
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Call

Tuesday, 09 March 2021 at 18:00 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 the agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/ogJACQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE HEDLUND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP charter drafting team call on Tuesday the 9th of March 2021. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. And I would just like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN's multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to Dennis Tan. You can begin, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Julie. Welcome, everyone. Okay, so let's first take a look at our agenda today. We'll continue reviewing our charter questions starting on J6 all the way—time permitting—

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.

through section L and go back to the long question in section A10 that we parked to the end of the meeting. So hopefully we'll go through those items today.

On the third one, we're going to be discussing just an overview of what the background deliverables and data [and metrics] requirements and then we do our post-meeting homework as usual, and at the end of the meeting, we need to talk about in the AOB section our meeting times moving forward next week, because I think our meeting invites have expired as of this week or next week, so we need to, with the time change, agree upon a new meeting time.

All right, so, any comments on the agenda, any AOB that we want to flag at this point? Okay, seeing no hands or comments, let's jump to the document. Thank you. So J6, just [including] the context, we are discussing the implications of the variant management framework on variant TLDs in other procedures and policies, and right now this is pertaining to TMCH and, if I'm not mistaken, the—no, this is not the exact match. Okay, let me see my notes here.

Okay. So this pertains to—and this is stemming from [SAC 060,] and reviewing this in preparation for this meeting. So we have SAC 060 that was published in mid-August 2013, and then we have the RPM requirement that basically address all the issues of sunrise and claims registrations and how the other processes as far as notifications, sign mark data [inaudible] need to be handled. That was published at a later date, September.

So in my opinion, I think because of the timing of these reports, there's this gap in how these recommendations are written, but later, I believe they were addressed. Specifically here, the J6 or SAC 060 talked about the registration of—of course, when you're talking about sunrise and claims, when a registry operator receives an application during the sunrise period, it has to come with the SMD file to validate that a string is eligible for a sunrise period registration.

So here pertains to variants now. So, what if the string has a variant label per the registry operator policies or what have you? What happens then? And the RPM requirements, I think section 2.4.something, I don't exactly remember the numeral, the language there says that if there are variant labels that a registry operator may allocate or register those labels per their policy.

So in that case, I think this is already addressed, and I would tend to say that all that we need to do here in terms of TMCH is to, according to [our framework,] to make sure that the SubPro IRT and the IDN EPDP coordinate their solution or whatever recommendation comes out from TMCH context applies and extends to the existing TLDs. I think this is all there is to be discussed here, so I'll stop here now and open for comments and reactions. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Are you saying that in the case where a variant launches after the primary TLD, let's say, that the variant TLD needs to go through a sunrise and claims process as if it was a whole new TLD, or ...? Because I think that's all this could mean, because if you launch them simultaneously, I think it is covered already.

DENNIS TAN: Right. So, that's a good angle, Jeff. If a registry operator is allocated two TLDs that are variants of each other, is there a requirement to launch them simultaneously, or can they do it sequentially? Can they just block one, have one launch, block the other TLD? And by blocking the TLD, you're basically blocking variant domain names.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right.

DENNIS TAN: And when you activate that variant TLD after the first one went through sunrise and claims, what do you do with the new ones? Do they need to go through sunrise or claims, or ...? That's a good question in that scenario.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, that's the only one I can think of. Maxim's got his hand raised.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, so let's hear Maxim, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think if two TLDs which are variants of each other launched, they potentially might need to be synchronized by the same timing of all periods, of sunrise, of all additional periods, etc. So there are effectively the same moments of registration, etc.

But if we have some TLD now, like [booting] one of the variants of the language, for example, of Chinese, and after this—in the next round, someone, the same entity, if it's approved, applies for this, it will have to pass through sunrise, because without sunrise, it will be a major violation of RPMs.

So it will, I think, have to mimic the behavior of the previous TLD. I'm not sure it's in SubPro results. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Maxim, I think you're right on the substance, but I think the question still needs to be asked. I think that is the right answer, but I think we still need to pose the question and have the group come out and say that ...

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Thank you, Jeff, thank you, Maxim. It's a good way to put a use case of the problem to solve here. So we need to rephrase this. It's not so much about SSAC advice but it is the reality, as you introduce two TLDs that are variants of each other, there is nothing as far as we've seen here or in SubPro that says that, oh, if you're allocated two TLD variants, they need to launch simultaneously or if you launch in sequence, these are the certain provisions that you need to take into account when you launch the second one, as far as the variant labels that you

will now make available for registration and not go through the complete sunrise—I'm just saying complete because lack of a better word, but complete sunrise and claims period.

Yes, Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we might formulate it as a question, what should be done if in the future, one or more TLDs which are variants of an old TLD or of each other are going to be launched? What should be done? And it's going to be an open question. So it's not going to be limited to only TMCH. Maybe some other things will appear we don't see now, just because we never thought about it. So it might be kind of open question.

And also, currently, you don't have to have similar limited periods. For example, in one TLD—which is a variant of another—it's in the past—you might have for example special limited period for, I'd say, bookstore owners of this city, and in another, you will not have to have it.

But given that TLD operators usually tend to care about the potential users, it's just hypothetical risk, but if they don't have same set of periods, it's not just sunrise. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, let me agree with Maxim and also state that it's not just like if you get a variant of a community TLD, are we setting the rule that that variant has to be treated like a community as well, or any kind of restrictions? So I guess the overall question is, do restrictions that apply to a TLD have to apply to all of its variants? Can we ask that question?

DENNIS TAN: I think it's a good point, yes, and we do have that question somewhere in the upper sections. I'm talking about the same entity. And I think this is where perhaps the good place to start the conversation, right? The ramifications of allocation of TLDs, variants of each other to the same entity, and think about those and then of course, in section J when you start in the substance of these procedures, for example TMCH, you deep dive into the implications of such processes. So there's an opportunity to tee up the conversation up in the same entity conversation and what are the implications in this context, sunrise applications when you have sequence or simultaneously, how do you treat those, whether it's in one application or different applications, one registry agreement, different registry agreements, etc.

Okay, I think we have a good grasp. Maxim, is that a new hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA: New hand, just short notice. I think we might bring the idea of synchronization between TLDs which are variants of each other, because it happens when you add one TLD to the bunch, when you launch two or three or when you kill one of three, for example, because for some reason, that nation decides to stop supporting that language as official one. I don't know.

But it's just synchronization. It happens on technical level and on policy level. And yes, of course, on operational. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Good point. Let me just say I was just answering to Donna's question on the chat. So the EPDP needs to answer the fundamental question first and assess the impact on other processes. I think they need to look at both at the same time, Donna, because I don't think they will arrive to a good conclusion, a good recommendation as far as how to treat these TLDs from a legal standpoint without recognizing the implications down the road, so I think they need to be exposed to the use cases, TMCH, sunrise applications and what have you, such

that the problem space informs their rationale and ultimate conclusion. I think that's my opinion. I'm not sure if you want to react to that. Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I don't necessarily disagree with you, but the problem I see, if you do it that way, is you look at the TMCH to see how it would potentially impact the TMCH and you might adjust things, but then you look at the URS or the UDRP or something else and it might have different ramifications. So I guess it really does get tricky, because if we're trying to adjust the policy to fit certain processes, then the process is ultimately going to be flawed if you're trying to retrofit it into some other processes. But yeah, it certainly is tricky, I'll grant you that.

DENNIS TAN: Yes. I hear you and I'm with you. It's not going to be an easy task and the deliberation is going to be really complex really fast. But yeah, so our job is to frame the problem so that the next working group has easier time to digest the problem statement and how they deal with it. So based on this conversation, I think we have a good grasp as to what we need to accomplish with this charter question and how we try to relate all the different implications. So we need to do some working on the rewrite here such that everything maps together.

Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Short clarification about Ariel's reference in chat to lifecycle. The thing is domain lifecycle is for general availability ,and it's for a particular domain. And the registration periods are for the whole TLD and they have different rules. For example, in Sunrise you have special rules of appealing that the registration was valid, etc. In limited periods, you can invent something like you can have a special court deciding who is the rightful owner. It's up to you. And it's different. We shouldn't conflate it.

Speaking about the different approaches in different variants for the community TLDs, I think it's one of the fundamental questions. Either those domains are equally treated as different views, different versions of the same string, or if we decide to treat them differently depending on the situation, it may lead us to quite strange and complex situations. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Good points. Luckily, we don't have to discuss the substance here, we just need to come up with the smart questions. So that's what we are going to do. That was a very good conversation, very good insight from all of you guys, so, thank you very much. So we need to come back to J6 saying how that really integrates with everything above. But it's a very good use case that needs to be dealt with.

So before moving to section K, any other comments or observations on J6? Okay, I see no hands or chat. So let's keep moving. Section K should be pretty straightforward. I don't think there's much to discuss here other than to recognize that the variant TLD concept brings another layer to look at how you treat those in different states. We are familiar with the evaluation process of a TLD, it's allocated and delegated and [inaudible], but the variant label brings another state, which is the withholding. Jeff, do you want to ask a question here?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think this one needs to be coordinated with SubPro as well, because obviously withheld same entity is a unique term, but the whole thing about allocated, rejected, we should have a common set of terminology for things that pass through the evaluation process, and we shouldn't have special terminology for variants where we don't need it.

So there are some unique things like withheld same entity, but the other terms should be coordinated with SubPro.

DENNIS TAN: I agree. Thank you for that, Jeff. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think since one of the basic principles here is the principle of the same entity, if it's approved, then we don't need other variants rather than rejected due to withheld same entity, because you can't understand if it's just blocked on the registry level for some reasons—for example, you want to register a forbidden name example.tld and it will be withheld because of requirements of ICANN and the stoplists on the registry side.

But there is a need to understand, if it's restricted, to which entity. For example, to the same entity than that domain, and you will have to translate this information somehow to this requester. So I support Jeff that there's no need for the items rather than new item saying withheld to some entity.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yes, and just one clarification. This only should pertain to top-level domain names, not second-level domain names, because those type of states don't really exist. But this is more for ICANN to manage the inventory, if you will, of TLDs that are out there. So I would imagine [the IANA repository] would add a data point for variant TLDs that are not yet delegated but are withheld for the same entity because they are the ones that have the rights to apply for that variant label or whatnot.

Okay, I see some action on the chat. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we might say that, does the group agree that those items are required or none of those or part of those? But my thinking is that if the new answer is invented, it will have to go into RFCs, or at least into some drafts which some new applicants will have to comply with, because it will work only for new registrations this way without being added to RFCs. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. And for that reason, I think we want to stay away from second-level domain names. And again, I think this is more of a management way to provide information to the outside world and to manage the TLDs. So I don't think they need to be driven from an RFC. I think that would be too much in my opinion, but basically, that's what the next working group thinks that's the best way to come up with these terms. Yes, but at least there's need to be a way to clearly know when you are trying to find information about a TLD, whether those TLDs, in which states they are.

And now when you go to the IANA repository, you can [clearly see] which ones are delegated and some that aren't or any other state there, but now the variant layer, you need to add certain other levels of other states, let's put it simply there.

But I think, coming back to the beginning of the conversation, this is something that SubPro will need to tackle as well because they also agree or conclude that the same entity principle needs to be implemented and therefore we're expecting there's going to be some conversation in tandem with the IDN EPDP.

Okay, so Maxim, just looking at the chat, [inaudible]. Okay. So moving on to section L, now we are transitioning from the big topic of management of TLD variants to the second smaller topic of the IDN guidelines that were identified by the scoping team, both parts of the policy track.

So the [management] TLD basically stem from the staff paper, SubPro recommendations, the TSG paper. The IDN guidelines, the way it was raised, because they are in fact—they started adding guidelines many years ago, they started [as such,] as guidelines, but they progressively become obligations to the registry operators by way of linking in the registry agreement. Right?

And so the question is if there indeed are contract obligations, what is the mechanism, the right vehicle to make changes to those contract obligations? That's mainly the question at hand that needs to happen.

A second aspect of the IDN guidelines, we've specifically been talking about the IDN guidelines version four that was developed a few years ago and still waiting for [that] to be adopted for the Board. That was also discussed during the scoping team working meetings, is that if there are any issues in the version four of the guidelines that need to be dealt with on a policy level, that those need to be referred back to the policy track, which is this one.

Now, this is where things get tricky. The operational track that was supposed to look at those issues never started, and right now, there's a conversation between the council and CPH about the issues, but the timing is just not ideal. So we don't know what issues—well, I can talk about those because I'm familiar with the issues, but from a processes standpoint, this policy track has not received that direction. I think that's what I'm saying here.

I'm privileged to information because I'm dealing with all of this in different working groups, but as a matter of process, this policy track has not received any direction from the operational track as far as the issue that would need to be considered.

So absent of that, I think the only item today that we have to discuss at this point is the question of the proper vehicle to update, change the IDN guidelines moving forward. I just wanted to give the context of this because there's additional information here that doesn't really pertain to this topic. But Maxim and Edmon who were part of the scoping team can keep me honest here.

And Maxim, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes. Those documents couldn't be adopted by the Board because they [weren't a product] of the policy work. And this EPDP is going to be, this policy work, but as it was—I think we might have here some chicken and egg question because some of operational items will be formed after the understanding of the policy part, which is formed in this process, because it might be one way. So to ensure that this policy doesn't have deep operational issues, all we need is to ensure that the Contracted Party House, in particular registries and registrars,

nee dot be on this group, and I'm not sure we need to do it formally. All we need is to talk inside of our groups and ask to participate. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Donna, and then Jeff.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So Dennis and I have been having a bit of an exchange on the request that's come from the council to the CPH. I think guidelines version four cannot be implemented at this time because there are elements in those guidelines that relate to what will be covered by this EPDP. So it would be premature to try to get the Board to approve the guidelines and then have that overtaken by policy.

So as it relates to approving version four of the guidelines, I don't think we can do that, because of this EPDP, but there is an additional question moving forward about how those guidelines can be approved moving forward. So I know there's a long history of how the guidelines have been approved over time, and that was documented in a response from ICANN to ICANN from the Registries Stakeholder Group, but I think there is a legitimate question for this EPDP about what's the process for updating and approving the guidelines.

And it may be that at the end of the day, the decision is that the IDN working group can be constituted to look at the guidelines, make changes, and then that's approved by the Board. But I think it's a legitimate question for this EPDP. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Jeff, and then Ariel.

JEFF NEUMAN: The only thing I was going to add was with what Maxim said, is I think part of our role is to determine the makeup of the group, right? And it sounds like we may or may not want a representative group but rather an open group. But, so, is that one of the topics I think we'll discuss at some point?

DENNIS TAN: Yes, that's correct. Okay, Ariel, and then Edmon.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. So staff just want to quickly flag that we already have some kind of placeholder language in the contextual background for the charter question. We'll review this together, but I just want to quickly flag that, it's page two, this paragraph is we have noted that there's an operational track that's also ongoing and that track is to determine what elements in the IDN guidelines should be removed for policy discussion, and if the council deems appropriate, this charter can be expanded to include those questions. So we foresee there's a possibility there for expanding the charter, and in this template, if we will have option to update it and include additional questions, should this operational track identify these elements for the EPDP to deliberate. So I just want to quickly flag this.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Yes, that's correct. Unfortunately, the operational track, there is no official owner, and that's what is creating this timing issue. But yeah, thank you for flagging that up for us. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, just adding one observation, or maybe something that we need to include in the charter, is that the IDN implementation guidelines right now cover gTLDs as well as

IDN ccTLDs. So we should somehow, I guess, identify that in that there would need to be some coordination between Gs and CCs.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. That's a good point. Donna, and then Maxim.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. So it's an important point, Edmon, and just out of curiosity more than anything, but would we ever be in a situation where the IDN implementation guidelines would be different for Gs than they are for Cs? I appreciate that they're nonbinding on Cs and I also appreciate that the Board has requested some consistency in approach between the Cs and Gs on this topic, but could we ever envisage that the guidelines could be different for gTLDs versus ccTLDs?

EDMON CHUNG: Dennis, if it's okay, I'll respond directly.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Sorry, I must have been on mute. But go ahead, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: So I think in the past, it would be no, but in the future, that's what this group needs to figure out, which part of the ... I guess in my mind, we will need to scope out which part of the IDN implementation guidelines might need to diverge in the future, just simply because the way that the implementation guidelines are enforced and Gs and CCs are quite different.

I wouldn't go so far as to say that the guidelines are not binding for IDN ccTLDs. I think they are, at least as far as the ccPDP with standing, the fast track process did specifically say that IDN

ccTLDs need to comply with the guidelines as far as how I read it. But there comes a point—I think especially the scoping team identified that there comes a point where enforcement of the guidelines is likely going to be different, and there are certain parts of it which the enforcement might—and the actual guidelines might need to diverge. And that’s, I think, what the EPDP needs to think through.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edom, for that clarification. Let’s go to Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: First of all, I think we need to understand that we cannot and we will not do policy work for ccTLDs, or a few reasons. One of those is the maximum we can is to ensure that the liaison from ccNSO is invited. The second item, ccNSO policies are obligatory only for members of ccNSO. So if the TLD never was, I’d say, part of ccNSO, or like all IDN TLDs which are regulated by the registry who is different for ASCII code and for IDNs. For example, I know at least a couple of countries where there are different companies for IDNs and for ASCII.

And also, effectively, it’s not obligatory for them. They can, at any moment of time, say no, we don’t like it, and [we quit your ccNSO.] So all we can do is to invite them to say that it’s the measure that we want to them to follow, but any ccTLD, after being delegated, can do whatever they want. There are no enforcement. And effectively, ccNSO never enforced their policies for one very good reason, to avoid situation where they ran out of members. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. So let me wrap this up into, I think, two questions and potentially a third if the operational tracks get in motion and provide information to us. The two things that mainly we identify is the evolution of the guidelines and how such process need to be developed and put into motion, and in that question, I think that subquestion is a recognition that gTLDs and ccTLDs might—or recognize the difference, I think, let’s put it that way, so the working

group discuss whether one document continues as what is now the guidelines or there needs to be a separate vehicle, separate legal framework for gTLDs and another one for general guidelines for any registry that wants to implement IDNs.

Okay, just reacting to the chat. Okay, so you're discussing something different. All right, so I think those are the issues with regards to the guidelines. And if in time the operational track provides input to this drafting team, we'll provide some time to discuss those items and incorporate as appropriate. But I think this wraps up section L. Any final reactions before going to the last item, which is the one that we parked and that is A10, and then we continue?

Donna, I see your hand.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, sorry, Dennis, just before we move on, I don't like the contextual outline of if it's [inaudible], there is concern within the GNSO, among some at least, about the guidelines. Let's just stick to what the issue is. The context is irrelevant, I think.

DENNIS TAN: Agreed, Donna. Thank you. All right, so let's move upwards, A10. So this is a recommendation we parked. Just a quick reminder of what the issue is. This is where a script is not yet incorporated, supported by the root zone LGR, and there is an applicant that wishes to apply for a label using that script that is not supported. So, what does the process do [inaudible]?

so the TSG paper explains, because it's not supported, the LGR cannot do the determinational calculation. One can do [inaudible] processes as it was before, but the overarching principle that the root zone LGR is the only source or the sole to determine variant labels and the calculated variants, then it's not supported, cannot be processed, end of story.

On SubPro recommendation, it's slightly different, and they defer into the timing of where to stop or where to pause the process. And I think maybe Jeff, I see your hands up. You can explain what was the SubPro position as far as on this issue.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so the SubPro position which is now policy because the GNSO approved it—assuming the Board approves it—is that everything except for that last technical evaluation can still go forward, so whether that's contention resolution or that's objections and other parts can still proceed, but the applicant needs to be made aware that it may never delegate if there's never an acceptable LGR if the script never gets approved.

So this is now policy. So the reason why this is on here is because I don't know if we are—it's potentially with applications for existing TLDs to get a new label as to whether that would be—if there's a different application process for existing TLDs than going through the SubPro rounds, but other than that, this has already been handled, and it doesn't matter that the expert report was different because SubPro had the expert report, looked at it, considered it, and made a decision the other way.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, I think the timing has worked in this way. So if that's the case, I think what—here on A10, we need to constrain the discussion into extending the policy, the SubPro IRT to existing TLDs, if an existing registry operator wants to apply to an eligible variant TLD and that TLD is not supported in the root zone LGR at that point, what's the process? So I think that's a way to frame this—

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, it's a little bit different, because the group needs to decide what is the application process for existing TLDs to get a variant. If the group decides that it's no different than what everyone else must go through, which is through the official SubPro application

process, then it's already resolved. So it's only if the group determines that there needs to be some special application process for existing TLDs to get variants, then they need to look at this question.

If the group decides no, it should be treated as a new TLD and should go through the SubPro, then it's already solved. Does that make sense?

DENNIS TAN: Makes sense, yeah. And [could tie] the other issue, the timing of applications. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the only difference is the same entity, and we might change it, we might clarify the questions, to which extent the principle of same entity should be followed in a situation where the TLD is applied for which is a variant of another TLD.

And yeah, that's it, and we will have explanation of maybe—for example, if it's allowed to use daughter company or if it should be the same legal entity. There might be many varieties, but since that principle wasn't in the work of SubPro, we should ask this question here. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. All right, we'll take note of that. So I think we got it now, so of course, we need to rewrite this, so don't go for these ones, but we've got the notes and the insights, so let's rewrite it and we'll do one more pass. We've gone through all of section two, so yay for us.

So, doing time check, it's 1:54. I want us to have the time to discuss meeting time for following weeks, because we have a change of time coming and there's going to be a disruption to some,

so let's have a discussion now. Ariel, I think you already worked on some options based on everybody's time zones. So, can we see it now?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Thanks, Dennis. I consulted with the GNSO secretariat based on everyone's location. Their suggestion is either 11:00 UTC or 12:00 UTC. That can catch almost everyone, although it's really bad for west coast in the US, but the rest of the drafting team members are not really located there. So that's the most ideal time. So we're just wondering whether the drafting team has any objection and if we schedule the meeting from next week until the end of the drafting team work for, for example, 11:00 UTC or 12:00 UTC. And I see Maxim. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I suggest we take into account the ICANN meeting week and the preparation week so we do not overlap with any major items there, because we will lose members and the quality might suffer. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Maxim. We don't have a meeting scheduled during ICANN meeting week, so next week is the last meeting before ICANN 70 and then we will do that after. Prep week is this week, so we already have the meeting today. So yes. And for Donna's question, I think it's probably 10:00 PM your time, but I would double check with Nathalie. It's later in your day. The time you suggested, 19:00 or 20:00 UTC, that will be 2:00 or 3:00 AM for other APAC-based members. So yeah, it's not going to work for everyone, unfortunately.

And then the time will be 7:00 AM if it's 11:00 UTC for east coast-based, and I think we have two members in South America, they're slightly ahead of us, so will be even better for them.

DENNIS TAN: So we have two options, right, Ariel? 11:00 and 12:00 UTC?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Why don't we do a doodle poll until the end of the week, or earlier, and see which time sticks better? Does that sound like a plan?

ARIEL LIANG: I think we can do that and get a doodle poll out. And just to quickly answer Edmon's question, 14:00 UTC will be too late for Donna and I think Tomslin. And Edmon said 12:00 to 13:00 UTC seems okay.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, so we are just basically down to one option, 11:00 UTC?

ARIEL LIANG: I think maybe we should still do a doodle poll just to get a sense of whether 11:00 or 12:00 will be better.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. So let's do that doodle poll. I see 12:00 UTC. Donna, it's kind of leaning towards 12:00 UTC. I'm okay with 12:00 UTC. Any objections to 12:00 UTC? So we can close this action item. I see no objections here.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis, could we do the doodle poll? Because there's actually another time change in April for the southern hemisphere, so we're going to have a double whammy. And my head's not clear enough right now, so a doodle poll would be appreciated. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Let's do the Doodle poll. No problem. All right, so let's do that until the end of the week. Please check your e-mails for that and try to wrap it up this week.

All right, so with that, any other items in the Any Other Business? Oh, yes, homework. Thank you, Ariel, for reminding us of homework. So next one, section four, formation, staffing and organization, so working on the group model. And I believe on this one, staff will provide us with options and see according to PDP 3.0 what are the options, membership structures and all the items so that we can properly discuss this. Yes, Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. I just want to note that we haven't completely covered section two of the charter because we didn't talk about the data metrics part, which I'll just quickly scroll down, these colored bullet points, and also some background contextual text before the charter question. I'm wondering whether we can just handle this on the mailing list, or should we dedicate some time in the next meeting to quickly go over them? And they shouldn't take too much time.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Sure. Yeah. Let's plan to do that. Anything else? All right then, so it's a wrap. Thank you, everyone, and so an action item, doodle poll, and after the doodle poll is closed, we'll send the invitation for next week. Thank you, everyone. Have a good rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]