maybe build some communication about their alignment with ICANN's Global Public Interest Commitments. I don't think you want to see it as more than that, but I think even with that status, it can be a very potentially useful tool.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Chris. Now just note that some of the comments in the chat are helpful in this regard. In fact, that GPI has been incorporated into the charter for Latin diacritics, so it is starting to be used as a tool. Anne, followed by Ajith, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks. I mean, I think it's a great question, Peter. The fact that it looks as though within the GNSO that we are incorporating it into—now it's in Latin diacritics and everyone's assuming that we're putting the GPI framework into every PDP. Does that mean we've already answered that question if it's going into every PDP? It seems like it's really a part of this criteria too, rather than something that should just be left out of consideration. I think it needs to at least be referenced. And if there are some questions in the community about that, then we probably need to discuss it.

JULIE HEDLUND: I should say that staff is taking the action to update criteria to include a reference to the GPI checklist. There are many notes that would fall into the column of yes, I think. Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS: Thanks, Julie. Thanks everybody for this really rich discussion. I think one of the things that the discussion really shows to me is that we're on the right track with these criteria because we're really digging into the substance of the criteria already. Which made me wonder—this is a question for staff in terms of maybe just putting it to context where we are in the development of these criteria and what the next steps would look like, especially in the interest of time given that we have another 15 minutes left. Really, where do we go from here? Are these criteria finalized? Do we need to finalize them? Do we need more criteria? And how the process for that would look like?

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. To answer your question, I think it's envisioned that this group needs to decide those questions, whether or not the criteria is sufficient as is. We've seen here already we have changes to Criteria 2. We need more work on these in this group and in the individual groups as well. Our homework item was to take these back to their groups and discuss them. But I think we should take more time to discuss them and staff can work on suggesting some indicators as well just to start to split up the indicators into two columns and decide who maybe already have existing indicators. I see Taiwo Peter has his hand up.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thanks, Julie. Just for clarification, I see Criteria 1, 2, 3, and wanted to know whether the scope is limited to that. Because when we're trying to look at GNSO and try to see what they've done and the improvements and defining the criteria for that, we have to look at the mechanism, the Operating Procedures and how they conduct what they've done to be able to know whether they are actually fulfilling their purpose. We're bound to the scope based on looking at the ICANN Mission, the ICANN Articles of Incorporation, as well as these Financial Year 2021-2025. Is that the scope? Are we looking at it in a broader perspective? Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Before I continue, I'll go to Manju.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Peter. It's a good question. I think these are all questions that we should be discussing once we review all the criteria for all the principles. Because now, we're actually just having the preliminary review of the criteria for the principle. As Julia's emphasized multiple times, these are the criteria that we have to bring back to our stakeholder groups or constituencies to ask if they think these criteria are sufficient or do we need more criteria. I will also note that actually in the CCIC, we've already reviewed the criteria. I will encourage staff to share the review of that to the team, so also, we're not turning down the work. But what I would suggest is we refrain from asking specific questions regarding the criteria from now on and we just look through them. Noting that these are the criteria that are now existing and these are the criteria we are going to bring back to our stakeholder groups. I will also suggest that probably we do a Google Doc listing all these criteria and people can just come into the Doc and ask suggestions to what we think or what questions we have for the criteria. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Manju. Very clear. That's helpful. We have question in the chat. Let's work and help handle this so we can say sometimes [inaudible]. Thank you. Next slide, please.

As Manju noted, these have been discussed already in the CCOICI. Next slide. Again. Thank you. Next slide. Keep in mind that the link to the slides is in the chat. We can also send you—there's a separate document that we sent along with this agenda. It has the criteria in there as well. Next slide please. Thank you. Next slide, please. Next slide.

The update on the work of the site is on the Council's agenda for the April meeting. There's an opportunity for the Council to confirm the project plan and the assignment form for the upcoming projects that will be by AOB and [inaudible]. Then we have the groundwork for the SGs and Cs to provide feedback on the criteria. Staff can provide some more context with respective indicators. But I see Anne's hand is up.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thanks, Julie. I'm the last one. Can you guys help us with the timeframe in terms of expectations as to when members would need to have the input on the CIP criteria that you've presented today? Sometimes getting that input from the SGs and Cs might take more than one week.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Anne. I think you're correct. Then we'll also think about the timing. We'll discuss the timing with leadership, and also the expectations. Because I think we're going to need to circle back to this in another meeting. We'll also discuss that with leadership. But I think there's some consideration as to whether or not these criteria are ready for adoption or not. Taiwo Peter, please.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thanks, Julie. I don't know if this is the right time to actually propose something because Anne raised that it takes time for the SG to actually respond to some of these to get feedback from them. Is it possible we can have a member of the SCCI group do presentation to each SG and collect their feedback, why still expecting them to provide some certain

things? Because, I guess, from my experience on the NomCom where we have to present to different groups and get their feedbacks and different kinds of positions that NomCom is recruiting for, I guess we can adopt that if the group thinks that approach will work to present to different SG and constituency these criteria to be able to get their feedback on time, that might be helpful. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you. I appreciate that, Julie. I just was wondering, it seems like there's a bit of consensus around the idea of formatting that slide in two columns. Perhaps if we could get a two-column format of that slide and send it to all the members, we could pass that on to our stakeholder groups to give them the idea of where we're standing at this time and seek a visual aid and a proposal on the second column and whatnot and stimulate their interest. That would be a step forward in today's meeting and we could hopefully come back with some good feedback on that in a week or two. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, John. Staff is taking the action to expand the indicators into two columns, and that would be helpful for us getting input from the groups. We also have the action as Anne noted in the chat the principle on Criteria 2. I'm noting also that we need some level setting at the macro level on CIP. We can have that agenda for the next meeting.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. We have one minute remaining. Anne, please.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I have a question with respect to GNSO Council to confirm project plan. Are we proposing to bring that to the Council in the next meeting or are we thinking we're not—

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: We're giving an update in Any Other Business. At the April meeting, Council has the option to object if necessary but we don't expect that. It's not a vote.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay, great. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Latin diacritics, still the same thing. We're on the top of the hour. Over to you, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Julie. Thank you everyone for a very fruitful discussion for our first or second, depending how you count it, meeting. I don't want to run this over time because I know that there's a meeting right after this. I'm sorry I didn't get to answer the question, Ajith. I think that's a great question but we definitely can do it in our follow-up e-mail to the team after this call to explain where we are for the CIP framework so everybody comes with more knowledge of where we are for our next meeting. I'll see you next week. Sorry for overrunning for one minute. Thank you, everyone. Thank you. Bye.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Manju. Thank you, all.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you, Manju.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. As you heard, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recordings and send them out shortly to the list. Take care. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]