EN

ICANN Transcription
IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group
Tuesday, 13 April 2021 at 12:00 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/7oCUCQ
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar/2021

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP charter drafting team call on Tuesday, 13th of April 2021. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Zoom room only. This call is being recorded, so please remember to state your names before speaking for this transcription and to keep your mics and phones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With that, I'll hand it over to Dennis Tan. Please begin.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Nathalie, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. So we have our agenda in front of us, so point number two on the agenda, discuss the [inaudible]. So we continue, membership structure, leadership, structure, criteria review, GNSO Council liaison support staff, then look into section three, time permitting, we'll review after that our homework for next week and Any Other Business.

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

So going back to item two, we circulated last week the proposed model for the membership structure, just as a quick recap, so we have been discussing this for two weeks and a half, I think, and I think we landed to a good model that addresses everybody's concern about simplicity of the structure as well as sharing the load and offering representation and open participation for the community.

So the model is where we have this hybrid model, representative plus participants, and each group will be given an opportunity to appoint up to three members, and this is an important consideration, it's not at least one, but up to three members, it's going to be up to each group to appoint somebody that can serve in this working group and represent their point of view during the working group sessions and of course whenever there is a consensus call.

So that's all that I want to say on the structure. Again, like I said, we discussed this, and I think we arrived to a good model here. I'll go to Edmon in a second. So my intention is to close this unless there is a strong objection. So with that, Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry I missed the last meeting, but I just want to clarify that I understand you, Dennis, correctly. So this is the kind of maximum three members from the different stakeholders and stakeholder groups, and this is for the consensus call, but participation-wise, anyone can still participate and speak at meetings and so on, right? Do I understand that correctly?

EN

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon, that's a very important question. Yes. So everybody has an opportunity to voice their opinions, but it is going to be up to the leadership how they manage the time slot, if you will, how much time you give to each one that wants to speak. But yeah, everybody can speak their mind.

Of course, those are representing each group. It will be taken differently, I guess, somebody speaking in their own capacity, but that's going to be up to the leadership of the next working group how to handle that.

EDMON CHUNG: Thanks. That works.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. And Ariel is posting a reminder about how they are representing themselves. Okay, so with that, let's move on to look at the next item in this section, which is leadership structure.

Okay, so what we see here is staff and myself recommending the model in which we have one chair and one vice chair. And just as a quick summary, highlight, the chair is appointed by the GNSO Council and the vice chair is selected by the working group. So let me pause here before going beyond to criteria. So I think the other option is to have co-chairs, one, two, three or what have you. So, do we see here support, objections or observations on this model, the one chair and one vice chair? I see Maxim plus one for chair

EN

and vice chair. Any other thoughts here? I see Edom's hand. Please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, I think one chair and one vice chair makes sense. I just want to clarify—and I'll state this as well—I think I am interested to put myself in as a consideration, but I see that it has to be an independent chair, but independent just means I don't need to represent a particular group, it doesn't mean that I cannot be from a particular stakeholder group. I just want to clarify if that's the case.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon, for first your eagerness to continue with this work and second, I believe yeah, independence—and Ariel and Steve can correct me if I'm wrong—means that you have to be a neutral chair. I think it will be difficult for anybody to chair something without any affiliation, but I think independence is in your work, how you treat other working group members and how you set your views.

But I think Ariel raised her hand to clarify this. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis, and thanks, Edmon, for the question. Indeed, independence means the chair needs to lead the group with a neutrality and impartiality, and if you read further down in the charter, there's a more detailed explanation of what that means.

EN

But in the technical terms, if you look at the model of the working group, the chair wouldn't be counted towards the membership. So within this table, the chair wouldn't be counted as one of the three, for example, in any of the groups. That will be a separate category. So even if Edmon, for example, you're from RySG and RySG, if they select members, then they won't count you as one of their members. That's just kind of an explanation there. So hopefully, that helped clarify a bit.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for that, Ariel, and Edmon says yes. I see support for the one chair, one VC, so let's move on. I think we have our model there, so let's move on to the leadership criteria here. I think most of this is boilerplate language, so I don't think we need to go line by line unless somebody has spotted anything. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Dennis. I think there is one remaining question about the vice chair, is, does the drafting team still believe this vice chair can be counted as a member, or the vice chair also needs to be independently selected? We just want to clarify that.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for pointing that out. My bad. So that's a good question. So in the case the vice chair needs to step up as chair, whenever the chair is unavailable ... Maxim, please go ahead.

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's important to underline that since vice chair is going to a chair in situations where he or she is absent or maybe where they need to just make some preparation work for the meeting or some other items, it's important that vice chair is clearly stating in which capacity he or she is acting to prevent misunderstanding and confusion. That's it. Because removing the ability of a person to basically participate properly just to be sometimes of help to chair doesn't seem a good incentive for trying this role. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim, for that. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I put something in the chat but I just want to put it on the record. I think the vice chair should be a participant but not a member. So if once the group is formed, one of the members wants to be a vice chair and they're selected by the group, then that member drops down to a participant and the group that had that member can appoint a replacement for that member, if that makes sense. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, I think there's support to what you're recommending. Personally, I agree as well, separating someone that is representing a group, not representing a group in different sessions, that's going to be something potentially difficult optically as well for the working group overall. So I think I like the idea of a participant being selected as—or participants eligible for the vice

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: Just to make the point again that a member is eligible to be the vice chair, it's just that if they're selected, that member drops down to a participant and the group from which the member came can now appoint a new member. Just to make that clear.

DENNIS TAN: Right. At the end of the day, it's not going to be a member, but start as a member but then they will have to change their title, if you will. Sounds good. I think we recorded that. Ariel, Steve. Okay, good. So now let's move on to criteria. Again, boilerplate language, leading with neutrality and impartiality, doing the representation, all things that I think most are aware of in terms of how to lead a PDP group.

There are some things that are highlighted here and are specifically to the IDN effort. So hopefully, it's not too onerous here, but basically, the chair needs to have some kind of expertise or is knowledgeable about the subject matter, as you would expect, so that he or she is able to manage the conversation in the right direction. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. So I'm just trying to interpret. Obviously, expertise in ICANN policies and procedures. I was looking at the second bullet. As well as registry/registrar services and domain name

EN

lifecycle. What is the point we're trying to get across there? They need to know about that, but expertise and experience are two different things. So I'm wondering if this is saying that you need to—or people are trying to say you had to actually work for a registry/registrar at some point. I don't think that's what we're saying, but I think we need to make that clear.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I agree with you, doesn't mean that you have to be a registry or registrar, but I think the point here is that you're knowledgeable about the lifecycle of domain names as there are questions related to transfers and updates and anything lifecycle of an IDN and their variants.

Okay, I have a queue here. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think the first clause about direct experience in IDN policy efforts of ICANN is extremely limited number of people, because basically, so far, we don't have IDN policies. And these words would limit to number of people participated in scoping effort, and I don't think it's fair, and it's extremely limiting number of people who can apply for this position.

And third clause is the most important out of the colored ones, and the second, it could be replaced with understanding in the second part, because expertise in ICANN policies and procedures is important for chair but deep expertise in registry/registrar services and domain name cycle, I'd say you don't expect that outside of CPH. Thanks.

EN

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I think I agree in part with your [inaudible]. I think we can [break] policies and procedures with registry services just because of the points Jeff made as well. As far as experience or expertise in registry/registrar services, I think you can find that outside the CPH, because nowadays you have BC, IPC folks also being part of registry/registrar services. So I think you can find that expertise outside just the CPH group, and just because of how people in the community work in different ways here. and there's also comments in the chat about changes of terminology, about [change understanding to say direct experience.] Yeah, I think that's what we mean here.

Maxim, just commenting to your comment, IDN policy—there are policies, right, in IDN subjects? So maybe we can clarify here it's IDN-related work instead of just policies. Let's see how we come back to that. Jeff, and then Donna.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Dennis. I was going to suggest something like that, ICANN-related efforts or ICANN-related work or something like that instead of policy. And then I don't like using the word "expertise" because there's no qualifying organization as to make you an expert, so knowledge of, experience maybe is fine, but let's stay away from using a term like expertise, because there's no qualifying organization to qualify someone as an expert. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for that, Jeff. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. I wonder if we can overcome some of the concerns here if we just changed that overarching sentence, so the working group chair is specifically required to meet the following qualifications, I'd make that a little bit looser, the working group chair is expected to have experience and expertise in most of the following areas, because as that sentence stands at the moment, it looks like you've got to meet all of the criteria or have all those qualifications, and I think maybe to Maxim's point, that's pretty unrealistic. So let's make that overarching sentence a bit looser and then you're not tied to everything that's contained in that set of qualifications, which is pretty comprehensive and to some extent unrealistic.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you, Donna. I think I understand the intent here. So we can revisit the way it's worded there. I'm just looking at the comments on the chat here, [chair's leader in consensus finding and process means.] Yeah, I think that's the main focus right there. But always expertise—or I'm using the word, but understanding of the subject matter helps into driving the conversation forward.

Okay, and Jeff notes, "Rather than expertise and experience, I like knowledge and understanding better. Experience means you have to be with a contracted party or have been with one, and there is no qualifying entity to make one an expert." Okay, yeah, so that

EN

point was made, Jeff, so thank you. Yeah, I think we get the concerns here and we can reword and address those in the drafting of those few lines here.

All right, so any other observation about criteria on the role of the chair? We are adopting or we are going to recommend one chair, one vice chair, and we're going through the criteria here. Okay, I see no other comments or hands, so let's keep moving.

Next session, expressions of interest for the working group chair. Again, boilerplate language, so we don't need to go through that line by line. And last is the expectations for the vice chair. This is short here. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. So for the expressions of interest for the chair, maybe it will be helpful if the drafting team can review these bullet points, because these are the suggested questions for the call for EOI and the candidates are expected to answer them. So since it's a relatively short list, probably, it would be helpful if the drafting team can provide some input and see whether these questions are appropriately worded.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. So for one, I think we need to change some of the terminology. For example, what I see here about expertise and experience to understanding and knowledge about the IDN [inaudible] efforts, right? So just maybe make it more overarching IDN efforts and put in the examples, at least the baseline, root

EN

zone LGR, LGR procedure, the staff paper, the TSG paper and so on and so forth.

So I think we have our work there. Yes. So what we have discussed on the qualification, I think [inaudible] these questions, so that's for one. And other than that, I don't see any other question that needs to be revisited. I just want to get reactions perhaps on the question about the experience with consensus building involving various stakeholders. Of course, that's the main reason we want—I'm sorry, the first qualifications of a chair of a PDP, to try to build consensus and move the work forward, and meet the deadlines of the workplan. So I think this needs to be there. I'm just asking about the form or the wording of the question. And Donna, yeah, potentially we put that question higher up, just to note and highlight the importance. Maxim agreeing here with Donna. Okay. But I don't see any other observations as far as the questions, so we need to revise the terminology that we're using so that it's consistent with the qualifications that we just discussed on the chair role, and that's pretty much it.

Okay. So let's move on to expectations for the vice chair. So again, recapping, the vice chair is going to be open for all members and participants. In the beginning, one person is being selected. If he was a member, then he needs to drop the member role and be just a participant with the responsibility to take the chair position whenever he needs to. Okay, I think pretty standard. Any observations or comments here? I see none. Okay, Ariel, anything to highlight here before moving on? Okay, thank you.

So let's continue with leadership review. So leadership review, the way I understand it, this is a self-assessment. Is it self-

EN

assessment? Sorry. It's an assessment as to how the working group is either—well, a range of things, but basically whether they're meeting the deadlines or their timeline or workplan and whether their leadership is behaving or conducting the working group work in the expected manner.

So the proposal here is to have at least two reviews, one halfway the work, and then the second one after completion of the final report. So that's basically—and the rest is just the criteria for what is the purpose of objectives of these reviews.

So I think what we can here customize or recommend to the Council how to do is the number of reviews and how far apart they can be. Any thoughts on this? Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry, Dennis, I'm not really understanding what this review is. Maybe if someone could just explain again what this is supposed to mean. Is the leadership supposed to do a review of its leadership capabilities, or is this a review of the work halfway through the [inaudible]?

DENNIS TAN: Sure, Donna, we can do that. I think Ariel raised her hand for that. Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis, and thanks, Donna, for the question. So this leadership review section in the charter is a new section that

EN

stems from PDP 3.0, and for the background of that, actually, I'm showing these additional notes on the screen. That's to provide a context to that, is for the Council to review the working group leadership and see how effective they are and whether they perform their role in a neutral, efficient, effective manner. So that's for the Council to review the working group leadership.

And then for the exact mechanisms, one of the recommendations on PDP 3.0 is to conduct a survey among the working group members, probably in this case also include participants, and then there's some standard questions in the survey that other [inaudible] can respond to and then factor in the result of the survey that will be part of the evaluation, the Council going to see in terms of evaluating the working group leadership. So that's a general background.

And we also have a separate document specifically talking about the regular review of the working group leadership. That's part of the PDP 3.0 final report, so folks can take a look at it if you're interested in learning more about this subject.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Donna, did that answer your question?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, it does, Dennis. I'm just a little bit—so I understand why it's there, because there have been some challenges with working group leadership teams in the past, and I fully get that. I just don't want this to take away from the main event. So if things are tracking and there's no concerns raised by the GNSO liaison

EN

about the leadership or where things are going, then I don't think a review is really necessary, but if things aren't tracking and there are some rumblings among the membership, then I think a review is warranted. But it's a bit of a balancing act. And maybe the review by the Council is just going to be a check-in with the liaison to say, are we on track here, are there any problems here? And if the answer is no, it's all good, then that's the end of the review. But it shouldn't be overly cumbersome.

DENNIS TAN:	Thank you, Donna, for the thoughts. Did I hear correctly —maybe paraphrased—I think we agree there needs to be some accountability tools, I guess, that's what this is meant, but not just put it as a "you must do it" and instead, because there is a GNSO Council liaison, this person has the obligation to call it if he believes there's a review that needs to happen because of whatever [his assessment of] what's going on with the working group, and he raise the flag with the GNSO Council and say, "Okay, a review is warranted, so let's go for it and do it," instead of, you know, it's a schedule to go and needs to happen, because it takes away also time from members on the Council to do that, and if it's not warranted, then why bother, right?

DONNA AUSTIN:	Yeah.

DENNIS TAN:	But the GNSO Council, if they feel something is not going the right way, okay, so let's call it—it's not a mandate for the working group

EN

to go with this, but instead ,it's going to be a prerogative of the GNSO Council liaison to call it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, so it's discretionary rather than mandatory.

DENNIS TAN: Right. Okay, so just wanted to clarify that that was your comment. Okay. So Maxim, please, your hand is up. Go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: This is kind of a safety mechanism and it was never used, or, yeah, it has two items. First is ability for the Council to extract a chair of the group if things are really going wild, and the second thing, it might be used as a post-review when things are all over to just have a feedback about, was it working or not? Something like that. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Any other views? So on one hand, we have PDP 3.0 that I believe requires the leadership review. On the other hand, we have views of, okay, so maybe not every working group needs to go under that review, and it could be discretionary on the GNSO Council. I'm keen to hear from others. Maxim, it's a safety mechanism, right?

I think there is a desire to—again, on one hand, we have PDP 3.0 that the community develop and they want to implement, and if I'm not mistaken—Steve and Ariel, please—based on PDP 3.0, this is

EN

a must have, there is no room for tweaking the procedure as it was for example in membership structure, just want to understand what's the latitude that this drafting team has in terms of defining the leadership review here. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. So based on staff's understanding, it is okay if we just leave it as leadership review may be conducted instead of must be conducted, as long as it's mentioned somewhere in this charter that we have this safety mechanism, as Maxim put it. So although the Council will be very interested in seeing how this PDP 3.0 improvement is implemented because this hasn't been implemented in any ongoing or already concluded working groups, and for new working groups, this will be an opportunity to do so, but we understand where Donna comes from and make it more discretionary instead of like mandatory may give some flexibility for the working group and not to kind of distract the progress and stall the good progress for the working group.

So we can change the wording to make it into a may, and then maybe in terms of the frequency, we probably can make it less prescriptive and slightly more general. And then I was noticing Jeff's comment too. What happens in SubPro is a working group self-assessment survey, and that's not specifically about leadership review, and that was based on the old survey questions developed for previous working groups. So that has been done for concluded PDP working groups. And there's some ongoing discussion or work in the GNSO specifically. Right now, just between staff and Council leadership thinking about whether the self-assessment survey needs to be also improved, and

EN

maybe the leadership review questions can be part of it instead of a separate thing. That is still a kind of ongoing discussion, and there hasn't been a conclusion of that yet. So just want to clarify that.

But from staff's viewpoint, in the charter, we should mention about the leadership review but we can change the wording to make it more flexible. So hopefully, that can satisfy all the concerns and address the concerns from the drafting team members.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel, for that. So I think we want to make those changes. Tomslin also agrees with the discretional nature of that call for leadership review, and there's other things going on in the chat, but I think they have to do with SubPro. So I think we have the direction here about leadership view. Any other final thoughts on this section before moving on? Okay, seeing none, let's continue.

And we were talking about the role of the GNSO Council liaison, so that's the next section here. I think one part that we can, if it's not here, maybe we want to tie the—we would just talk about the prerogative for the GNSO Council liaison to call for a leadership review if they feel it's warranted based on their report to the GNSO Council and the general observation of how the working group is going.

EN

Okay, I think most of these list items are boilerplate. Ariel, anything to highlight here for the group to consider? Looks like pretty much standard language.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. Nothing really specific, but we just want to emphasize that the most important item or requirement for the liaison is that he or she needs to fulfill his or her role in a neutral manner. So that means during the working group meetings, this liaison also needs to behave sort of like a chair or vice chair in a way too and not to constantly take off hat and put on hat and provide individual member kind of comment. So that's the first item we put in this list, and that's from the PDP 3.0 improvement document. We just want to remind folks about this.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Any final thoughts on the GNSO Council liaison role? Okay, seeing none, let's continue. Support staff. This is a [inaudible] section here, although very important without whom most of this work cannot be done. I don't see anything here that raises any flags. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. And I don't think you need to specify me or Steve in this section. But there's one item I want to note, is that besides policy staff, we may have additional staff participation from GDS for example and as you can see already, we have Sarmad and Pitinan following the drafting team, so I guess the expectation is from GDS team, they may send staff members to follow as well.

EN

And then there's also another staff resource in the policy team. Maybe some of you already know, her name is Melissa Allgood, she is an expert in conflict resolution or consensus facilitation kind of work, so she can be a resource to assist the working group leadership, for example, during the consensus building process, especially if the working group is running into issues in terms of a consensus process. So we'd just want to note these additional resources from staff's side.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you for that, Ariel. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Dennis, and thanks, Ariel, for that explanation. In fact, you just kind of rang a bell with me here. Perhaps we make it more mandatory that GDS assigns people to this group, because of the heavy reliance of GDS and implementation issue of this and the fact that they've been involved with since the beginning and are going to be the ones responsible, for example, in reviewing new gTLD applications and variant tables and all that kind of stuff. I would like to see us make a GDS staff person a member of the group or at least required participant. I think that's important for this group.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. And to build on that, the IRT staff is part of GDS, is it not?

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, but this is not IRT, this is the policy group.

DENNIS TAN: Right. No, I was just thinking along the lines you were describing, because it's important that there is some—at least in my mind—continuity, understanding and being knowledgeable about all things happening relating to [inaudible] IDNs and the policy procedures, but also continuity as this work goes to IRT. So I was thinking along those liens.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, and the fact that there's some dependencies with the IRT or eventual IRT for SubPro. So we should make it more of a mandatory role as opposed to a "support staff may." Let's give it an official role.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, I think I would agree. That certainly will add value and be helpful, having the knowledge about how things are happening, because it can raise flags in a timely manner. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Dennis. I just want to note that the consensus policy implementation framework notes that that participation that Jeff is talking about from—it says GDD right now, but GDS staff. So if we want to reference the required participation, we might want to tie it

EN

to the CPIF, because that more or less asks that GDS take part in policy development processes. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Sorry, Steve, to revise what? I couldn't catch what you were referring to.

STEVE CHAN: Sorry, it's early for me, I'm probably not communicating very well. So the governing document that GDS uses for implementation efforts is the consensus policy implementation framework. Sorry, I shouldn't assume everyone knows what that is. So that's the document that they use once the Board adopts policy recommendations from the GNSO.

And so what I was suggesting is that that document—I'm not saying simply rely on that, Jeff, I'm saying you can reference that document in asking for the participation of GDS members during the PDP. So tying them together, because the CPIF—is what the acronym is for—envisions the participation of GDS staff during policy development. So they're thematically linked and I was just suggesting to reference that document in our draft charter here. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you for that, Steve. But I think we have a direction, right? I think we are in agreement, at least I don't see any objections as to pushing the role of GDS staff into more active—in the PDP, and Steve provided a means to tie certain language

EN

requirements there that can be useful for drafting this charter. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Dennis. I was thinking a little bit more than that. If you scroll up to the members list, I would like to see them appoint—I don't know if it's up top three members or whatever, but I'd like to see the ICANN GDS listed, or whether it's just GDS or ICANN staff, I don't know if it'll be OCTO or whoever. I don't think we should be the ones that pick the group that it comes from. But I do think ICANN staff should be listed as members.

DENNIS TAN: Got it, Jeff. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I'm not sure I agree. I think there's a distinction between the members of a working group and the role that staff provide. So we run the risk of blurring that if we add staff to the members, so I think the way that it's represented is adequate. I don't think there's any intent that they won't be well resources, that these efforts aren't well resourced. They always have been. If additional expertise is required from ICANN staff, then I'm sure that those supporting the PDP have access to that and can provide it. I'm really worried about blurring of the membership if we start adding ICANN staff to the roster.

DENNIS TAN:	Thank you, Donna. Yeah, I think the intent is not to make those fully members. I think what Jeff is pointing—nonvoting members. I think we can make the distinctions. But we get the gist of putting more weight into or requiring staff to be involved in a way that's permanent, not just in and out of the working group. But I'll let Jeff speak for himself.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Yeah. I didn't mean to intend that you have to count them for consensus. I think that it's important to make it very explicit that ICANN should have—not just should or not the normal loose language that's normally in there like they'll appoint, but that they have a seat at the table. So I know we've done it before for certain groups. I'm not sure how we did it for—like I know that they have people for the WHOIS EPDP stuff, but that's a full representative model. Whether you call them participants or whatever you call them, I guess, is not the issue. I think it should be spelled out that they must assign—there should be qualifications for the ICANN staff that's assigned. The ICANN staff should be one that's familiar with the implementation or the eventual implementation, one that's got authority to speak on behalf of ICANN Org.

The reason I don't like calling them a participant is because participants can represent themselves. If we say that they are participants that represent the organization and can commit the organization and have authority to commit the organization, I think that's important. So I don't think the way that it's represented is enough here. It's very loose here, it's very noncommittal, and we've had issues in the past where ICANN staff has participated but then we all of a sudden—just go back to SubPro, we all of a |

sudden get a whole new batch of feedback when the public comment period comes that was never brought up by ICANN staff. And I'm trying to avoid that by giving it a more formal role than the loose language that's here and has been used in the past.

So if we can address that, that would be great. I just don't want to see what happened with SubPro happen here.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff, and noted the concerns. I'd say that we can figure something out in the [off session] here. I have Maxim here in the queue. I think we'll draw a line on this subject. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think invitation of members of GDS department is a good idea. I am not sure that any staff member of ICANN should be participating as a member. While participation as a participant with ability to share some aspects of what they know or their thoughts is going to be valuable. So yeah. And I'm not sure that adding any text about the experience in IDNs is going to help us, because I'm not sure that ICANN tech personnel is going to participate, because they basically don't seem to like bureaucracy a lot. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Okay, noted. I think we have the input here and we can come up with some way to put it in the chart. All right, so I think that closes section four, so membership and leadership

EN

structure. So thank you for that. I think we have one minute left, so I just want to—we didn't get into the next section, which is project management, but that is going to be the quickest one, I believe. If we can scroll up with the draft list. so that's going to be the first item in our agenda next week, project management here.

This is part of the charter, but something that this working group can provide as a tentative or baseline, if you will, for the next working group. Personally, I'm not [fond into] designing or suggesting other people's work without knowing the details. We know so much about the policy considerations, overarching questions, but as far as the detailed discussion that are going to happen, that's going to be very difficult for us to determine how much time they will need to really nail a solid, sound recommendation.

So let's talk about these items, what we could do, we may want to do to propose for the GNSO Council to have as a baseline, I guess. But this is going to be our next item for next week. So with that, just really quickly, Any Other Business? Okay, seeing none, that's it. Thank you for today's discussion. It was very good. We made a lot of progress here. I think we are back on track. So next week, project management and other items there.

And yeah, see you all, or we'll meet again next week, same time. So, thank you, have a good rest of the day, rest of the week, and talk to you soon. Bye.

EN

[MICHELLE DESMYTER:]   Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT