EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP

Thursday, 16 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/pgBmCg

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

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and welcome to the IDNs EPDP call taking place on Thursday the 16th 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 identify yourselves now? Hearing no one, we have listed apologies from Jeff Neuman and Sarmad Hussain.

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

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.

EN

Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the IDNs EPDP Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our chair, Edmon Chung. Please begin.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, and welcome, everyone. Thank you for joining the call. I guess you have the agenda in front of you. It was circulated earlier as well. We have a pretty full agenda, but just as a note, there's no rush to it. If we don't get through everything, that's okay and we'll keep forging ahead in the next meeting.

But the plan is to first take a look at the project plan, the workplan and the timeline that is based on the survey that we did in the last couple of meetings, and that leads into a little bit of a discussion of the length of the meeting that we have every week. Right now, it's at 60 minutes. I'll just jump right in and say that in that particular discussion, we would like to see if it makes sense to lengthen that to 90 minutes, noting that the last few meetings, we were kind of rushing through in the last little while, so that's the idea for that particular agenda item.

And then in the last couple of meetings, I've brought up the issue about some of the deliberations here that this team will probably

need some information, some data to be gathered from staff to help us with the decision and deliberations. So we'll go through what has been identified in the charter first and see if it makes sense to have the staff team go ahead and collect that data for us as we go forward, and that's number five on the agenda.

And then we'll go back to the deliberations, discussions on the particular topics. So that's the proposed agenda. Again, if we don't go through everything, there's no pressure on rushing through everything, but I did want to at least of course get through three and four so we can have a good sense. So, any questions or thoughts on the agenda or some of the items, any clarifications what we want to at least try to tackle this meeting?

Okay, seeing no hands, let's get right into it. And if you have any questions, feel free to put your hand up or throw it into the chat window. But we'll try to walk through the draft project plan and if I can pass it to Steve to help us walk through a little bit of that thinking based on the survey that we did in the last two meetings. So Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks, Edmon. Before we get into the details, I just wanted to note that these more formal project plans that you see now in actually all of the GNSO PDPs is a result of some reform and efficiencies and improvements from the GNSO's PDP 3.0 effort, which as noted is all about efficiency and effectiveness of PDPs. So while we've always had workplans, they haven't looked quite as detailed as this one, often taking place in just a Word document instead.

EN

So the result of having these project plans is we have much better accountability for what groups commit to the Council. So with that—

EDMON CHUNG: Just something quickly, you might want to zoom in slightly. I can make out the words just because I've seen this a few times, but if you can zoom in slightly, it might allow people to actually see what's on it.

STEVE CHAN: Sure, and I also just dropped the link into the chat as well. So with that, section one is really about some administrative things which I wasn't intending to go over at all. So the bulk of everything that this group needs to look at right now is all within group deliberations, and so as Edmon just noted, the source of the timing for everything came from the survey that Edmon ran through with all of you, and so you'll see there are groupings for every one of the topics, topics A through G, each of them has a grouping here. So everything is actually collapsed except for topic A which we're using as our example to show everyone how the project plan is built.

So what you'll see here is that under deliberate policy issues, every one of the questions from the charter is included, and that is the case for every one of the topics. So the idea here is to have basically a repeatable process for every one of the topics and essentially, what you're going to do over every one of the topics is the group will understand the topic and questions, what they

mean, conduct deliberations on the questions and once there are some preliminary conclusions, do a first reading with the group followed by a second reading with the group, and then confirm the draft is stable.

And the idea is that is the repeatable process that the group will conduct for every one of the topics within its charter. So as I noted, only topic A is expanded right now, but topic B, C, D, E, F, G are all captured here and as noted, every one of the charter questions for each of these topics is captured in full detail if you're able to actually expand every one of the topics.

And the idea here is that all of the deliberations on these topics here serve as a dependency to be able to develop the initial report, which I think probably makes some sense.

So once all of the stable drafts are developed and topics a through G are created, then they populate into the initial report as you see in line 146 here. And then there are a couple steps that are required of course for the group to get comfort with the initial report and then it eventually gets published. The draft project plan is available on the link for the agenda for this group.

The only other thing I'd add here is not really about the details of this draft but the idea is that once this group thinks this looks like a reasonable amount of time for the project plan. And as noted, again, I've said this a few times already and Edmon did as well, the timing elements in here for each of the topics is based on the survey. So hopefully, all of these seem like reasonable times.

EN

But once confirmed by this group, it'll be communicated to the GNSO Council and that will be what this group will commit to work against in terms of timelines. So with that in mind, since it's a commitment, the idea is to make this project plan something that is realistic and achievable and not aspirational. So this shouldn't be what we hope to be able to achieve, this is what we think we can achieve.

And that said, even though it's a commitment to the Council, it doesn't mean that there isn't flexibility involved. If this group does realize it needs more time or even that it needs less time, it can communicate and inform the Council that there are chances to the plan.

Since we're at the very beginning, I don't expect that we'll have absolute precision on what this project plan will convey. So if there does end up being a need for additional time, there's something which is called a project change request which is submitted to the Council to inform them that there is additional time needed to complete the work of this group.

So with that, I will stop there and maybe Edmon will want to add an additional word, maybe talk about where this project will end. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve, and thank you for explaining. This is a fairly detailed and sophisticated timeline, but just to give you an overarching feel of it, the idea is based on the survey, we're really looking at about 18 to 20 months of discussions through this

EN

working group and for the initial report to come out somewhere in early 2023, and so we would come to a final report around April of 2023. That's roughly 18 to 20 months from now and that's based on the survey that we did in the last couple of meetings.

I would add to that that sort of reconciles quite okay with what I have personally estimated in my head. So it seems to me that it makes sense. Again, the idea is that we will track the progress, and if things go well out of sync and we're looking at clearly that we need more time, then we should revise the plan and also inform the GNSO Council on the situation, whether it's much faster—I don't know, like everything just gets done very quickly or everything is much delayed. So that's the idea. Any thoughts? I see Maxim's hand up, and I see chat back and forth, but Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I support the suggestion which Donna provided in the chat window, that the working group leadership might conduct the small assessment monthly of the plan, but I do not recommend to submit the request for the change of the timeline or PCRs each time we see one week here, one week there, because in general, it's not common process, it's an exceptional thing, and usually, it is sent to the Council only when something serious happens, because I do not think that all items will take as much time as we see in the draft now. Potentially some items might take for example one week less, etc. So one week plus in one item might be consumed by moving faster in another item. Thanks.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Yes, I think, Maxim, that makes a lot of sense, and thank you, Donna, for the suggestion. I think that makes sense. I guess we'll take note, the staff and the leadership team, to kind of review the status and where we are every month to see where we are and at appropriate times, if we're significantly off, at that time we will bring to the attention to this group and potentially make some adjustments with the GNSO Council once—if we get to a situation where the difference is going to be significant.

So this is the kind of workplan for us at this point. I'm just trying to catch up on the chat. Sorry. Yes, so what else do we need to talk about this and what next steps? Do we kind of package this up and send it to the GNSO Council for their reference? Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Edmon. At first, I had actually raised my hand just to answer Justine's question in the chat. Just about line 21, which is about input from the community groups, inputs from other SOACs and GNSO SGs and Cs. So this is actually a required step within the PDP manual. So this is something that we will engage in. I think Emily had spoken about this at a previous meeting.

So after this group had reviewed its charter questions, we had suggested that those charter questions can form the basis of this outreach. So the intention is to get early input from the community groups that are referenced here. And I think what we had also mentioned is that this process, while it's required, is maybe not quite as practical as it used to be, since we have moved for this group and some others to a more representative model. So we do have representation from quite a number of different community

groups, and by that, we will get input from all of you as we go through. But this is something we'll be working on. We'll put together a draft communication that will go out to these groups. So hopefully that helps, Justine.

So to Edmon's question about what the next steps are, assuming there are no objections to what is captured in this project plan, it'll be shared with the GNSO Council as Edmon mentioned, and it'll be put onto the Council's—I'm thinking October, actually—meeting for formal acknowledgement. It doesn't require necessarily a formal approval and a motion, but it's more an acknowledgement of this is what the EPDP on IDNs, their workplan that they will work against. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. I guess in that case in terms of the workplan, please raise your hands if you have any concerns. I do see Satish, your hand. I'll come to you momentarily. Just as a note, if you have any concerns or thoughts, please bring it up here. Or else, what I guess we would probably suggest to do is to throw it out to the mailing list for a last call and consider it wrapped up by next Monday so that the staff team can kind of organize it and send it to the GNSO. At least that's in my mind, that that's the idea, obviously unless we have lots of concerns, then we might need to come back to it in our next meeting and go through it further. So Satish.

EN

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Edmon. In earlier meetings, there was a discussion on one or two additional items which may be bumped up to us. Have we made any inclusions in this plan for such eventuality?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Satish. I guess you're talking about at least the IDN implementation guidelines and some of the interactions with the IRT of the SubPro.

SATISH BABU: Right.

EDMON CHUNG: So I don't think the IRT for SubPro is starting yet, so until that gets underway, we won't know. But I would suggest we still forge ahead with this without waiting. Likewise for the IDN implementation guidelines, work from the Contracted Parties House in terms of the operations side, I think for the time being, we should keep forging ahead unless there is some additional information on those few items. That's what I guess is the situation. Steve or the staff team, is what I understand a reasonable status, or is there updated status on those things?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Edmon. As Donna noted in the chat, the IRT for SubPro is some time away. And to be quite honest, it's actually more than six months, because I think the announcement went live about the Board's decision on the ODP. So the ODP length of time

EN

suggested by the Board is at ten months. So the IRT would not start until the Board takes formal action which will only take place after the ODP completes.

EDMON CHUNG: So with that, I guess for us, we will—I wouldn't use the word "ignore," but in a sense ignore that, as in we will keep forging ahead and as those items come into play, we might adjust further. So that's, I think, where we were with this group.

With that, I guess I'm not seeing further hands or any objections to the rough timeline here, so if it makes sense, maybe Steve, we should put out a last call to the mailing list and if there are no substantial issues, then we would consider the workplan as it is by Monday and be in position to send it to the Council. Does that make sense, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Sounds good. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So that takes us to the next item, the length of the meetings. Right now, we are running 60-minute meetings every week. Given the conversations in the last few weeks, I'd like to suggest that we budget for a 90-minute window for each of these meetings, and that would give us a little bit more time to deliberate on issues. It seems like as we talk about issues, sometimes not only does it need a little bit of time of warmup and everything, but

once we get into the heart of the issue, we might want a little bit more time.

So I'd like to budget for 90 minutes if that works for everyone. So we would use the same start time which is 13:00 UTC and run for an extra 30 minutes, potentially closing earlier, and also, the overall timeframe, I'm not looking to change that. I think ... this is my personal experience and I don't know what other people's experience is, a lot of times, these items, the discussion just needs a little bit more time in one meeting to hash out some of the ideas and thoughts. So basically, the idea is to extend to 90 minutes with potentially ending earlier in the meetings, but that's the suggestion to the group. Any thoughts, concerns? Or if there are scheduled meetings right after this hour, please let us know or bring it up.

Tomslin, the suggestion is to start at the same time and extend for 30 minutes. I guess Tomslin's question is whether we could start 30 minutes earlier. Any thoughts, questions? I think there were some concerns about starting earlier, especially from the staff team on some conflicts. Maxim mentioned as well, not sure to start earlier. Tomslin, do you want to take the mic and speak to it?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, I can, Edmon. It's just that it's a struggle since it was moved on Thursday. So I was just wondering whether it could start 30 minutes earlier so that I don't miss the last 30 minutes. But if most people are okay with starting at the same time and then go, that's fine. I guess I can catch up on the last 30 minutes by listening to the recording.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: I understand, Tomslin. I think the earlier time would be very challenging, to start 30 minutes earlier. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Edmon., I think we actually g to a little bit mixed up on the conflict with the staff meeting. We actually need to start at the earlier time as Tomslin is hoping for. So if we were to start at 13:00 like we normally do and extend for 30 minutes, that would run right into conflict with quite a few of staff related to IDN-related issues. So at least from the staff side, it's preferable for us to start at 12:30 UTC, even if it is indeed an unpleasant time for some of us in L.A., which includes me.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Do we think we do any of the scheduling in terms of Doodling, or should we try to forge ahead with 30 minutes earlier? I just want to get a sense, Steve, I guess, what's your recommendation there? And I see Nigel's hand up, but Steve, so you're saying that the staff team would actually have a problem with a conflict. I guess I got it wrong. I remembered that there would be a conflict.

So I guess the issue is we must stop at 14:00 UTC because that flows into other staff meetings. So if we want to run for 90 minutes, we are starting at 12:30 UTC. Did I get it correctly? Okay. Nigel.

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thanks very much and good afternoon. On the extension to 90 minutes, I take your point entirely, Edmon, and we spend a lot of time understandably on process at the moment because we're defining project plans, etc.

But when we get into the substance, I would hope that a 60-minute chat would be sufficient. I think 90 minutes every week for the next 18 months or whatever is quite a commitment. So perhaps we could review as we go forward whether we need 90 minutes or whether 60 minutes would suffice. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Nigel. That's probably a suggestion that makes sense. So I guess I take back the suggestion in some ways. But if other people want to weigh in, I guess let's stick to 60 minutes for now and let's go for a few more meetings, because as Nigel says, because of this administrative stuff, it takes up a lot of time and it causes the rush at the very end. And that might kind of correct itself as we get into the actual substance of the discussion.

So I guess with Nigel's suggestion, my question to the group is whether it actually might make sense to keep it at 60 minutes for now and maybe revisit this in a few meetings once we get into a roll on the discussion on the substance of the issues. Anil.

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Edmon. I agree with you. Let us complete section A with the same timing, same length of session as well as the same timing of 13:00 UTC. And once it is over, then we will come to know that this was the estimate of completing section A and this is

EN

the time we have taken. And if we feel that we are taking more time, then there is a justification that we can increase from 60 minutes to a 90-minute session. at that particular time, we can take from all the members what is the suitable time to all of you. This is my suggestion. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Anil. That's supporting in the suggestion for it. So in that case, let's keep it to the 60 minutes and the 13:00 UTC time on the Thursday, and we'll keep running it for the next few meetings, and we'll probably relook at this once we go through the first section of the substantive discussion on the charter.

Any other thoughts, concerns on this? If not, we'll move to the next item, the proposed data and metrics request from the charter. So in the last meeting, what we bumped up against is that once we start discussing the issue like what to do with the applications in the 2012 round, we realized that it's quite significant to actually know how the root zone LGR is going to impact the decision on how we deal with the 2012 round of IDN TLD applications.

So Steve or staff, I don't know whether you can jump to that— that's perfect. So in the charter, a number of studies have been identified. Six of them have been identified. Hopefully, you've had a chance to take a look at them. I'll just quickly run through them.

First one is to look at the 2012 round and determine if the list of calculated variants matched the ones that are identified by the applicant. I guess maybe not just match but whether it's within the allocatable deposition and so on. I guess a little bit of nuance in

EN

terms of "match" as well. But in essence, that's the main [inaudible].

Next one is if we are looking at potentially having a process for applications to be stalled and waiting for the LGR updates. We want to get a sense of what the estimated time is needed for updating LGR script proposals. So maybe looking at the previous LGR script proposals and the mean time and the median time, a little bit of statistics from the creation and development of the root zone LGR for particular languages, that would help us in some of the discussions.

The third item is on the issue of a same entity or the same registrant and looking at how different registrars may have been implementing this type of requirements or looking at this type of approach to allocate second-level registrations to the same entity. So we would gather some information for this in preparation for our deliberations there.

And then the fourth one is the number of registries that use the root zone LGR format based on the newest RFC, the RFC on the LGR basically, to see whether that's a format that makes sense for upcoming IDN and registry to ask them to provide that information. If a lot of gTLDs are already ready with this, that might change our perspective on the issue.

And then the fifth one is to take a look at all the delegated gTLDs and determine whether the root zone LGR is consistent with all the gTLDs that are delegated and whether or not—last meeting, we talked about if there are exceptions, whether we need to change the LGR or provide grandfathering processes, but without

EN

knowing what the actual situation is, it's very difficult to engage in those discussions. So the idea is to ask staff to go ahead and actually generate those statistics and that study first.

And then finally, there is going to be a deliberation on how to deal with the trademark clearinghouse as in sunrise and the launch of gTLDs and to look at the impact if we are going to implement the LGR for the top-level and the second-level, what the impact would be on the TMCH, the trademark clearinghouse, to calculate those variants and look at how it might look like and the types of languages and scripts that are in the trademark clearinghouse versus the language and scripts that are supported by the root zone LGR.

So those are the six kind of data gathering and metrics work that were identified in the charter. The main question to this group is whether it makes sense to ask staff to go ahead and produce those reports and identify and look for those data and report back to this group so that as we go along the discussion, we would have that, or not, I guess, or we should just forge ahead and start discussing and collect further requirements before we ask staff to do this. So that's the main question. Any thoughts from people? Anil.

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Edmon. I suggest that I think it is a good idea in case they get the information from the [inaudible] first, because they are the custodian of all the data which is the past data and the current data. And when we are discussing the data which is produced by the staff, at that particular time, members can contribute in

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Anil. I think that makes sense as well. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: I agree with Anil and I think it's important that we get this data now. If we need to add on to it along the way, then we should do that. I think this is important information for us to have up front. Thanks, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Donna, and I note that Satish and Dennis agree to that as well. At this point, any objection to commissioning staff to go ahead and collect that data? Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: I just want to clarify, make a query. I was going through the notes from last week's call and there were a couple of questions noted by staff that were recorded, suggested from participants last week. I was just wondering whether those were ... Do they coincide with what's on the list that you've just read out, or do they possibly add on to this list? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Justine. That's a good question. I think there's a little bit of nuance. Right now, the six items seem to be very broad

strokes and some of the suggestions from last week for example is—for example, the first bullet point is just a few more nuances to the main data. So I guess the question to ... is Sarmad on? I'm guessing Sarmad, you or your team is going to be helping this, but Steve, is Sarmad on, or would some of the nuances that have already been discussed be taken into consideration as we take this baseline set of data?

STEVE CHAN: Hi Edmon. Yeah, I will consult with Sarmad and Pitinan about ... So I was thinking that the first bullet, as you noted, is connected to what was discussed last week and then probably also the fifth bullet too. I think we can look back at the transcript and see if there's some additional nuance that might not be captured by these two existing bullets.

EDMON CHUNG: I guess we can take this offline, the leadership discussion with the staff team as well just to make sure. And Justine, I think it makes sense, since we have already talked about it. And I'm guessing those nuances could be collected as part of the exercise. So I guess the point is that, yes, I think we should do that since we have identified some of the things. But I guess the leadership team would work with staff on making sure that that happens for the first gathering of data.

Pitinan, did you want to add anything to that, since you're from the team and you probably understand the nuances there?

EN

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: Yes. Thank you, Edmon. I'm looking ad the note from the last time, but to be thorough, I think we—let us take a closer look from the note last time and consult internally and then get back to the group. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Thank you. It took a little bit longer than I had hoped it to be. We only have about ten minutes left at this point. As we are looking to continue the deliberations on topic A, actually, we were in A3 if I recall correctly, and we were going to ask—we asked Jeff to explain a little bit on the challenge and appeal mechanism. I note that Jeff is not on the call this time.

So the main thing about A3 is if an applicant comes in and it doesn't match the root zone LGR and they want to challenge the results, the question is whether we would go directly into the root zone LGR process to deal with it and whether or not an appeals mechanism that is based on the SubPro PDP makes sense.

I see Justine's comment that Steve can actually speak to that. I don't know if Steve or even Justine, yourself, might want to jump in. The main thing I want to make sure that this group understands is how the challenge and appeal system that works in the new gTLD process so that we can then decide whether it's the right process to use for this particular situation and what kinds of things that this group would need to look at to configure. Because there is a general challenge and appeals process, and then for each particular type of challenge, there are probably going to be some different in terms of what we need to provide for the appeals challenge and the exact way to process it. So that's the reason

why I wanted to make sure everyone knows about that. But Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN:
Thanks, Edmon. As Justine noted, Jeff volunteered for providing a bit of an update on what SubPro produced, and with that, I would note that Emily helped support that group and we also have quite a number of members in this group that were also in SubPro, like Justine and Donna and Maxim, at least that I saw off the top of my head.

So with that, we're going to take a quick look at what's in the annex from the SubPro final report. And what this table does is looks at the different mechanisms within the new gTLD program for both the evaluations and objection processes within the program. And basically, it lays out the factors for all the challenge and appeal mechanisms within the program.

So the factors it looks at is, for each of these mechanisms, the outcome that might warrant a challenge, the potential affected parties, the parties that have standing to be able to bring an appeal or challenge, who would actually arbitrate the challenge or appeal, what the result of a successful challenge would look like and who bears the cost.

So when the group looked at all these factors, it helped them understand the nuance of what the appeal might look like. So what this group could do is use these same factors in considering what the appeal would look like for challenges to the outcome of the RZ LGR. For instance, one of the things that might come up is

EN

that for the RZ LGR, looking a bit ahead and not being prescriptive, unlikely that there would be a panel that makes this determination. The RZ LGR is formulaic, it's basically an algorithm to be able to generate outcomes.

So it might not fit perfectly in this sort of categorization, but it might make sense still to use this to help think through what the appeal mechanism could look like. So that's a real quick run through. I know we're already short on time. But that's essentially what SubPro did for each of the evaluation and objection mechanisms, and the same could probably be used for this group. And if any of the folks that supported SubPro and participated want to add anything, please definitely go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. I guess the approach would be that next week when we come back, we'll try to fill in one of these rows and the process being RZ LGR as a process for appeal and then fill in the boxes for outcome that might warrant challenge, potential affected parties and so on, each of them. And that would give us a sense of whether this approach would make sense. And I see that Justine has her hand up and also asking for the grounds of the challenge as well. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Edmon. I just wanted to point out that as far as I remember, in terms of nomenclature, we used in SubPro the term "challenge" to basically ask for a review of an evaluation process, whereas an appeal was used to term a review of an objection

EN

process. So we were quite specific about not using challenges and appeals interchangeably. That's something that this group should probably note. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: So this sounds like a challenge. Does that make sense for you then?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I believe so because I don't think there would be an objection process that covers the root zone LGR framework. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. So let's call it a challenge, at least for now. Thank you, Justine, for that clarification. But I guess the idea for next meeting, at least we will start off with, is looking at A3 and making this a root zone LGR challenge process and trying to fill out those six boxes, the outcome, the potential affected parties, parties with standing, arbiter of challenge, likely results of a successful challenge, and who bears the cost. We'll run through that and see if it fits into this challenge process. If it does, then it makes sense. If this format doesn't make sense for us, then we might need to think about a different challenge. To me, that seems to be the approach. Steve or Justine, you're more familiar with the process. Would this make sense as an approach for our deliberations starting next meeting?

EN

JUSTINE CHEW: I think it makes sense. As Steve pointed out, this is what SubPro used in the context of SubPro. So we don't necessarily have to fit what we're discussing into this framework. Obviously, it would help if we could, but it's not mandatory per se. It just provides a good guide in terms of the questions that we probably need to consider in order to establish a challenge mechanism if we were to go that way.

I also had another point about perhaps we need some base data to also inform how we're going to proceed. For example, one question in my mind would be what's already on the list of questions which would be the frequency the root zone LGR is updated. Meaning, for example, if the RZ LGR is updated very frequently, then there may not necessarily be a need for a challenge mechanism. So it's a chicken and egg kind of thing. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Justine. I would say it's not like there's an active review. So it's an on and off issue. But we can take that discussion further at our next meeting. But again, the homework, I guess we'll start here but we will continue to go through A4 to 10 in the next meeting, but A3, we're going to try to fit it into here. As Justine mentioned, if it fits, it's perfect, then we'll use this mechanism. If it doesn't fit, if this group feels it doesn't fit, that's okay too, it just means that we potentially won't be using this mechanism and we'll need to think through what mechanism to actually use.

So with that, we've run out of time. Any burning questions or thoughts before we close this? I think we made pretty good progress, although administratively and not the substance. But any questions before we close this meeting?

Seeing no hands, thank you so much for joining the meeting today, and we're right at the top of the hour, and we'll see everyone again in a week's time. We'll keep it to 60 minutes as discussed, and we'll review this in a few meetings' time. Thanks all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]