EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Team Meeting

Thursday, 02 September 2021 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/lwBmCg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDN EPDP call taking place on Thursday, the 2nd of September 2021 at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please let yourself be known now? Hearing no one, we do have a tentative apology from Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

All members and participants will be promoted to a panelist for today's call. Members and participants, when using chat, please select panelists and attendees or everyone depending on your Zoom update in order for everyone to see your chat. Observers will have view-only chat access.

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.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any update to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your Statements of Interest, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat.

All documentation and information can be found on the EPDP IDN's 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. And as a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. And over to our chair, Edmon Chung. Please begin.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Julie. Welcome, everyone, to this call. I guess the proposed agenda was circulated and in front of us. In general, we'll be picking up from where we left off last week. We're just going through a little bit of a survey among ourselves in terms of planning purposes for the work plan the different topics based on the charter to get a sense of how much time we might need to spend on each of it. And then we're going to go into a little bit of the administrative part in some sense, which is to reach out to the different SOs and ACs. I think Emily is going to help me with that particular section.

And then if we are quick enough, we will dive right into starting the discussion on the topics themselves, so the substantive part of the discussion. On that particular point, I expect us to be walking through the topics not just once, so probably two times or three

times over the course of the entire working group. So this is just the first pass and we will try to come up with thoughts and suggestions. But just as a note, we probably will be going through this more than once. Then I'll leave a little bit of time at the end to organize further.

Any questions or thoughts or suggestions on the agenda? Seeing none. Feel free to jump in, put up your hand, or keep typing on the chat. I will try my best to keep up with the chat as well as I speak and as we discuss. But feel free to put up your hand at any time.

So just a couple of notes and not so much welcome but more of an update. As mentioned last time, I guess it's my honor and privilege to be able to serve on the Board of ICANN and such. And EOI (Expression of Interest) note has been sent out for a new chair once I transition to that position, which would be the end of October, end of the AGM meeting, the upcoming ICANN meeting. So please feel free yourself or if you feel that there's someone that might be interested, please let them know. Any questions on that? I don't think we need any discussion on that unless someone has any concerns or questions about it. Seeing none, I'll push on. Again, feel free to jump back to any of the topics at any time. I'm happy to pick it up again.

As we go into the discussions, actually, before we talked about the substance, please do take a look at the data and metrics part of the charter. Part of the PDP process anticipates us as a working group asking the staff team to help us gather some data and metrics and do a little bit of research. For example, how the last round of new gTLDs in terms of IDN gTLDs, how they're doing, how does it match with some of the policies that we're talking

EN

about, and the LGR or so on? I think it's in page 19. So do take a look at that as we talk about the issue.

Today, as mentioned, if we have enough time, we'll jump right into topic A. I expect us to hit a few points where we might actually need to think about the data and metrics. But I think it's much better for us to kind of try to go down the path of discussion. And then once we hit an issue, we can think a little bit further about whether further data and metrics would be useful for our consideration, what happened in the last round in application, what happened in various known issues about IDN and variant. So please do take a look at that as we go through.

At the very end, I'll remind everyone again, because I think for topic A and B, once we go through that, we're probably going to hit a few of these and we might come back to consider getting to the data and metric process and getting staff to help us with gathering a bunch of the data as we go into consideration of the other parts. But as I said, I think it's more constructive and probably more useful for us to jump right in. Once we feel that there are certain areas that that we need to draw on data and metric, then we can get a sense of what exactly the types of data and metrics that we might want and might be useful for the group's consideration. So that's the general approach I'm suggesting for us to take. Any questions on that or concerns or other ideas? Okay. Seeing none. Then I'll push ahead further.

Just one more item in terms of my updates. As mentioned, I will be leaving my current position and what the immediate future after the ICANN AGM, I will be meeting with the ICANN Executive and legal counsel, and we'll be bringing this up to see what the

EN

transition should be and how best to approach this. I will keep everyone updated in those discussions. But note that I have made the note to the ICANN Board, the ICANN chair at this point of this situation. I think as we keep forging ahead, it seems like, at least at this point, everyone is comfortable for myself and for the group to continue its work without interruption.

So with that, if there are no further questions, we'll jump right into the continue review of the charter questions, which last time we have been through A and B. The exercise is to get a sense of how much time, less than five hours. That means less than five calls, five to ten calls, or more than ten calls for each of the particular topic items. Any burning questions before we go in to? I see Satish's hand up. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Edmon. I had a question on the exercise we had done last time with A and B where both came out as medium. I think for some of us, it is a bit counterintuitive. So can you or staff kind of corroborate whether this is accurate what we did last time? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: The results posted by Emily to the chat, so you can take a look at that. I don't think this is—how should I say this?—this is not like a hard science. I think what we will use this data for is just to come up with a work plan so that we can report back to GNSO and saying, "Hey, this is the estimate of how much time this workgroup thinks will need to take to come up with, let's say, an initial report

EN

that can go out for public comment. And thereupon make some further estimation as to reconsidering these with comments, and then coming up with the final report. From what I understand, that's the purpose of the exercise. So we don't really need to come up with very exact numbers. I think based on the survey results, we'll try to come up with a work plan and everyone can take a look at the work plan and see if it makes sense based on the results. Does that answer your question, Satish? Okay. Gopal?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you, Edmond, for the nice introduction. Let me gently start. What I was observing is that the scope of the term technical utilization in itself is quite restricted. I've looked at the document. It's on page five of a nice document on technical utilization, and it clearly tells that it's only labeled syntax validation, variant label calculation. Unless we understand these two, what we are taking are random guesses. I'm sure you would appreciate that. Label syntax validation, variant label calculation. The two are there. And since the rules are well framed, we can probably arrive at a theoretical upper bound and the lower bound, and then see whether it is matching or not. But for that, we need to understand what exactly we are intending to do in terms of budgeting the time for discussion. I hope I made it clear.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, Gopal. I think that's a nice intervention. That brings to mind that maybe once we have the work plan in place, as we go through topic A and B, we look at the actual time spent on them

EN

and potentially go back and revise the work plan. Or if we're right on then we know that we are kind of [inaudible] with it. So yeah, I think at this particular moment, it's really just a guess, but it gets us started with a reasonable target and work plan that GNSO can take a look at, and other people following our work would be able to see as well. I hope that makes sense to you. Gopal?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Unless we keep telling in the way we work, it's guesstimates. It's on the case of making the resolver happen for different languages so we'll start with a guesstimate. At the end of the day, that is the concern that the software resolver will have to tell us what is happening with these rules.

EDMON CHUNG: Right. I understand, Gopal. We're not trying to guess what the resolvers and the DNS does. I think this is just focused on the exercise of coming up with policy recommendations. So hopefully, the technology side is not so much of a concern.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: You mentioned it up front. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Thank you, Gopal. All right. With that, I see more hands. Emily and then I have Maxim. Emily first.

EN

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Edmon. This is Emily Barabas from staff. So I thought maybe it would be helpful to just provide a little bit more context about the work plan as a reminder. As part of the PDP 3.0 work, the GNSO has been more and more carefully trying to project manage these PDPs and EPDPs to make sure that there are, to the extent possible, accurate estimates of how long a PDP or EPDP will take, what some of the key milestones are so that Council can more effectively serve as a manager of these processes and check in with the groups to make sure that the work is being done.

So this initial step is really about building out a work plan that the GNSO Council can use as a reference point. And the main thing that we're doing is looking at the overall timeline. And so we're looking at each of these building blocks, these topics, and putting those together to build an overall timeline. So some topics take a little bit less time and some take a little more or some need to overlap a bit. That's not necessarily a concern. It's really about hitting these key milestones of delivering the reports and so forth. I think Maxim is going to speak to this, but there are processes in place within the GNSO Council so that if a group takes more time than is anticipated, the Council gets a warning, essentially, and can sort of review that request to extend the timeline.

So, Maxim, I'll probably speak to what the PCR is specifically, but the idea here is to create a comparison against what is expected and what is actually happening in order to troubleshoot if something is going wrong along the way so that Council can support the group in completing the work in an effective manner. So hopefully that helps folks. It's really not so much about exactly

EN

how many hours we're going to spend talking about each topic. At this stage, it's really about planning the overall kind of trajectory of the work and understanding what needs to happen to deliver the final product. It's an accountability mechanism. Thanks. Oh, not accountability mechanism in the traditional sense but a method of accountability with the Council. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Emily. To me, that's much more clearer than what I was trying to explain, so hopefully it's clear for everyone. Gopal, I'm guessing that's an old hand. If it is, please put it down. If not, keep it up, but I'll go to Maxim first. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about PCR, it's GNSO project change request. The idea is we should try to guess, I think, or estimate how long the process will take on our side. We shouldn't be too pessimistic because given long, long times will not make GNSO Council happy and potentially we might see exchange of opinions between the leadership of the work group and GNSO Council, but it's part of life and it happens. And also, we shouldn't be too optimistic because if we, for example, say that everything will be ready by

EN

the December, which is obviously not easy and potentially not achievable, we will face a situation where the predicted milestone comes and we don't have materials, deliverables on hand, and it's a bit of awkward situation. And the group leadership with the GNSO Council liaison will have to talk to GNSO Council leadership basically to issue the PCR, this Project Change Request, with the request to extend the timeline. Genuinely, we shouldn't expect to have more than one PCR in the timeline. Because if the group is not prepared to properly forecast what's going to happen and then to properly adjust it, most probably there are some issues. So we should make our estimated guess, not too optimistic, not too pessimistic to avoid this situation with PCR. This thing happened in the past to other PDPs so it's just part of life, but we should try to be as accurate as we think we can. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. That's very useful. Whereas this is not an absolute accuracy test, I think, let's go about it with our best guesstimate. With that, any other clarifications before we go into C, same entity at the second level? You can scroll back up and take a look at the A and B, just to refresh your mind, what the group has said in terms of roughly the estimation, and then we can go into the next one. Seeing no further hands.

You can see the poll, but just quickly in C, that's about same entity at the second level. That would be a flow from B, I would say, and it has C 1 to 6. If you look at your Charter document—hopefully you have it open in front of you—it will look at the second level. These are policies for gTLD registries. So this will dive a little bit

EN

more into the registry operations, not only the TLD, which is where the ICANN process is. So hopefully, you get that sense. Are there any questions or thoughts as we poll, or if you want to advocate that we need to spend more or less time here? Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think that this item could have potentially something which was not investigated. Basically, a situation where two different legal entities had rights for variants and suddenly only one of them should survive. Basically, it's a job but after some process, two strings should belong to only one of those, and it might have legal implications. Since it was not investigated by the technical team before, I think it might take some time. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. It's great that we have people from the IPC in this group, which will help us answer that question as well. Quoc, did I read your name correctly? Hopefully I did.

QUOC PHAM: Yes, it's correct. Quoc Pham from GoDaddy registry. Just a follow on from what Maxim just said, with these two specific tracks here, when you're changing the definition of an existing IDN implementation in a TLD and names already exist and you make changes to the variant method based on whatever sources that you choose, that is problematic, but you have to decide the winner of one or the other based on the rights. But then there's also the other track, which is much more [inaudible] when you introduce audience to an existing namespace where no names are

registered in the IDN. So that is determined even before all of that happens. Basically, what I'm just trying to say is in the instance where you introduce new language or script then there won't be that conflict of determining who gets what based on rights. But you may still get rights arguments because of a variant assignment, if someone believes that they should have a right of string.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Quoc. That's a very good observation. In fact, allow me to highlight both your intervention and Maxim's. It might be useful for our consideration as we talked about the substance of the policies to have some data points, like what the existing registrations look like, how many of it would have some conflict one way or the other, if the LGRs are applied over them. As we talked about A and B, the idea is that as we talked about topic A and B, we might bump across some of these issues and we will then take a deeper look at the data and metrics part, which is on page 19, again, on your Charter document. Please take a look at those and as we go into the discussions, think through what type of data we might want to try to gather before we make the recommendations.

With that, how are we doing in terms of the survey? Are we good to reveal the results? All right. Okay. So it seems like people think it would take another five to ten calls for C. Any questions on that? If not, then we will push ahead to D. Jeff notes that he thinks the issues are much more complex, then likely need more time. I must say I'm generally sympathetic to that as well. And I think data points, again, I highlight the fact, please do think about the data

EN

metrics and what we need to gather before we make these decisions. So, pushing ahead to D then.

In general, I would say that A, B, C is one kind of aspect. To me, that's the fundamental aspects. A and B really, and then C an extension of B. Well, actually D and E would be very much the administrative processes that are required. So I think for D, there are eight questions and it covers a fairly wide range of issues from Registry Agreement to the domain name life cycle and other services and so on. But that being said, a lot of it is if you look at the Mapping document, a lot of it potentially has been covered to some extent but we still need time to think through this. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. It took me a second to get off mute. For this topic, I just want to be clear that we're not talking about actually writing the legal language in the Registry Agreement or any kind of actual— we're not going to be implementing these. Just keep that in mind that this subject is really just the policies around what needs to change in those things. Not that we're going to sit down and write the actual legal language or anything like that.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. I think that's very important to note. Again, I would emphasize that even further to say that it's not just it's sort of the high level principles, it's what is specific about IDNs. You have to think about it in a way that it's because of the IDN, especially IDN variant TLDs, that certain things have to change and not anything that you like or not like with the existing systems.

EN

So it has to be relevant to the difference that IDN makes. With that, how we do—Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about the time to adjustments to the Registry Agreement, registry service and transition process and other procedures. The thing is we are going to change something very basic on the level which is quite, I'd say, low in terms of how it's integrated in everything else, including the back ends of registries and registrars. It even attempts to list all things dependent on each other from a procedural point of view might take some considerable time. So I think it's not going to be few hours. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. How are we doing in terms of the submission? It's pretty clear that this is the heart of our discussion. So far, there is a good sense that we need a lot more time on this. It covers a pretty broad topic and this result seems to align with what is being said as well. Gopal, please go ahead.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you very much. My apologies if I have understood the exercise slightly differently and it is not as per the charter which we have. Say for example, I'm looking at the IDN's Telugu script. The core points cannot occur in all contexts. Once we start looking at it, we have to prevent the occurrence of certain contexts. Until then, we will not be sure whether the exercise is as per the LGR or not.

EN

Now, without considering the expectations on every language, which we are talking about, how are we going to conclude on what is the kind of an adjustment which we need to make for every Registry Agreement? And what is the kind of an adjustment we need to make for registry transition process? This is how I've been looking at it in the time that I spent going through the documents. It is bound to be language specific is what I think. Maybe I'm wrong, but I'd been looking at it like this.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Gopal. It seems like you're focused on the specific Registry Agreement or the specific TLD that is, let's say, [inaudible] versus Urdu or Chinese, and they might have different timelines that needs to be in place in terms of completing. I guess our approach here is more to talk about—let's say if there are IDN variants, what the overall policy should be? And each individual TLD process and each individual Registry Agreement is not so much of our concern, but I think we need to establish the high level policies, and that's what the EPDP is about.

As Dennis mentioned, it should be somewhat agnostic of the specific language. But I take what you say, Gopal. And if we get to the substance and you think there are relevant issues that particular languages poses that could affect the overall principles, then please do bring it up and it might be quite useful. But right now, this exercise is talking about how much time we need and not how much time the TLD applications might need. I just want to clarify that.

EN

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you very much.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. D seems to be okay. It reflects what we generally think it seems like from the discussion. So let's push on to E. E is about the objection processes, the string similarity review, string contention resolution, reserved strings and these type of policies. Many of these, I am guessing, would have been covered in the SubPro process. And I see Jeff's hand up, I was going to call upon you as well to give us a sense. Many of the things that this group needs to consider is simply how they might apply to those that were applied in 2012 and somewhat in consideration with what the SubPro already has looked into. Unless there are significant issues that are discovered that was not considered by the SubPro, I don't think we're looking to revert or double guess those results, if you will.

Gopal, I'm guessing that's an old hand. So I'll go to Jeff first. If that's not an old hand, keep it up and I'll come to you. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Edmon. I agree with you. I'll just say I put a low effort on this. But the reason is that, presumably, there's going to be an IRT setup for SubPro. And I think our role should be as coordinating with them, perhaps even reviewing what the IRT comes up with just to make sure it's in line with what we've been discussing and make sure there's no glaring holes. But this is one, for the reasons Edmon stated, it does say in Section E that it should be coordinated with SubPro IRT anyway. It could be more complex

EN

than what we thought but at this point, from what I believe, I think it's going to be a lower effort just because it's more kind of oversight over what the SubPro comes up with the IRT.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. Any other thoughts and suggestions? Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me now?

EDMON CHUNG: Yes.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think this might take a lot of time because it has other policies and procedures, and it means basically all procedures related to new gTLDs, potentially to TLDs which were before the 2012. And also, it will change the processes of review of applications. So in my opinion, it's something between medium and high. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. How are we doing with the votes? Most people in or are people still thinking? There we go. There are some lows and mostly medium and not too little—I think it's high as well. So it seems to also align with what was discussed. Unless there are any concerns about it, we'll forge ahead with F.

For F, there are only two questions but I think obviously they're important questions. Again, a little bit like SubPro but in a different sense. Some of the issues are taken up by the Rights Protection Mechanisms discussion as well. But this will cover the dispute resolution procedures and the trademark protection or the Rights Protection Mechanisms. So as it relates to IDN, and again, we're not looking at reviewing the entire Rights Protection Mechanisms, we're just trying to look at how IDNs may or may not change or highlight those changes that may be required in those processes. So that's about F. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, sorry. It took me a second there. As a rep of the IPC, this is a very complicated issue. And to those that don't realize, part of it is going to depend on the ability to switch if names are going to be transferred to switch between what was the primary name that was "registered" and any variants and whether those can be switched by a new registrant. But it's very possible for an intellectual property owner to have rights in either the name that was registered but not the variants or, alternatively, for an IP owner to have rights and variants but not the name that was actually "registered" and bundled in and figuring out the legal ramifications and whether transfers could be ordered in such a manner. It really is something that is, I think, extremely complicated even if there's only two questions there. The PDDRP, I don't know how tough that one will be, but certainly with the UDRP and URS and even the TMCH in a bunch of ways, it's complicated. I've tried to go through these things in my mind that I

EN

can't even get a grasp on it at all. So I'm voting that it's going to take a long time.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, these are some of the topics that have been out there but nobody really picked it up and talked about even, I would say, I like to use this example, xn-cocacola, it has a domain which represents a completely different IDN but might actually have trademark implications in other ways and not to mention IDN variants and so on. But nevertheless, how are we doing with the guesstimate? All right. So, people think it's 5 to 10 hours. It's a very small number of questions but they entail quite intricate discussions. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the issue is not many people outside of Registries and IPC are aware of the time required to understand what's going on or what's going to happen in UDRP or URS, I mean also Registrars. So outside of this circle, not many people know the complexity of the process. So it's what we have.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Maxim. I take your note. Also, I'm seeing from Jeff's note on the chat. Yeah. I think as the staff and leadership team tries to come up with a work plan, we'll take those into consideration. And it might be the case where, in fact, we need more help, right? The hours that this group spends might be so much, and then we actually might have to [pump] this to some further, whether it's data or metrics gathering or some further

EN

advice from other groups in order to inform the final discussion on this group. So we'll take that into consideration when we think about the work plan as well. Again, I alert people to the data metrics part and whether this might be another one that we need further data and metrics or even further advice from others that would inform this work here.

But with that, I don't know if a lot of people voted before we had the discussion and might want to change vote. If there are such people, could you give me a signal whether we want to revote? Or if most people would just stick with their original vote, we'll keep going forward. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Can you hear me okay?

EDMON CHUNG: Yes, loud and clear.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, great. I think it's important that we just put the task that we're doing here in the perspective. I'm pretty sure that we've probably overestimated or underestimated how much time that we'll need on each of these topics, and it's going to make a hole, right? So what we're trying to do here is just give a best guesstimate of what we think the time is and involved in preparing a work plan. So I take Jeff's point that perhaps we've underestimated on this one, but I suspect that we've probably

EN

overestimated on some of the other topics. So all this will come out in the wash, so to speak.

If the worst comes to the worst and we do need to spend a lot more time on things than we thought when we started this process, then we have the option to go to the Council and say, "Look, we haven't got this right the first time, so we want to put in a request to extend the time that we need for this PDP." So I think just keep in perspective what we're trying to do here and understand that we've probably have overestimated and underestimated, but all we're trying to do here is develop a work plan. Thanks, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Donna. Yeah, I think that's quite well spoken. And yeah, we might just give and take in the different items as well. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. Two points. One is I'm happy to defer to or let leadership review the poll results, the survey results, and adjust it accordingly unless there are people who want to redo the survey, I'm not too fast.

The second point was that with the survey, we have been asked to rate or indicate a certain range of hours. So maybe we want to take a conservative approach to take the high end. So it says the majority voted low, you still take five hours instead of two and a half or whatever. Thanks.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Justine. I guess staff could take this into consideration and maybe in the future PDPs, we could refine this process. But I still think it's a very useful process so far. Let's see how well we do. Seeing no one jumping up and down and say we need to revote on this, we'll move to G.

For G that's the process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines. In fact, on this one, just as a note, we have a little bit of uncertainty here. More might be brought our way, especially I think the last couple meetings we have already touched on this that IDN Implementation Guidelines 4.0 is still not adopted and it might come back to us for further considerations how to deal with that as well. So we probably should take a little bit of that into consideration when we consider how much time we might need for this. Any discussion or thoughts someone want to bring in? I'm seeing no hands up. How are we doing with the survey? Have most people voted?

JULIE BISLAND: There's a few changes being made. Just let's give it another 30 seconds.

EDMON CHUNG: No problem. And if anyone wants to jump in to advocate a particular position, feel free to. Looking at the time, we probably won't be able to jump into topic A yet for today. Right after this survey, we'll pass the time to Emily to talk a little bit about the

EN

outreach to SOs and ACs. Okay. So mostly medium and some high. It seems to be on the high end as well for this. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: I think what we have here, with all this voting, is people to—I think leadership and staff should take these back and kind of discuss all of these because I find it weird that people would think that coming up with a process on how to update a guideline would be would take much longer than a process to discuss the complex intellectual property rights involved in dispute resolutions and the legal rights associated with it. So I do think that you all in leadership to just take this back and just understand the people on this call—we have a lot of Registry reps, we have some ALAC reps, and some GAC reps, only one IP person and that's me. So I'm not sure how representative this vote is because of the people that are actually voting on this. So I think this should be kind of a heart to heart with the leadership, just to talk about it and the issues involved and come up with recommendations. But it's clear that people who are experts in certain areas think their areas will take much longer. And because there's only one IP expert in here, that kind of gets outvoted. So I trust leadership to come up with something based on all of these discussions.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. I think that's well taken. I think you made a very good observation as well. I look at it and kind of agree with you in one sense, but it also means that certain topics, people have more things that they want to talk about and they would weigh in. It means that some topics may be very difficult but

EN

people don't have much to offer and weigh in. Therein lies the point where we might need external help as well, and that's what I mentioned.

I saw Maxim's hand up and now it's down. Did you want to still weigh in? Oh, Maxim. And Jeff, I guess that's the old hand. I'll come back to your view. Keep it up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: The thing is, when the process started, we asked IPC/BC to participate, to ensure that their representatives are in this process and so we can have their expertise on processes and legal side of things. So I think we shouldn't conflate between the overall estimates of the persons in the chat with the expectations of consistencies because we have here a representation, a hybrid model, and potentially the members who represent constituencies. Yes, they might have different opinions. Then all participants also I remind you that representatives are directed by constituencies. So we might either want to collect by e-mail opinions of constituencies here by representatives. And then leadership of the workgroup will be able to see what opinions of constituencies are, and then to present maybe to June 2 to leadership that we have a couple of options, what is the current understanding. I remind you, for us all that it's only current understanding. We haven't touched this well yet, so it's how we think now, not necessarily all things the same in the mouth. On the other hand is the opinion of constituencies and what's better in your opinion, etc. In the end, it's up to this workgroup leadership to decide which estimation is to take, but I suggest an offline e-mail conversation with the representatives to understand what members think. Thanks.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thanks, Maxim. I think the leadership and staff would try to figure out—we'll try to put a work plan in place, and then that will be a draft which will be circulated and we will talk further about it as well. Jeff, we're quickly running out of time. Please keep it short.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Edmon. I'm not complaining about the representativeness here at all. That's not what I'm saying. I'm just saying that the experts in the area, there should be a little bit of a deferral to their opinion those issues as opposed to straight voting on how long it's going to take. And I think Brian would agree with me that understanding the IP implications of this is very complicated. And I defer to the people in this group that were helped with the LGR rules, right? If you all think A, for example, would take a tremendous amount of hours, I'm going to defer to you because you're the experts in it. So that's what I think leadership should do and take into consideration. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Jeff. That's noted, very useful. I'll then jump to the next item. We'll take these back and we'll try to draft a work plan for consideration. Emily, please take us through the topic of early outreach to SO/ACs.

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Edmon. This will just take one minute. As a standard step in the PDP or EPDP process, there is a step in which the group

EN

does outreach and asks SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs for any early input on the topics within the charter. So this is a little bit of a duplicate of stuff, because obviously many of the groups are represented here in the group already and those perspectives will be brought into the discussion through the members. But nonetheless, it is a required step.

So the question here is, is the group okay with staff going ahead and drafting an outreach letter to these groups based on the discussion so far and using the charter questions as they're currently drafted? Are they fit for purpose or is there any concerns or issues that folks want to raise that need to be taken into account in this initial outreach?

As far as we're concerned, we think probably given how long the process has been in developing the charter, it should be just fine to use the charter questions as they're presented in the charter for the outreach. But if anyone has any concerns about that approach, please send an e-mail to the mailing list for further discussion. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: With that, I guess we ran out of time. But what Emily said, I wonder, Emily, if you can send this to the mailing list as well and give it a couple of days. And if no further thoughts, then we'll send it off as you suggested if that's okay.

All right. With that, we are over the top of the hour already. The only two things I want to leave with you is the next meeting is going to be next week, the same time. Based on the Doodle, this

EN

time seems to work for most people. So we're going to try to continue through with this time and we'll send out the note for next meeting as well. Unless someone jumps up and down about it we'll at least keep this time for the next few meetings.

There's two homeworks that I'll leave you with. Do take a look at the data and metrics. I still note that there are only nine of us that signed the note that says we've read all the documents. Please do go back to the welcome note and sign off on having read all the documents because hopefully we're going to get into the substance of the discussion starting next time.

With that, thank you for your time. Sorry I went over two minutes again. Hopefully we'll keep the time better in the next few meetings. Thank you, everyone, for joining. Talk to you all next week.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN: Bye-bye. Thanks.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Edmon. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is adjourned. You can disconnect your lines now. Have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]