
TERRI AGNEW: The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Continuous Improvements call taking place on Wednesday, the 22nd of April, 2026. We have apologies listed from Julf Helsingius and Gaurav Vedi. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

MANJU CHEN: I have never really updated my Statement of Interest. I updated it on the website, but I didn't update it to our team. I moved from jobless to having a job. Now I work in an organization called Trusted Notifier Network. That's my update. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. If anyone does need assistance with updating your Statements of Interest, you can always reach out to 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.

As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standard of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct. With that, I'll turn it back over to Manju Chen. Please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you very much, Terri. Hello, everyone. Welcome to the call. I see people are slowly coming in still. So, maybe we stay on this slide for another second before all attendees are promoted to panelists. Or not, we can move to the next slide, please. So first, we will start with the recap of last week's meeting. So, the key outcomes basically for team one and two, they were about the vague period, as in like sometimes it says something, something regularly.

And what do we mean by regularly? And there are indicators that people question that might be unmeasurable. And we explain and agree that there will be a mixture of indicators where some can be measurable, some will be simply a statement, and it will be a yes/no answer to that kind of indicators. We also agree that for some of the criteria, we will add qualitative indicators and incorporate other qualitative characters into certain indicators as you can see from the document that we sent to you 7 hours ago, and we will actually go to that later, but not now.

I guess, just in general, we captured what we agreed in the meeting, and we have reflected that agreement in the updated document, which we are going to review later. And also, for this comment about some indicator has too low of a bar, for example, at least one mechanism is in place. Those kind of indicators, we agreed to replace that with one or more. And all of those indicators have been updated too in the document. So, basically, these were the key outcomes from last week's meeting. And we have finished the action items too from last week's meeting.

Any questions or reflections now? Not seeing any comments or hands. Let's move to the next slide. So, we will continue to review the comments. We unfortunately have to stop by the third thing last week. We asked the team to kind of review the document again bearing in mind of how you think we should distinguish GNSO Council and GNSO. We haven't really discovered any particular comments about this during this week on the document.

And we have something in mind as the leadership team to kind of propose to the team to see if this is how we will agree moving forward. What we have in mind will be on the next slide. So, basically, we think it will be helpful to when we are reviewing the whole principle criteria indicators, to bear in mind that the purpose of GNSO in relation to ICANN bylaws, because at the end of the day, this is a review of areas of continuous improvement of GNSO.

So, in order to identify various of improvement we have to always keep in mind the purpose of GNSO and ICANN bylaws. And as you can see from the screen, GNSO basically, its main responsibility is to develop and recommend ICANN Board of substantive policies related to gTLDs and other responsibilities of the GNSO. So, I guess one, the most important part is gTLD policy, developments, and responsibility. Another is just other related responsibilities, as we can see, also capturing the indicators and criteria.

So, this is what we think is, well, I guess in a sense will be the principle that we follow when we review the indicators and to make the distinction between GNSO and GNSO Council. And since we haven't seen any comments in the past week on the document, aside from the

previous ones, we are proposing to you that maybe the leadership team will take the first step of reviewing it, as in the distinction between GNSO and GNSO Council with this principle in mind.

And then, if any changes, we will circulate the updated version to the team by next week because we won't have a meeting next week due to there's an ICANN event happening next week. The team will have two weeks, well, no, one and a bit more week to review the updated document and we can come back the week after next to finalize the indicators. Does that sound good for everyone? Cool.

So, let's go back to the previous slide because there's another thing of comments that we are seeing, which is a lot of people have sharp eyes and discover that some indicators are repeated throughout the document. Let's say it's not a bug, it's a feature, because as we have explained when we started reviewing the indicators, and according to the guidance from the ICANN team who are in charge of Continuous Improvement Program, because collecting data is a lot of work and because it's always good to kind of save the extra effort or not reinventing the wheels in a sense when we are doing the Continuous Improvement Review, it is okay and it is encouraged for some indicators when it is appropriate to be repeated.

So, I guess if you have discovered this, good eyes. If you have discovered this even without us already listing them out, even better eyes for you. But as I said, it's a feature, it's not a bug. So, thank you for who made the comment of pointing it out. But I guess just clarify here, it is okay for indicators to be repeated and we will only address this when there are people who, when reviewing, feel like some indicators

are not supposed to be repeated there because it's not supposed to be there. If that thing happened, that kind of situation or scenario happened, we will have a discussion.

But if it's simply repeated and it's fit-for-purpose to be put there, it's gonna just stay there. I hope that explains and address this comment. I'm not seeing any hands or questions about this. So, we can move to slide nine. So, these are kind of standalone comments that cannot be categorized under themes, and for these comments, we will go to the documents and to discuss them. So, let's move to the document. The first one is this one. Because this one is about GNSO contributes to the global public interest.

And as you can see here, there are three indicators under these criteria. The first one is about how many mechanisms we have in place to ensure that global public interest is considered. And the third one is measurable, so indicators where it will be a result of the survey that people agree we contribute to global public interest. And the second one is the one with the comments.

What we are proposing, as you see from the screen, I guess what we're thinking behind when we are developing this particular indicator, indicator two, is that we wanted to show that every product, every output of GNSO has at least a part of it that consider global public interest. And this is how we chose to phrase it as an indicator. But there is a comment about instead of just saying that, oh, there's a part of every output, maybe it will be more effective to assess the quality and substance of that particularly part of output, I guess that was from the comments.

And as we can see, the person who left the comments is not on the call right now. I guess I'll leave time for you guys to kind of think whether you agree with the comments. But also, I guess, in a sense, bearing in mind how, like, if we agree, how do we even assess the quality of the global public interest that's included in the GNSO reports? Because as we all know, in ICANN, it's already hard even to just define, have like a consensus on what global public interest mean regardless of how it relates to individual parts in ICANN. I am not seeing any hand or comments. Oh, I see one hand. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Manju. I wasn't planning on putting my hand up, but I thought you wanted us to respond, so I did. I think that the way that Indicator 2 is written seems to be fine, and perhaps Gaurav, and I don't want to put words into his mouth because he's not here, I don't think Indicator 2 is saying we need dedicated sections in any given report that talks about GPI, but only that if there are sections that demonstrates that this was considered. So again, this might be not just counting how many sections, but actually looking at the substance. I don't know if that's articulated well or not. That's my understanding of this indicator.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you. Yes. I think both you and Thomas pointed out a very good point, which is that it's not about compliance, it's more about we have considered, well, GNSO has considered it during its process of policymaking and it is reflected in the results of the policymaking, which is the report. I personally will suggest that we duly consider Gaurav's

comments and we think, well, it is a good comment, but it's probably difficult to fulfill.

And as we agree per last meeting, we have to bear in mind the feasibility of collecting data when we are developing the indicators -- Oh, I see another hit. But just before I go to that. Oh, sorry, something happened in my screen, that's why I had a weird sound. And I lost my thought. I'll just go to the end. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you, Manju. I just wanted to say it's a nitpicking thing, but if we make that change, we should change the following word demonstrates into the singular, take the S off the end. So, what are more sections that demonstrate that the global public interest was considered during the policy development process.

MANJU CHEN: Oh yes, thank you very much, John.

JOHN MCCABE: You're welcome.

MANJU CHEN: So, yes, I guess what I was suggesting is that we duly consider this comment, but we think this indicator is still fine. And what we can do is really when we are replying to this indicator, responding to this indicator when we are doing the assessment in the future, we try to do

more about showcasing the quality and substance of how it's considered, but not to force it into indicator. Does that sound good for everyone? I'm counting. Oh, Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Manju. This is Steve. As we navigated into this document, it reminded us of something that we also adjusted for this document. You'll see some, well, I'll just show an example here above here. Yeah, so, Saewon is highlighting right now. What we try to do is to sort of find the, we called it the operative word, essentially what the criteria is asking for, with the assumption that this would help us guide the right drafting of the indicators.

Because the way that some of the criteria are written, they are just asking about the existence of things rather than how effective or how regularly or some other descriptive words. And so, what we tried to do is, depending whether or not we got all of them exactly correct, but like I said, we try to carve out the word, like basically the action that's being asked of this group, well, I guess the next group for gathering data, and trying to figure out what we're essentially looking for.

So, you'll see there's certain words highlighted in the criteria that is hopefully going to help us understand whether or not we're drafting the criteria true to what the, sorry, the indicator is true to what the criteria is asking for. Hope that made sense.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Steve, and thank you again for reminding us about that. I'm sorry I forgot to point this out for everybody. Well, I was going to count five seconds for those who, if you are having a violent disagreement of what we're going to deal with this, to raise your voice or hands. John, I assume that was in old hand of the demonstrate thingy.

And if we're not seeing any violent agreement after five seconds, we're going to move to the next comment. So, five, four, three, two, one. Okay, we can move to the next one. So, this comment is by Jen. So, although she didn't ask for the floor, but I'm gonna give her the floor to explain her comment and what we should consider here, or what she thinks we have to consider here about these indicators. Sorry, Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

No worries. Thank you, Manju, for volunteering me to explain myself. Sure. When I was looking at this, and I guess I looked at the other indicators and criteria as well, a lot of it is looking at efficiency, effectiveness, how GNSO and GNSO Council are producing the outputs they need to produce, having the mechanisms they need to have. But this one seems to be measuring things that depend on other things as well.

So, I'm not really sure how we go about that other than I guess maybe when we respond to these things, we point this out. But then again, I don't know how to explain any more than what I put in the comment. And the second part is I'm wondering also, I guess maybe this is not just a question for this particular indicator, this particular criteria, but again,

is it a period of time. So, when Manju started talking about some improvements to this draft, there's some that says regularly, some that says the periodic part, and I think she kept it that way.

But this one, again, are we looking at a particular period here? Are we looking at the entire output of GNSO's history of all of the policies that have come out of it? So, I think that's the more long-winded version of my comment. Hopefully that makes it a little clearer. I don't know if that's okay, Manju. If not, I'm happy to take a second shot at this.

MANJU CHEN:

Thank you, Jen. I think it was very clear for me. And while I really agree with all of the points you raised, but I also feel like that's something probably when we are answering to the indicators that we can address, for example, about the period of time because of the Board readiness work that happened within the GNSO Council. Probably in the future when we're answering this, we can say something like before this Board readiness work, something, something percent of GNSO recommendations were determined as non-adaptable.

But then later after this work, the percentage hopefully lessened. And that will be, I guess, a signal of improvement of GNSO's effectiveness of developing its policy, ensuring its policy, its outcome is implementable. But I also agree that these are kind of the things outside of the Council. Well, that's the thing, right? It's not like it's totally outside of GNSO council's control because or else there wouldn't have been those kinds of efforts within the GNSO council about Board readiness, about

improving its communication with the Board, about requiring ICANN Org liaisons to the GNSO PDPs.

So, it's like an effort that's not carried alone by GNSO, but GNSO still has a part of its share in ensuring this. This is how I feel about it, but I'm open to any other feelings, opinions, feedbacks. Do you think it's better if we just get rid of this or we keep them, and when we're answering this, we keep in mind of the more nuanced context that we just discussed. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thanks, Manju. I absolutely think we need to keep this section because it is a huge part of the reason why GNSO exists. You flashed us that lovely screen slide about what the GNSO is in the bylaws. So, this is necessary. I'm just wondering if we need to add anything to it. I'm fine if the answer is when we're looking at the survey, when we're looking at trying to answer these, we include, of course, this nuance and consideration. I haven't decided whether or not we need to add something to this or not.

I think I'm leaning towards no, but I'm also pointing out, because I'm also very involved with the Board readiness work, that the findings of that team, there's a whole range of reasons why, and not all of them, actually not all of them are under GNSO Council, or now I'm talking about Council, not under Council control. And it will also depend on, I guess, I don't even know if there's going to be some kind of review of the other factors that cause these recommendations to not be implementable or be non-adopted or be pended by the Board.

I think I'm circling around the thing I'm trying not to say on recording, but I'll just say it. I mean, a lot of this also, when we were doing that Board readiness work has to do with how the Board functions. So, looking at our criteria, looking at assessing our own criteria, when we determine in a substantive answer that other factors, whether those factors or those mechanisms work is highly dependent on that as well.

So, again, I don't think there's much we can do here in this criteria six, but if we find that when we're going through this whole assessment framework, and the way we are structuring how we're trying to create this survey or I guess this criteria and the indicators, when we find there are dependencies with other such mechanisms, how do we go about it? Thanks.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes. Thank you very much, Jen. Timeline. Did we address it? I feel like I kind of did, but that was not a satisfactory thing. What I was suggesting is that probably you can point to some improvement effort within GNSO and make it like a milestone to distinguish the periods of time. Like I said, for example, after PDP 3.0, certain percentage of GNSO's recommendations are determined as non-adaptable, and then after Board readiness work, certain percentage.

But that's my suggestion. I'm open to any other suggestions about do we have to include this period of time in the indicators so we don't just come up with anything on our own? Steve just suggested that we can also check in with staff who support CIP overall to see if they have any

guidance about this. I'm not sure if he's talking about the timeline or the dependencies of these indicators.

Oh, timeline. Yeah, so while nobody else has any particular strong opinion about how we address the timeline, I guess we will rely on staff to go see guidance of other staff who's more knowledgeable about this than us. Or you can also consider my suggestion about having our own milestones that we can come up with. And about the dependencies, I feel like the tentative agreement now is we don't change anything about indicators. We just try to put more nuance and put more context when we're answering to the indicators.

And also, I think we can definitely have suggestions like Board readiness, right? They have suggestions to Board or to the Org that's like, depending on them whether they want to do that. But although this essentially is a self-assessment work, I don't see why not that we -- well, I guess at some point, we will also be able to spot something that has to be improved, but it's not GNSO but somebody else.

And I don't think that that's not something we cannot do, which means that's something we can definitely do, but that will be in the future when we start collecting answers to the indicators. Sounds good. Not seeing any valid rejections. Then we can move to the next comment. The comment is about, is there any scenario where GNSO would disagree with any of the recommendations of a particular review? Because in the criteria, it includes where appropriate.

I'm not the perfect historian, but I believe there have been scenarios where certain recommendations from certain reviews were not really

accepted, probably non-adopted by GNSO. So, that's why in the indicators, we only suggest to investigate whether it's been duly considered, and then whether it is implemented. And we are not assuming all of the recommendations are going to be accepted. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

I figured you would call on me because it's again a comment. I now see the edit that takes away my concern because originally Indicator 2 says fully implemented, and now fully is crossed out. So, I'm fine with that. Because if there are scenarios where GNSO can make this assessment and say this is not appropriate, this is not something we will do, it will not be fully implemented. It'll just be implemented as where appropriate, I guess, is where you can put that in.

MANJU CHEN:

Yes, thank you, Jen. And sounds like we're good with this edit. And thank you for your comments that kind of pushed to this comment to realize this more updated and accurate, I guess, indicators. And let's move to the next one. Oh, yes. So, I guess this comment is about too many actions in one indicator.

And I guess for us to discuss here is really, do we want to break this indicator into three to kind of reduce the density? Or are there any other thoughts about how we deal with this? Or you're okay with the density of this? Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Manju. This is Steve again. While you're all thinking, this is where we thought it was hopefully helpful to be able to highlight some things in the criteria. And you can see that the way that it's drafted now, it says the processes are in place to do the assessing, the prioritizing, and implementing of suggestions.

And so, the way that we interpreted this, the operative word is that they are in place. And so, it doesn't necessarily ask about how effective or how well these things are working, for maybe better or worse. But the way that the criteria is drafted is a pretty simple yes, no, are there things in place. So, just thought that might be helpful. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju, and thanks, Steve, for bringing us through. So, I think, well, not on this call, previous calls, maybe the one that we just had, actually, Manju explained to us, some of these, in any given criteria, or not any given, in some of the criteria, there is one indicator that kind of tries to show the existence of such things, and then there's a second one that looks at it in a more qualitative way. Do we you need to have that qualitative indicator for this one as well because this is also about the quality of the CIP, I guess, or the quality of the GNSO to be able to implement the CIP.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Jen. What I'm getting from your comment is probably as in like the first one is a quantitative, how many mechanisms are in place. Probably we add an Indicator 2 that says the mechanisms in place to assess prioritizing implements are effective. Something like that. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you. I think if I understand Jennifer right, and I'm reading this right, maybe what we're missing here is that it doesn't say that there's any -- it implies that everything will be assessed, prioritized and implemented, not that it could be ruled out, it could be not chosen. It doesn't seem to suggest anything in there that things could be considered and not implemented. So, do we want to change that at all or no? Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, John. I see Chris' comments. Is the criteria perhaps an indicator for a higher-level criteria? I have no idea what that means, even with the example. I'm so sorry.

JOHN MCCABE: I can jump in if it's helpful. And sorry, I'm just being sort of a sub-editor here really rather than a -- but I mean, to my reading, the criteria and the indicators as they're currently written, they're basically saying the same thing. There's probably nuance to that, and I think that's what we've been discussing, but yeah, they're very, very close at any rate.

And so, I was just going to suggest maybe the criteria is not that processes are in place, but that the GNSO is able to assess, prioritize, and implement suggestions. And then the quote then the indicator for that would be that there are processes or mechanisms in place dedicated to that activity.

MANJU CHEN: Ah, okay. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sorry, Manju, you should finish your sentence before coming to me.

MANJU CHEN: No, I was just saying that after this, we are hoping the next step, like after we review everything and then in the next meeting, we are hoping to kind of start, because we have said that for these calls, we're going to only look at indicators. But we also say that in the future, we might have to go back and see which criteria are maybe not as useful as we thought it would be when we first developed it.

And that will be the next step after this call. So, I think that's definitely something we have to bear in mind and consider in the future. And thank you, Chris, for kind of bringing it up now. And that's like a good segue for me to kind of warn you guys about what we're going to do next. So, yeah, that's what I was going to say. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. Makes a lot of sense. I don't know who's controlling the screen share, but if they can just scroll up one more. Yeah, there you go. So, I feel I had to go back into the document that I had open to see if it was part of -- so maybe I can take my comment back if it's part of this. And I also agree with Chris's suggestion to adjust that language in criteria, I guess it's criteria nine right now. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN: Yes, but this criteria with the operator term being in place, wondering if qualitative assessment is necessary here. What I'm thinking, actually, probably, is there a way, I don't know, to kind of merge criteria eight and nine because they are all kind of review and continuous improvement, and then we collage the indicators together. Is that something we want to do? Because then it's like.

For me, I feel like criteria eight and nine basically is the same. It's all it's all about whether it has considered and prioritized and implemented continuous improvement or any kind of improvement recommendations because that's also how GNSO reviews were about. So, do we really have to have two criteria about these or is it possible if we just merge the two criteria to make it kind of all-encompassing of all this review improvement work?

I see probably this has to be separated, but then probably it's better if we follow Chris' suggestions to kind of tweak the wording of criteria 9 to say GNSOS is able to assess, prioritize, and implement suggestion to make it like this distinction between criteria indicator. And we will do that later after this call.

Does that sound good for everyone? Again, what we're doing now is to tweak the wording of criteria 9 to change it to the GNSO has ability or the GNSO is able to assess, prioritize, and implement suggestions. And then indicator will still stay the same, basically. Sounds good? Not seeing any violent objection about this. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Manju. This is Steve. And I'm just trying to absorb and it's early, my head's still not working quite right. But I'm wondering if there's a timing issue here. Because this is talking about the Continuous Improvement Program, which is still a pilot at the moment, I think. And so, would the data gathering element, which is the next step or one of the next steps in the process, are you going to be able to determine whether or not the GNSO is able to actually integrate or is able to assess, prioritize, and implement suggestions from the CIP, which is sort of still in flight, if that makes sense.

And so, the answer to indicator one, as it's currently drafted is essentially this group. The GNSO does have a group that is able to assess, prioritize, and implement. It's this group. And so, just like I said, flagging whether or not there's maybe a timing issue as noted. The daily gathering part is coming up pretty soon, and I just don't know if you're going to be able to answer that question as drafted or as future drafted.

MANJU CHEN:

I'm not sure I get what you mean. I guess, yes, this is still in process. So, when we're answering it, we're just going to say, well, this is still in

process, and we can flag it as an area of improvement in the sense that, well, we haven't been able to do that, but this is something we're going to do in the future. I don't see a problem of not being able to answer it, but probably I missed a point. John, please.

JOHN MCCABE: Thank you. Could you just scroll down a little bit so we can see the criteria eight and criteria nine. Scroll up, yeah, so we can see eight and nine at the same time. Right there. That's great. I think is that indicator one only or nine? Is it just the one or is there a second one too?

MANJU CHEN: There's only one.

JOHN MCCABE: There's only one. Okay, yeah. Okay.

MANJU CHEN: Okay, was that all your --

JOHN MCCABE: Yeah, let me see. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN: I guess, again, what we're gonna do for criteria 9 is we say GNSO is able to assess, prioritize, and then we have the indicator as it is now not

changing. Is that okay for everyone? Okay, not seeing any violent disagreement or objection. We are gonna do what I just said after this call. I think this is the last comment that we have to review. So, we can probably go back to the slide. So, we have finished in a sense all of the comments that we captured in the document. And for now, we will kind of discuss next steps.

So, we're not going to have a meeting next week because there's an ICANN event going on next week. And what we're going to do after this meeting is we will incorporate what we discussed in this meeting and clean up comments as necessary. We're also going to do what I suggested in the earlier part of this call, which is review it according to the purpose of GNSO and the ICANN bylaw and make a more, I guess, pointed review of whether the criteria and indicators should be GNSO and GNSO Council.

And we will circulate that if updated to the team for you guys to review, and we'll come back, if we deem necessary, on 6th of May, I guess. Well, the next week after next week. Well, we will see if we need that meeting. And if we need it, we will come in and we will go through the document about that point again. And after that, we will have you guys to go back to your Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to seek their comments for their confirmation of defined criteria indicators. Oh, sorry, I missed one.

So, aside from the GNSO and GNSO Council distinction, when you're reviewing, please also check if you think or if you see some criteria can be deleted, because for some principles, we're, in my personal view, having too many criteria. But, of course, we can keep all of them just

again bearing in mind the data collecting work that we have to do after this.

If there are criteria that don't seem necessary anymore at this point, you are welcome to point that out and we can discuss in the meeting after next week. Yes, I guess that's all about next step. Is there any next slide? Are there any confusion about what we're gonna do for our next step? Not seeing any hands. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju. Can we go back to the previous slide? Sorry, I'm trying to read this. When we come back in May, because we don't have a meeting next week, is it then that we need to involve our SG&Cs to look at this, or is it going to be before that?

MANJU CHEN: After that. So, in the meeting, we will finalize and we will agree that, okay, now, after this call, we are going to go back to our SG&Cs.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Manju.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Cool. So, again, when you're reviewing the document in the coming two weeks when we circulate an updated one to you, two tasks. First is to review the distinction between GNSO and GNSO Council and see if you agree with all of the indicators which make the distinction.

Second is to look closely and spot any criteria you think can be eliminated.

It's okay if there's none. It's also okay if there are several that you feel like we need to discuss whether we still need to keep them. That's the two tasks you're going to do when you get the updated document on the mailing list. And we will come back on 6th of May to discuss those. And after that, you will share that document with your SG&Cs. I hope that's clear.

I don't think there's anything else, and I don't think there will be any AOBs either. So, I will happily give seven minutes back to your valuable life. I'll see you in May. Have a good next week. Have a good rest of the day if you still have a day. I only have three hours left for this day. See you, everyone. Thank you very much. We will try to circulate the document as soon as possible. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]