
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvement Call, taking place on Wednesday, the 30th of April, 2025. We have the following listed apologies, Prudence Malinky, Julf Helsingius, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Desiree Miloshevic-Evans, and Ajith Francis. 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 Wikis pace 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 your chair, Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Thank you, Terri. Hello, everyone. Let's move on to the next slide. So this is the agenda for today. We are kind of short on attendance today, but I believe we can still do some work. And that concludes my welcome. So we will move to the next slide, which is the recap.

So this, I guess you're all familiar with already. We reviewed the P&I, which is the Policy Implementation PSR Policy Status Report. We went through, we've thoroughly discussed all the analysis regarding EPDP,

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.

and we kind of did a overview of GGP, Genome as a Guidance Process. So the key action items from last, not last week, from the last call, of course, staff will always excellently capture the outcomes of our discussions. And we will move on to review the GGP. And we also urge everyone to review the CIP criteria. Next slide, please.

But although we kind of been rushing everyone to review the CIP Continuous Improvement Program Framework, sorry to share that. Actually, the CIP CCG, which is the Continuous Improvement Program Cross-Community Group, they have been reviewing the public comments they received from the, well, they received from the public comments and on the CIP framework. And they feel like probably they'll have to change quite a bit of the framework. And as a result, they advise all community groups that probably it's best we hold on our work about any further review or modifications of the indicators or criteria, because if they changed anything, then we'll have to go back and kind of check. So they are expecting to finish their work in mid-June this year. We did kind of suggest that we will be reviewing the CIP framework criteria on the next call, which is not next week, but the week after next week. But we'll probably have to change that, because as you can see, we're advised to hold off on more work on this. Next slide, please.

So as you can see, also kind of modify the timeline here, which the CIP part two will probably have to start only after past June. And they'll stay the same. Next slide, please. Oh, I see a hand. Peter, please.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Manju. Just wanted to ask, how does that impact our timeline?

MANJU CHEN: Let's move back to the slide. So it doesn't really impact our timeline in the sense that we're not, how do I say this? So we kind of expected to start working on this in mid-May, which is 14th of May, but they kind of suggested us to hold off on that. But I don't think in the long term, any of our work will be delayed because of this, because as we have informed the team, we have been moving much faster than anticipated anyways. So even if we start later on CIP part two, it actually in the long term will not affect or impact our overall timeline for this year. But I hope that answers your question.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, it does. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, let's move back to the next slide. So, yes, no meeting next week because it's a CP summit and also it's the APAC DNS forum for next week. And if we don't finish the discussion this week, we will carry on to the 14th of May. And because after GGP it's GIP, it's a rather shorter kind of analysis. So we're expecting probably we'll wrap up our whole review of the PSR in the call of 14th of May. And if we do for 21st and 28th of May, we will be having a holiday. And while staff still diligently work on the report. And on the 4th of June, because people will be traveling to Prague, we will not have a meeting that day. Also during

ICANN 83 in Prague, we did kind of for, you know, schedule's sake, we kind of secure a slot. But depending on the discussions and depending on, you know, how things move along, we probably will not have a meeting during Prague either. So that's the overall timeline for the next few weeks. Is there any question? If not, let's move on to the next slide. And next slide. Oh, John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thanks, Manju. Could you tell me, could you go through that again? We are, I want to note those things. So we are today, let's see, where are we at? We're going, sorry. Meeting 6. In a week, we're not having any SCIC, on the 7th of May, we're not having any SCCI meeting. And then we're, the following week, we're having one on the 14th. And then the following week, or the 21st, are we meeting or not having a meeting?

MANJU CHEN: It depends on whether we have already wrapped up our discussion on 13th. If we do, then we don't, we won't have any other things to discuss on the 21st.

JOHN MCCABE: Based on this advice you received and told us about today.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, also, yeah. I mean, we could have started on a CIP, but they, then we are suggested that we don't until mid-June, so.

JOHN MCCABE: Okay. And then on the 28th, we should, of May, would we meet or we wouldn't meet or to be advised?

MANJU CHEN: We wouldn't if we didn't meet on 21st, because that means we already finished the review of PSR.

JOHN MCCABE: Okay, so SCCI is a question on the 28th. Yes, okay, great, thank you.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Okay, so we finished the review of EPDP during last call. And today we're going to start with the GGP and probably GIP. And, yep. These were the things reviewed in the policy status report. Next slide, please.

So, I just like to note that, so in the policy status report, they also kind of reviewed the consensus policy implementation framework and the IRT principles and guidelines. But as we all know, these processes are owned by ICANN org and not the community. So the reviewing of the analysis and the PSR will be done by ICANN org, the staff, instead of us, because we don't own these processes. Just wanted to make it clear for everyone, because there wasn't, I wasn't very clear on this in the previous pause. So we just wanted to emphasize this to everyone so we are clear on this. Thank you. Let's move to the next slide.

And this is the key outcome from the last meeting. We discussed like how do we explain better to the community of the distinction between EPDP and PDP. And we decided that we will kind of try to draft a clear message to kind of explain to the community, what does EPDP mean? And how and what circumstance, under what circumstances will the general counsel choose EPDP over PDP as a process for policy development? Peter, please.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, thanks, Manju. Yeah, so just a thought on that. When we're drafting a client message, I'll come on that. Is it possible for us to have a kind of a matrix that shows why EPDP is, what a pity. So a kind of a selling point in such a way that people will understand with a glance, not just drafting a client message, maybe a kind of visualizations that show, I don't know if that exists, that show the difference between EPDP and PDP and what are the benefit of that for people to be able to just see it at once and understand what benefit does EPDP has versus PDP and the cost benefit analysis. I don't know if that's possible. That's already exist. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Peter. I think with this, but definitely kind of agree to it in the last call too about your suggestion, how we kind of will create another graph if we remember the Z graph for PDP. So we will create another graph for EPDP. So if you put them together, it clearly shows the difference. And of course, when the message is drafted, I'm sure it's going to be presented to the team and we will discuss together how to

make it clearer or where do we think has to be improved or emphasized more. And what kind of visuals we think will help for delivering the message. But I feel like it has to wait until the message is drafted and we have to give staff the time to work on this. But definitely we'll take that in mind. And when we're developing it, we will try to make sure all the points and discussions we had is captured in the message. Thank you. Thank you. Let's move on to the next slide.

So today we're going to be reviewing the analysis in the PSR for the genital guidance process. Let's move on to the next slide. These are the main analysis that we kind of got from the PSR. We're going to review one by one starting next slide. So we will not go through them now. Next slide, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Thank you, Manju. Before we go on to GGP, I would like to kind of reflect on the question that Peter had for all of us. I think he was kind of referring to a statement that would assert the need for EPDP rather than PDP in such a way that an EPDP would be initiated when the community is clear about the issue and where there would be no need for an issue report. And there would be no need for gathering public comments and reflecting on the public comments. So I think a clear statement of that would help all of us to proceed. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. Definitely. So what I was trying to say is probably, so we're not going to drop the, well, as in like we the community members on the team will not be holding the pen to draft this message. I think we

rely on our magnificent staff to do the first draft first. And then they will come back to us with the draft and we will review it and suggest, you know, either improvements or modifications or edits. And that's the time when we will see exactly what is drafted and, you know, and we can suggest all the improvements we just discussed now and like the brilliant points you guys have raised. So yeah, I hope that helps. Okay, nothing for the hands or comments. So for GGP, we will start with the first analysis we discovered in the PSR. So in the PSR, they find, in the history of ICANN, there only has been one GGP. It was the GGP on applicant support program. I think we kind of go through what it was in the last call. And then the PSR, they suggested that the first GGP, this GGP on ASP was the GGP on applicant support. The first GGP, this GGP on ASP was affected, but they felt like there are more comprehensive targets that needed to be set to ensure better communications between the Working Group Council and ICANN. So I guess, I don't know if you guys will be as confused as I am when I see this analysis, because I think, like, generally, it looks reasonable, but why exactly are they suggesting and what situation happened in GGP on ASP made them to bring up this suggestion? I felt like it's easier if we see exactly the example they provided in the PSR for us to understand, or more like contextualized, why they have this analysis. So that's why we are bringing you to the exact text they provided in the PSR, where they think more comprehensive targets and communications are needed. So this is the text we kind of captured in our slide, but I think the examples are more important. So let's move on to the example. This, this paragraph start with in Task 4. So in Task 4, which include defining the represent, what represents the sex for DSP, the GGP recommendations clearly define an expected number of supportive locations, 0.5% of all

successfully delegated next round new gTLDs to be supported applications. And to this extent, the objective and intent of the GGP could be seen to have been met. However, the working group noted that this figure should be considered for not a ceiling, and ICANN should strive to exceed this minimum. And this is why the staff think, said, why the staff think, As I said, I think this example kind of provides a context of like, based on what they do, they suggest a more comprehensive target will help. And after seeing the exact example, I think we can go back to the slide. So based on the examples we just saw, let's move on to the discussion questions. Is there a problem to solve? Because they feel like a floor is not enough. There should be more comprehensive targets. Is it a problem to solve? Is it that we're actually clear enough, but what the community was actually clear enough, but the org were expecting too much or is it whatsoever? But I'll stop here and I see Asteway's hand.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Thank you, Manju. And thank you for bringing out that example. And I think it makes things kind of clear for us to continue on legislating on the GGP and what comes after it. So the way I see it, the reason, the fact that we only had a very once experience of the GGP, actually makes sure that we only have a short term experience with the GGP for us to be legislating a lot around the nature of the PDP or the nature of the policy process itself. But I think we need to have a thorough understanding of the GGP and its nature in general, because I feel like the GGP is initiated very incidentally or without having a premeditated understanding or a premeditated consensus of how the process should begin and how the procedure should be implemented. However, from

the way I understand the GGP and how it should be laid forward, I see that the GGP by nature has to be very narrow in scope instead of a wide issue.

First of all, I think we need to understand why the council resorted to a GGP instead of a small team. I think someone would be able to explain that a little further, but the nature of the GGP itself calls for the board to ask for an interpretation on a matter and for the council to set up a team that basically responds to that. So by nature, I think it has to be narrow in scope, as opposed to the actual policymaking itself, because the policy process has to be robust and extensive in its nature, the way I see it. And the response to the question of a board has to be narrow in scope and has to be specific. So that's how I perceive it, basically. So the question that a GGP should be comprehensive actually does not make a lot of sense to me, basically. So I feel like comprehensive has to be elaborated in a state where it should reflect basically something like the WGSA or something like self-assessment or impact assessment, I would rather say. Impact of the GGP and the recommendations on other policies has to be studied. And a reflection of the recommendation has to be announced to everyone. That's how I perceive a comprehensive, basically. So that's my reflection on it. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. So I think you actually just covered all of the analysis in one go. A lot of your comments are actually answering questions we have for the next few, like second and third analysis. But thank you very much. Can I understand you correctly if I say so you don't feel like the GGP needs to have more comprehensive targets because it has a very

narrow scope? Please correct me if I'm just putting words in your mouth.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Yeah. Well, basically, we need to understand how the GGP works. Basically, we only have a short-term experience with the GGP. But for the way I understand GGP is a response to the board questions. So I don't think it makes sense to make it broad in the sense where it should reflect a lot of topics at a time because it has to be focused on some topic. And I basically see it as a response to any specific question that the board has. So comprehensive should be understood in the sense that its impact basically on all other consensus policies has to be understood thoroughly. So that's how I understand it, comprehensive. But other than that, there is a scope and the scope has to be narrow. And you basically respond to the question that the board has on a specific topic. So I don't think there is a need to complicate it more than how complex it actually needs to be. So thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. So I think we agreed that instead of setting more comprehensive targets for GGP, it's actually more work has to be done to align expectations from all participants of the GGP and like all community, every community members, as a more educational work should be done to kind of tell people what GGP is really for and set the correct expectations. Peter, I see your hand, please.

PETER AKINREMI:

Thanks, Manju. My thought is in the line of the first submission. The finding shows that GGP was effective. What basis was this actually founded on in terms of what makes it effective and in terms of comprehensive? So why are we actually looking at GGP for more comprehensive? I know in terms of floor and ceiling, that might not have been determined, but do we have past discussions to why floor and ceiling was actually the consensus or times used in GGP? So in order to know whether we need a more comprehensive GGP, so we need to understand what makes the first one successful, because we have a narrow experience with this, which is like you say, is that it just as a community has not actually been experienced with this a lot. So how do we know whether we need more comprehensive GGP to address this issue? So the first things we need to understand whether is there a problem to solve is for us to understand what problem is GGP actually solving? And are there problems, the first application of it, are there issues that arose that we don't need? So it's good that we look at the example, that does not actually give us more comprehensive understandings of whether we need to determine whether GGP should be expanded and the scope should be broader. So that's kind of my thought on that, for us to be able to determine whether there is a problem with it and there is need for us to expand the scope of GGP. I don't know if my thought line is helpful in this, yeah, thank you.

MANJU CHEN:

So you're saying there are not enough examples for us to determine whether ...

PETER AKINREMI:

Yep, yep, exactly.

MANJU CHEN:

Well, that was the only example provided in the PSR. So, and I'm guessing like, if, so I guess in a way we can say that this is the only example they can provide to suggest to have a more comprehensive target, then probably this is actually not a problem because the other criteria and targets were met, you know, successfully by the GGP.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, exactly, that's my point because we need to know, the recommendation says the GGP was effective, then pointed out, okay, area for improvement. How do we know when it's to improve? Because from the outcome sayings, ensuring better communication between the working group council and ICANN, is there a situation where there was no, there was an issue or gap in communication and what happens is that the rules wasn't defined or is in term of the floor and ceiling that was stated in there. So we need to be clear on what needs to be solved for us to know whether GGP needs to be, we need to expand it or the statement needs to be looked into. Thank you, Manju.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, thank you very much, Peter. So I feel like we're roughly agreeing that there's actually not a problem because, you know, the examples PSR can provide is very slim and probably for me personally, I definitely don't feel like it's a sufficient example to suggest to have a more, to have more comprehensive targets. From the discussions I've

heard from the team, I feel like we are all agreeing to that assessment. Please let me know if I'm totally wrong in assessing your opinions. Peter, I see your hand, but because Jen's hand is like first time in this call, so I'd like to give her priority if that's okay for you.

PETER AKINREMI: Yep, yep.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Cheers, I really needed that coffee to kickstart my brain. I just reread the entire PSR analysis on GGP. I'm tending to agree with your summary just now of the discussion so far, since there is just that one example, especially on the task for regarding comprehensive target as in the comprehensive response on this task for. So I agree also with Peter that there is just really not a sufficient, I guess, set of data for us to look into it to say that this is a problem. I do really wanna pick up on the last bullet. Oh wait, not the last bullet. What am I reading right now? There was something I was reading. Ah, sorry, not the last bullet on this side, but I think there needs to be more clarity on the request. I think that was the recommendation as well, the initiation request. So having a clear, I guess, scope there would make this process, or really any process, much more effective. So I don't know where that is. And I see staff is now going through the slides. Okay, perfect. Scope, yes. So maybe it is already contained here because I was reading as well. This is

page 16 of the PSR report, something about how it needs to require supplementary information beneath each of its tasks. I don't know what that might look like. I should have probably dug up to see what it looked like for our first one. But if there's any improvement there that we need to address, or really are we just trying to find problems to solve when there are no problems? Maybe I still don't sound coherent because coffee hasn't kicked in yet.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Jen. You definitely sound more coherent than me. This is actually, yes, one of the analysis we will be reviewing too. This, I believe, is the third analysis. And I think we actually have a more kind of concrete suggestion for this one about the initial request. But let's just quickly move back to the first analysis to kind of make sure that we agree on the assessment for now. But I'm very glad that actually all of the discussions until now, I think you guys all just went through all the analysis and all have your reflection on it. So thank you very much for reading ahead.

But yeah, for this one, do we agree that there's actually not really a problem to solve? And we can just, I think a problem we kind of pick up for all of us, we kind of identify as actually people are not sure about what GGP is for. Therefore, there has been kind of a misaligned expectations from different parties. So one thing we can do probably, instead of having more comprehensive targets, is to kind of similar to the EPDP, we create like a clear message or like a more, you know, sustain educational material of some sort to explain what GGP is for and why its scope has to be very limited. And does that sounds like a good

kind of thing to work on for everyone? I'm not seeing objections. Thank you, thank you, Jen. Also, I've got one supporter. So probably we can take that as an action item for this one. And thank you, Peter, too. And we can move on to the second analysis.

So for the second analysis, it's also kind of about the misaligned expectations. So example is in a PSR. Well, long story short, the staff expected it to be done, finished, shorter, but it kind of following its process took a longer time than the staff wanted. Well, again, of course, it's me paraphrasing what was in the PSR, but I feel like that's the gist of it. And so that was the analysis and rationale. They feel like different parties have different expectations of when the GGP will be finished and they feel like there are room for improvement in terms of can you communicate better on and align better on when the GGP will be finished. That's the analysis and rationale. And let's move on to the discussion question.

So again, is there really a problem to be solved? Because, I mean, the process there, and then ICANN process everything. We have to follow the process to ensure the transparency and accountability. And it takes longer than you want it to be. I mean, sorry, but it has to be followed that way. So I guess this is another example of misaligned expectations, but are we seeing any problems to be solved here? Or is it really just another thing we have to address in that message we're crafting to kind of align expectations from all party, including the org and community on what GGP is, what process it follows, and what scope it has to be doing when it's tasked for something. I'm seeing one hand, John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thanks, Manju. I think what you're saying is that this is really more of a communication problem than anything else in that we're hitting, our plan is to hit all the points that we have to deal with, and then the plan is to hit all the points the task is to communicate that those have all been done to the wider community, is that right? Or more or less?

MANJU CHEN: I feel like, yes. Peter, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Okay.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks, Manju. When I see a misalignment, so it's actually, maybe that could be a result of communication problem or because we know we're heavy with procedure and policy statements in the ICANN environment where we have a lot of stuff bundled up together in policy and statement. So this could be a communication issue. Maybe we need to find a way to explain GGP process procedures to each of the stakeholder involved for them to understand it. So it could be a communication problem and a way to simplify even GGP process itself. Maybe that can help with or address misalignment in expectation, yeah.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Peter, great suggestions. I think we'll definitely include that in this message that we're about to draft on, well, whatever. Is it a message, it's an infographic, but an educational material about GGP for

our community and for the org probably, because the misalignment is not only within the community, apparently it's also between community and org. So I guess that's definitely something we should do. And just to note that I remember, and in her apologies to the meeting today, she suggested that we should make clear when the analysis is coming from the org or when it's coming from the public comments, because sometimes it's kind of mixed up in the PSR. But I rely on staff to correct me, but I believe analysis one and two are both staff's assessment. And for the next one, analysis three, I think it's also staff assessment. And again, I rely on staff to correct me. But yeah, I just remember why I suggested in the mailing list. Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH:

Thank you, Manju. I rather would thank you for bringing up that point. I rather feel that a lot of the points arise from the public comments that have been collected on the PSR. And the way I perceive misaligned communication is in the sense that maybe the role of everyone needs to be defined clearly, the role of everyone probably, the working group itself or in the council has to be clearly stated, especially when it comes to staff. I think it's a good idea to, well, I don't want this to come out as bold or kind of blatant, but maybe we need to define what the staff actually has it as a function within the court, within the court's effect of the policy making. Well, besides the role of implementation of policy, maybe we need to clearly define what staff has to do in the effect of facilitating for the policy making to go smoothly. Some of the public comments seem to, well, assert that staff may have a heavy hand on defining the processes, the procedures, and actually putting these things into frame. And when you actually frame the process and the

procedures, well, the outcome will also be framed in some manner. So I believe the overall sense of misaligned communication is from understanding the role of every party involved in the policy making process. So I feel like we rather need to define the role of everyone and state clearly how everyone should interact within the process of policy making. So that's how I perceive things.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. I think this will be more thoroughly and like what you're saying about clearer definition of roles for either community members or staff or whoever is participating in the policy development process, I think that that will definitely be analyzed deeply and overseen deeply when we are doing the review of PDP 3.0 in the later stage of this year. So thank you very much. That's a very good point. We should keep that in mind when we're discussing the PDP 3.0, when we start doing that. And definitely we can capture that, I think also some points of that in our report of this review. And Peter, please.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, thanks. Good conversation on this. On point number two, this suggests that this is like a future enhancement on how to improve communication between ICANN and the GNSO council, given that GGP issues may arise during implementation of policy. What kind of mechanism do we have in place currently for communication between ICANN Org and GNSO council? Because I'm concerned when we talked about enhancing communication between ICANN and GNSO council. So in order for us to know whether there is, there's a mechanism that is

needed to improve that kind of communication, what kind of mediums do we have currently to address this issue?

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you very much, Peter. I'll defer this question to staff. To my understanding, I don't see any like formal mechanism, but I feel like we talk quite proactively to Org as the GNSO council. But again, I rely on staff to rescue me from this poor answer. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks. This is Steve from staff. There are probably a lot of informal ways in which the two parties can speak. And maybe it's helpful to think about how this particular issue arose related to the applicant support program. I recall correctly, and it's testing my memory. I believe the issue was identified in the context of the operational design phase. It wouldn't necessarily have to happen in that phase. It could have been in the course of just normal implementation where further guidance was needed. But in this case, I think it was actually, the issue was raised via writing. So just written communications were shared with the council via the implementation staff. And the council determined that upon receiving the input, that the GNSO guidance process made the most sense to be able to deliberate on the issues and concerns and the gap and provide guidance back to the Org. But as Manju noted, that wouldn't be the only way. There are open lines of communication. If the council needs more input or information from the staff, they could request it. And vice versa, if the staff implementation folks needed more information, they can do what they did, put that in writing or

maybe request time on a council meeting to seek input. So I think there's a variety of ways in which the two parties can communicate. Hope that helps, thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Steve. So I guess for this analysis, do we agree that overall it's just, again, communication problems. We just need to do better with, you know, educating everyone on what GGP is and what procedure it has. And, you know, what it is and what GGP is. Today, I'm going to talk about how to avoid further misaligned expectations. Not seeing any objections and being conscious of time, we might not be able to finish the discussions of Analysis 3, but let's try to just probably start. Next slide.

So the Analysis 3 is about more directions on the level and detail of guidance appropriate for the GGP. So it's mainly about how initial request is kind of framed and what's contained in the initial request. So this is where public comments, like the analysis is public comments, because as you can see from the second point, in general, comments suggested that it means it's from the public comments. So the comments suggested that more direct comment in the GGP process is encouraged, but then again, like, I didn't personally participate in the GGP, but the GGP itself is an inclusive process where I remember, if I remember correctly, all SOs and ACs, SG And C had representative on the GGP. So probably this comment, we can take into note, but I'm not sure what improvement we can do about this. Let's move on to the discussion questions.

So yes, for the initial request, what further details should be added to the initial request? Or should we, you know, what kind of information? Let's see what's in the initial request now. Keep switching between slides. So this is what in the initial request. Is there any more information needed in the initial request? Now there is the name of council member or SG or C that initiated the request for the GGP. And then there's explanation of the origin of issue, for example, for request. In the case of SG, actually, I'm not sure, but I mean, the origin of issue is in the SubPro final report, there was this explicit recommendation that there needs to be a specific IRT to deal with the metrics of success for ASP. And I think that's kind of the origin of the issue. Scope of the effort, we were talking about how GGP has to have a narrow scope. Proposed GGP mechanism, for example, working group, discussion team, or individual volunteers. Methods of operation is different from the working group guidelines. Decision making methodologies, how to assess consensus is different from the general working group guidelines. And the desired completion dates and rationale for this date. I think this answer is also to the question or the analysis too, which like they expected it to be finished shorter, but there, well, it is already written in the initial request when it's expected to be completed.

So with this in mind, there's only three minutes left. Probably we won't have time to have a very thorough discussion. And I think we kind of jinxed it by saying we're moving way faster than we planned in the beginning of the meeting. But we're still faster than we expected. So no worries. But yeah, so please just keep that in mind and remember it when we're coming back to our next call. If we don't remember, it's okay. We can just go through it again in our next call too. Let's just

review the next steps real quick. So first, we don't have a meeting next week. We will reconvene on the 14th of May. And we will start with the last analysis of GGP. And we were collecting feedback of the CIP criteria. But now that with the additional information from ORG and CIP CCG, I think we can kind of have a pause, put a pause on it. And we will pick up in June. And we will continue to review the P&I PSR. Next slide. We don't have the next slide. Well, does anyone has any AOB? Peter, please.

PETER AKINREMI:

Yeah, just a clarification, Manju. Since we're putting a pause on the CIP criteria, should we inform our members or stakeholders that the work that is currently being going on, should they continue to review? We don't know if there will be substantial changes to that criteria. So what do we do?

MANJU CHEN:

So every stakeholder group should have representatives on the CIP CCG too. I actually will expect their rep on that group to come back to their SG&C to, you know, deliver this message. But definitely we can do that too. Just coordinate with your teammates and your SG&C, I guess. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. If no further questions, we're going to end the meeting now. Thank you very much for participating. I'll see you in the week after next week. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]