

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX:

Greetings, everyone. Welcome to the Continuous Improvement Program project meeting number nine, being held on Wednesday, June 5 2024. The attendance for today today's meetings will be taken by the zoom room and it will be posted on the wiki shortly after the meeting. We have some apologies for today's meeting from Alan Greenberg, Christelle Vaval, Irina Danelia, Manju Chen, Marco Martinelli, Natalia Filina, Owen Smigelski, and Sean Copeland. We'd like to remind everybody that today's call is being recorded. So if you're going to speak during the call, please state your name, slowly and clearly for the record. And I think that about does it for me. So with that, I will go ahead and turn it over to Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks so much, Yvette. And hello, everyone. Thank you all for being here today, just before ICANN 80 and now officially halfway through the calendar year 2024. So since our last meeting, we had an active discussion on the list regarding the red line to principle four, as well as the commentary on other principles. We've set aside most of our time today for the group to discuss any adjustments and input on this phase of work. And the second item in line with the community coordination group work plan is to move forward into the next phase of work with your groups regarding the criteria and indicators. So many of you may find that your recent discussions and input received from your groups on the principles segue nicely into this next phase, which requires more specificity and collaboration with your structures and substructures.

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 to address this conversation about some structures having substructures, such as the stakeholder groups and constituencies within the GNSO and the regional At-Large organizations within the At-Large community, language was added to the red line document on the principles. But we would like to, of course, open this to the group for discussion and consensus. So let's please show the red line document, Eva, if we could. That was distributed to the CIP CCG list. Great. So we displayed all the comments for transparency and purposes of this discussion. We also had a couple apologies from people who made comments on the list so I can relay some of their comments. I guess we can just open it to the group now. I know Tijani would like to make comments, Justine as well. And I can relay some comments on behalf of Irina, but please feel free to provide any input. Tijani, please go ahead. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Evin. First of all, I would like to apologize because I have to leave half an hour after the beginning of this meeting because I have another meeting that was scheduled a long time ago. And this meeting had been rescheduled. So we are in a conflict now. So I have to leave 30 minutes after the beginning. It's not a concern, but I think that on the list, the discussion almost come to a consensus because everyone is okay that we cannot. A body who appoint another body cannot be accountable to the appointed body. This is obvious. It will be top down in this case. So that's why the RALOs cannot be accountable to the ALAC. It is the contrary. It is the ALAC who must be accountable to the RALOs. And the RALOs are accountable to the ALSes and individual members who elected them, who appointed them. So this is the main

issue that was raised last time by Anne Greenberg. And I think that after the discussion, we are always in agreement on that.

I disagree with Irina regarding principle number five. I think we have to keep it as is and not replace it by what she proposed. It's not because I don't like her proposal, but there is a slight difference between being accountable and being—And I have to see to read my next comment.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Tijani. Yvette, I'm not sure if you could scroll down a little bit before to the bottom of the document. We added a footnote. It's kind of hard to see on the screen, but this was from the ATRT3 report. Sébastien noted on the list specific language speaking to this issue. So just wanted to share that we added this as a footnote. And, Damon, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. Thanks so much. And apologies. I'm new to the group. And for the past month or so, my father was ill and passed away, so I haven't really been as plugged in with this as I should have been. But as I'm looking over this right now, I mean, I think these look really good. My one question is these are all sort of looking at the particular group as it is right now. Should we have any of these? Should we have a principle that talks about the SOSC or NomCom being well positioned for the immediate future? Something in there, because if we see changes, I think one aspect of improving the organization should be all right, this particular group is they're fulfilling its purpose. They're doing a good job now. And we also see the fact that they're going to be ready for the

future. Like, for example, the NomCom, they're in the midst of having a whole bunch of different changes. So, yeah, they may be fulfilling their purpose now, but in order for them to be doing a good job, they also need to be well positioned for those changes or what's happening in the immediate future.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Damon. I appreciate that feedback. So I'm not sure if someone from the group would like to respond to him, or otherwise we'll note that these five draft principles stem from the ICANN bylaws for organizational reviews objectives. And they serve as the base for the CIP framework. And some of the next phase as well, the criteria and indicators can also specify to about whether the structure is fit for purpose and moving forward into the future. But I am just responding to your comment. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Scarily enough, I'm supporting what you're saying, Evin. Damon, I think what's important is to recognize that if something, if in interrogating these higher level principles, which have to be sufficiently wobbly wobbly, but still very specific, that they fit ICANN and everything that it is composed of. And obviously, the rubber hits the road when we really get into the specific criteria and the indicators within those criteria that can become more and more bespoke. But what we haven't discussed, what you've brought up is, of course, if the answer to the question is your particular ACSO or NomCom fit for purpose, and the answer is no, it's the and then what. And it's in that no, the and then what would, for

example, take us down a entirely different route, which would probably include and end up in changing a definition in a bylaw. So one would redefine the structure, perhaps, of a particular SO or AC. And that's why the wording has got to be all substructures where applicable. So we're keeping it less specific to how it's built now. But yes, if the answer is suddenly no, the and then what has to kick in. But having these things more bylaw based or rules of procedure based, depending on where you are in the [inaudible] of things. So a constituency or stakeholder group might have not so much bylaw anchor, but they might have a rules anchor within their own structure. Then obviously they have to change to have that trickle down effect. So thank you, Justine, saying the charter in that case. So it is important that we're very careful at this principles point perspective. Thanks.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Okay, thank you, Cheryl.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Damon. Great point. Bill, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: I think Cheryl has only half of the and then what? I think we need to distinguish between what they're doing is good. But it doesn't fit the principles, so we need to adjust the bylaws or whatever. But the other half of that is, then what? Well, they're not doing the right thing, so we need to adjust them. Because what's in the bylaws or wherever is what

they ought to be doing and they're not doing it. I think we need to keep in our minds that where the change needs to be is not just in how ICANN has defined them. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Bill and Cheryl and Damon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: an entirely different point as in not responding to Damon, something that the ALAC specific small team on this work would like us to raise in terms of principle five. They were wondering whether or not in principle five, there would be an opportunity to not just specify the ICANN multi stakeholder model, but specify the ICANN bottom up multi stakeholder model. And that did get wholesale support from the small team. I'll hasten to add it has not gone through a full 15 person ALAC approval, but it has got support from the small team, which represents each of the regions' interests within the ALAC. So time isn't permitting them to go to the ALAC and come back. But Bukola and I certainly want to bring it forward here for consideration. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Cheryl. That's great to hear the work from the ALAC. Sébastien, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry, I am driving, but I just wanted to come back to the previous question. Sorry, Cheryl, for that. But isn't it something who can fall into

the future? Maybe one day holistic review. The question raised by Damon. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Sébastien. So, yes, as the inputs of the continuous improvement assessment will eventually feed into the holistic review. And we could perhaps revisit that in the next part of the meeting as well. So just want to highlight some of the comments on the screen that have already been shared. But Irina, since she was unable to be here today, she did have some comments on the list. I know Tijani was not supportive of them and Justine as well, but just wanted to share those for the group's consideration that she proposed striking principle five and principle four being split into two parts. The proposed text would be that the SOAC or NomCom is accountable internally to its stakeholders and structures where applicable. And the second would be the SOAC or NomCom is accountable externally to the wider ICANN community. I noted so far there was not support expressed for this, but I wanted to just open it to the group since she wasn't here today and provide opportunity for anyone else to comment on that suggestion. Okay. Thank you.

And the other comment too was about and or or in the comments on the red line. I'm not sure if we want to discuss this language specifically, but otherwise there seems to be consensus on using the term substructures as per the ARTR3 report. So that'll be incorporated into the adjustment to this principle. Pausing here for any feedback or comments. So with that, if there's no further comments on this item, we would move into the next item. Yvette, if we could pull up the slide

deck. Oh, and wait, actually, hold on. I see a couple hands up. Thank you, Sébastien. And then Amrita, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yeah, now that we get through these five principles, I have a more broader question. We say that we will evolve the organizational review into CIP. We didn't say that we will mimic the organizational review. Can we or may we or whatever have additional principles who are not in the bylaws today, but who will be useful for the continuous improvement program? And it's really a question. I don't know even my own answer on that, but I don't want to stick just to these five principles because it is currently what is on the bylaw. Because our work may be something, some addition, and it will need to be included in the bylaw one day. But I would like very much that we as a group be sure that it's a five and that's it, or if we need additional one. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Sébastien. And just to note, I believe everyone is aware, but just a reminder, too, that all organizational reviews have been deferred until early 2025 to impart you to implement a ATRT3 recommendations, including this continuous improvement program. And the board will assess the progress of this work in the coming months. And Amrita, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Evin. Not on these points as in I'm okay with it. And while I can live with just a suggestion on the ALAC suggestion on adding the

bottom up with the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. But my only question here is, as in I can live with it, I don't have any issues, is when we talk about the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, it is inherently thought to be a bottom up process. You know, that's what the thought comes with the different SOACs participating. So do we really need to think of having a bottom up word there as in this is taught in all the aspects? You know, when we, for example, for the RALOs, we communicate with our ALSs or individual members or we revert back. So as in I can live with it, but I was thinking that do we really need to add more words? And to Sébastien's point, I think we could begin with these five principles. But since it's a continuous improvement process, there is always scope of improvement or adding things as in we need to be flexible. But even working with these five, when we are working with our subgroups, is quite cumbersome because there's a lot of overlap between even the criteria amongst the principles. You know, in our small team at APRALO, we've been kind of baffling on those criteria and seeing that there is a huge overlap. And I think we should try to merge those overlaps. So perhaps we live with these five first, try to kind of tame these five principles first in our own SOAC RALOs and see where we stand. And then we look at more. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Amrita. I see Sébastien's hand is up and Cheryl after him.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Amrita, I have no problem with that. I just want to be sure that we stay open to any additional ones if it's happened one day. Now regarding the ... I know that it's a recurrent theme that in '25, the board will review. I don't know what they will review because CIP will not be really starting. Therefore, I can just think about what they are, what we are planning to do or what different groups are planning to do. And I have an additional question. I feel that it's more the work of ATRT4 than of the board to review the reviews. Therefore, I am, I would say, a little bit concerned with what we are recurrently saying about the board reviewing this in 2025. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Sébastien. We will also kind of go over the overall timeline for the work plan a little later. But Cheryl, please go ahead. I see your hand is up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I think it's very important to just reinforce particularly what Amrita said and what I see in chat. You know, we have to start somewhere. That this is a this is the nascent spot. This is the very beginning of getting a whole organization used to a different way of doing something. And that even with these five principles as a starting point. Oops, sorry, I just disconnected my audio from my other. There we go. And Alan Greenberg was talking to me, so I needed to have him in my ear. Sorry, but the concept of this continuous improvement program, having those positional points in future holistic reviews and one could even argue ATRTs, where the opportunity for watching

improvement, refining mechanisms and processes and then recommending changes, all of that's a bit of a way down the track. But it is very important. And I think I'm certainly reinforcing, Sébastien, at this point in time that this is not seen as a set and forget, even at the point of these overarching principles, which we still have to get through the wider community, of course, to get to this point. So what we're producing is something that we believe will at least get the initial out there, getting it going aspects. But we certainly need when we're socializing it to remind everybody this is not—and we'll look at it in 20 odd years. And we will now look at it continuously. So keep reiterating to those that we work with that this is a continuous improvement framework that we are talking about, which is applicable ICANN wide. The safe place is to start with a set of anchor points that are rules based, because that is less difficult to operate in the beginning. But it doesn't mean that it cannot be modified as a program going forward. And when we're all talking about this in another 20 odd years, won't it be nice to look back. But right now, let's start simple and get everybody used to the concepts as well. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I noted agreement with you in the chat as well. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Evin. I do support the proposal of At-Large regarding principle five to add bottom up decision making. So that the SOAC or NomCom collaborates to further the mission of ICANN and the

effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder bottom up decision making model. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Tijani. And we will make note of this in the red line as well. And Larissa, please go ahead. I see your hand is up.

LARISSA GURNICK:

Thank you. Hi, everyone. I wanted to comment on Sébastien's observation and in terms of what the board will be looking at. And I also put into chat a link to the board resolution. The board will look at the progress of this community-led effort to see where things are developing, with the expectation that if the progress of building continuous improvement program, which will include the framework and all the other things that this group is working on, is progressing steadily and well and according to plan, then I would imagine that that would be a good sign that in a year's time, the effort should continue and be supported and there should not be a return to the organizational reviews. But it was just simply a checkpoint to see, to make sure how things are progressing, because when the board deferred all organizational reviews, obviously the implementation work hadn't started yet, so it was with the expectation that progress would be made. And that's the only checkpoint. The board will not be reviewing reviews. The board will only look at the status of this effort so that they can make a determination whether to bring the organizational reviews back. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you very much, Larissa, for that point of clarification. And I see Benjamin's hand is up. Please.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yeah, thank you, everyone. Apologies, I came a bit late. I'm also traveling to Kigali now, so I'm in transit. So what I wanted to say that, yes, the principle seems okay, relatively well for my team, my organization, but the challenge is they are still yet to understand quite clearly. And the reason why I'm doing this intervention is, would there be anyone in Kigali willing to talk to our constituency to just give the highlights, because everybody's always saying, oh, we need more updates, we want to understand, and they mix it up with the review as well. So my ask now is, would there be anyone willing to join any of our membership meeting to just give a quick highlight of what is maybe people want to start better, because we've tried to do a lot of documentation, dumbing down and updating, and yeah, we're still where we are. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Benjamin, for asking. You're asking for staff support, specifically, or open to the...

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yes, someone from your team will be in Kigali, who probably has like five minutes or ten minutes to any of our stakeholders' engagement meeting, a membership meeting, sorry, either NCSG or NCUC or NPOC

membership meeting. That would be really amazing if you can make that happen. Anyone who would take advantage of that. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Yes, thank you so much. So the reviews team specifically won't be physically on the ground in Kigali, but we're happy to participate virtually and we can prepare some talking points for your group. So please just feel free to email me or the team and we can help get that set up for you. So thanks so much. We're happy to talk to your groups. And I see Caleb's hand is up. Please go ahead.

CALEB OGUNDELE:

Sorry, it wasn't really... I wanted to communicate with Benjamin. So just to let him know that there is an ongoing background work on this to have... Remember, at the early part of this meeting, we talked about staff coming to socialize with the non-commercial. So, yeah. The information is already in the chat.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Great. Thank you, Caleb. I appreciate it. And yes, if any of your groups are interested in the reviews team speaking to you about this work or any other reviews program activities, please always feel free to reach out to us and we're happy to connect with your groups for Kigali. Thanks. And the policy forum is a great opportunity, too, for all of you to speak with your groups and update them on the work and receive feedback as well. So please do leverage it.

All right. Well, we're about 30 minutes in. So if there are any other comments for this question we've taken for this item, we've taken a few notes on a couple additions and we'll resolve this over the list. But this is certainly an iterative process. And as you receive input from your groups, this can be refined for the first assessment as well. Yvette, if we could go to the slide deck, please.

So, in accordance with the work plan that we have outlined and since we're six months into the calendar year, we want to now segue, now that you've all spoken with your groups about the principles on the kind of next layer, so to speak, of the framework, which are the criteria and indicators, which are more specific and flexible to your groups. And this kind of requires a little more hands-on collaboration and communication with your groups, too. So it's more of a heavy lift in terms of engagement. And ICANN Org is always happy to support you, of course. So this slide deck is similar to the one that we distributed in April for the first engagement with your groups on the principles. So it does recycle some of the same slides, just repeating the information to your groups to be useful, to clarify, keep ensuring consistent messaging about what the group is aiming to do and where we are in the process in terms of developing a framework and what the ultimate goal is in terms of public comment at the end of this year on the framework before the first assessment. So a few of these slides, I won't go over because they're from the prior deck, but if we could go to slide four, Yvette, on the CCG roadmap. Thank you so much.

So this is a new slide, not for you all, but it's been incorporated into the deck based off of feedback, which shows more specific timeline for this year about what the expectations are for the phases of work. And then

also the community and boards socialization of the framework ahead of the ICANN 81 Annual General Meeting. And the goal for the public comment is ultimately end of November, soon after that meeting, but the work in preparation will begin months before. So we're right now, as you can see, on the 5th of June, and we're looking at the next couple months being time to work with your groups during and after ICANN 80 on the criteria and indicators. If we could go to slide 11, Yvette, that's on the five principles. Thanks.

So this is the same as before, but we will adjust to the red line to principle four based off of the discussion today. And we can just note that this is a draft and ongoing discussion for your groups. If we could go to slide 15, please. Thank you. And then this just emphasizes how this phase in particular needs to leverage the collaborative input of the groups and Sean Copeland from the ccNSO presented on the open space session format and World Cafe format that has been really successful for the ccNSO to address their continuous improvement activities. We have a slide deck that he prepared that we can distribute. If that's a useful format for engaging with your groups, it's a great best practice that you could replicate. There have also been jam boards we've used in the past. We're happy to create those for your groups if you'd like to use them. But as a reminder, there's also a dedicated workspace for you in the external Google Drive that we have for the CCG, which is a Google Doc for each of you. And many of you have already started work on those Google Docs with your groups. So we're happy to create tools for you and you're able to use any format that is most useful for engaging with your groups. Next slide, please. 16 I think it is. Thank you.

So that's just emphasizing what I shared now where the resources are to collaborate with your groups and to also please use the database that we created earlier this year on all the existing continuous improvement activities because these can inform the development of the criteria and indicators in line with each of the principles. And the next slide, please, is 17.

So slide 17 through 21 are just, they're new, but they're copying the current principles and then draft criteria. This is just to help get your groups thinking and trying to kind of understand the concept of what criteria would be most useful for them and their perspective to adhere to the principles. So these can be altered or changed by your groups or prioritized as you see fit. If we could just kind of scroll through 17 through 18 or 18, 19. Thank you. So just to give you an idea, these are new slides, but this is also all in your Google Drive. And slide 22 is the last new one. Thank you.

So this, we're asking for the ultimate question after you're also collaborating with your groups, do they feel comfortable about criteria and indicators that's informing this framework and this process? And we've incorporated the note from the ATRT3 report that Sébastien and Justine have pointed out about how some of the groups have substructures. So the question may come up about what's our relationship to our overall organizational structure in this process? And the ATRT3 report is very informative to that end. Thank you. And then the last slide, I think, is just the resources.

So this slide deck will distribute as before to the CCG. We'll also translate this into the five UN languages. And then you can use it as you

see fit with your groups. You can choose some slides, remove some slides. It's up to you, but we hope you find it useful for engaging with your groups in this next phase. And Cheryl and Amrita, I see your hands are up. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Evin. And the rest of the team that you're with, I want to think the provision of these resources are extraordinarily useful because in these things, it's really important that to the best of our ability, we are all working from the same playbook, that we use a single set of baseline resources. We can complement them, but there should be this core of identicalness or similarity. So that really is important.

I just wanted to remind everybody, particularly, and just pop back to, I think, slide 17 will do us, if not one of those, certainly between the 16 and the 18. But this is an example. When you dig in with your groups, there's often a temptation to start adding criteria at this point in time. Try and get your groups to control themselves. Not perhaps so much with principle one, but if we pop over to one of the others where there's already, say, seven or 11 criteria listed, there's such a temptation to go, oh, but we could do this. There's a difference between we could do this in the future and we can and need to do this now. So remind them that these criteria also develop and evolve. And it's much better to start with as small a grouping as is possible and effective than the larger point. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Cheryl. Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Evin. Amrita, for the record. So I was from a small team in APRALO, we were working on these criteria. But even within criteria, when we look at things, there are subsections. For example, if we look at principle one and criteria one, it has a lot of aspects. It talks about at least three or four aspects which would have to be looked at from different angles. So when we are working as teams, though, we are looking at what are the existing processes there. And then we will be working on smart indicators. Is there some kind of a framework which is there so that we I know the indicators and parameters would be different, but is there a standardized reporting back mechanism? Because we at APRALO are looking at it in a particular way. And we are using a particular format, but at the end of the day, you would want to have more unified structure. So is that there? Because as Justine mentioned, we are trying to cut down on some of the criteria because they are, though our team also, as Cheryl mentioned, wanted to add in much more and we are trying to kind of curb that at this point of time. But is there some, like you're having these formats, is there some template format you're having so that once we do all the work, we don't come back and again redo it to put it into some formats or something.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Amrita. I'll take that as an action item for the org team just to propose a format that's useful to maybe kind of fill out for your groups. Of course, as noted, there's the Google Doc that has this listed out as a workspace. And in the slide deck, actually, slides, I think it's 13 and 14, show an example for principles to criteria, and then 14 being

criteria to indicators. And we always try to encourage, of course, that the indicators are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound, that SMART acronym. And we can certainly provide some more tools for your groups to kind of keep it in a consistent format, but ultimately this framework is also going to be a part of the survey. So the survey itself would go out for the assessment and the framework would inform this survey. So that would be a consistent way to collect information for the Continuous Improvement Program. And is that a new hand, Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yes, we can live without templates. I just wanted to ask so that, again, we don't have to reinvent the wheels, but, and we are happy to continue what we are doing and we can post that once we start, because we've done certain things, but we also know that the SMART team has to go back to the community, get their veto, and there would be improvisation going on because this is not the final way to do things. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Certainly. Thank you, Amrita, very helpful. And there's also, I think, as noted in the chat by Jessica, we have the talking points as well. And that includes like a FAQ, Frequently Asked Questions document as well. So this stage is really useful to just getting initial understanding and work and the creativity going and then we'll be refining as the CCG work progresses throughout the next few months. So thank you very much. Any other comments or questions on this deck? And we will again be

distributing it soon after. Actually, it should already be in your folders, but we'll be sharing it on the list as well after this meeting and translating it into the five UN languages so you can share it across the regions. Great. Okay, thank you so much.

So I guess we could go back to the main agenda slide. If there's any other business for today, I know we're a little bit early, I guess maybe about 15 minutes, we should give some time back to you all. Our next meeting is going to be on Wednesday, June the 26th, I believe, in light of ICANN 80. And Justine, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. Hi, this is Justine. I wonder if someone wants to address the question that Naveed put in chat.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Oh, thank you for flagging. Let's see. Do we have a lower bound on how many criteria we are looking for per principle? Thanks for your question, Naveed. This is the draft criteria that's on each slide and also in the Google Docs serve as draft criteria for your considerations. So, and each group is able to prioritize those criteria that's most relevant or important to them as well. I hope that helps. Cheryl, I see your hand is up, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just to perhaps assist here, whilst I was definitely suggesting people don't get their groups carried away and end up with so many indicators that it's a month of Sundays to read them all, I also would suggest that if

you only ever get one criteria associated with a principle, that's way too, way, way, way, way, way too few. In my experience, three is a very safe baseline. There may be a reason to argue for two, but there would almost be never a reason to just have one, at least in this type of modelling. So, try and not drop below the three line. And if we are dropping below the three line, make sure you can justify it. But definitely, as Justine puts in chat, do not go to extremes. And for me, three is about as low as you should go. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Justine, I see your hand is up.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yep, thanks. This is Justine. So, just to reiterate what Cheryl just spoke to, I'll give you an example. And I'm the alternate for APRALO, by the way – so, principle 5, for us, some of these suggested criteria don't really apply to us. Okay. Because you're talking about SOAC round tables. We are not part of the SOAC round table. So there are two quite suggested criteria that mentioned SOAC round tables. So there's already two knocked off for us, but we are definitely looking to replace those two with something else that would be relevant to us as a RALO. Thanks.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you so much, Justine. Appreciate it. That's a good example. Wonderful. Well, thank you all so much for your time today and hope for those of you traveling to Kigali, you have very smooth travels. And

again, as mentioned on the call, we're happy to, as staff support to provide resources to your groups or speak to them virtually during the meeting. So please reach out to us and we look forward to moving this work forward and having these stimulating conversations. So looking forward to seeing you all next time and being in touch. Thank you all so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]