
**ICANN Transcription
IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group
Tuesday, 16 March 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/L4WBCQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<https://gns0.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 16th of March 2021. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken by the Zoom room only. This call is being recorded, so please remember to state your names before speaking for the 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. And with that, I'll hand over to Dennis Tan. Please begin.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Nathalie. Good morning, everyone. All right, so new session, new time, but I'm glad to see that we have quorum today. So let's jump right into the agenda we have in front of our screens. So item number two on our agenda to continue discussing the draft, other sections. Today, we're going to look at background, deliverables, data and metrics, and also, we're going to hear from staff about the working group model, membership structure, membership criteria, and there is a recommendation made from staff, but we're going to look at the other options as well just to confirm or adjust the current state of the draft charter.

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.

So that's items two and three of the agenda. Number four is our usual post-meeting homework preview and then we'll open up for Any Other Business. So at this point, any items to be added to the agenda that we want to flag?

Okay, seeing none, let's go to agenda item two, so then we need to switch to the draft and we start with background. Okay, so I don't think we want to read through this, but I just want to highlight—I need to change my screen settings here. One second.

And the link to the document is posted on the chat room for those of you who want to follow on your own pace. Okay, I've got it now. Background. So again, I'm not reading every single line. Or is that the way we want to do it? I want to hear any reactions or suggestions on how do we do this background section?

Okay, so I'm going to go with a summary of the important points, and you can read at your own pace and submit your comments either via the document comments feature or through the mailing list.

So on background, of course we start with the action from the ICANN Board on the staff paper, the set of rationale, motivations and recommendations as to how to manage IDN TLD variants. So that's one item. As you remember, there are two big items that this policy effort will tackle. One is the management of IDN TLDs or gTLDs, both existing and future.

And the other item—so we move quickly to second paragraph on the IDN guidelines. And the major item on the IDN guidelines is the change process or the evolution of the guidelines, those being recognized as contract obligations. So, the policy will look at the proper vehicle to update those guidelines moving forward, with the caveat that the current draft, the latest version four which was drafted back in 2018, if there are any items there that need to be discussed on a policy under a policy development process, those need to be identified by an operational track team and send those back to the IDN PDP.

As a parenthesis and just to give context to this operational track team, right now, I think that work is sitting with the GNSO council. GNSO council is trying to lead that work. They have asked the CPH leadership to flag those issues on the IDN guidelines so that those can be discussed, the way to resolve whether the IDN guidelines working group needs to be reconvened and look at those issues and then decide how to move forward or some other mechanism. But as of now, from a matter of process, we have not received—this group has not received any input from the operational track.

So those are the big items that the [PDP effort,] and as a result, that's what we have been discussing the last several weeks as far as policy questions. The vast majority of those questions relate to the management of IDN TLDs and their implications into existing procedures and policies, and a question about the proper process to change the IDN guidelines.

Okay, so I think that's basically the background. The last paragraph is basically just an affirmation of the work of this drafting team and at what point the GNSO council will have issue a resolution as far as how to move forward as far as the EPDP.

Any questions? I see Edmon's hand up. Please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. No questions. I think the way that you described the background is quite spot on, and I just wanted to say I don't have anything to add. I think that's fine.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Any other comments on background? Okay, so seeing no hands up and hearing no voice or comments on the chat, let's move on to the next item. So it's background, now we move on to—is it the scope and charter, or is it the deliverables, I think?

ARIEL LIANG: Dennis, it's the introduction of text right before the charter questions. There's some text here, and we want to make sure the drafting team is also okay with it.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, so I missed that then because I have not reviewed this action yet. But let me go through real quickly—if anything, I think here what we want to talk about is if we're talking about the scope and the charter question, we want to talk about our approach to the policy considerations as they relate to the management TLD, the body of knowledge that we have consulted or being used as a source to inform our deliberations and scoping of the questions, which are SubPro recommendations, the staff paper and the TSG paper, as well as any other SAC-related reports, which I see [are actually here.]

And as far as the IDN guidelines, just to refer back to the scoping team deliberations and put here the actual scope of those items which I've mentioned before. Also, I think that could be a topic here. Not sure if I'm spotting this to here is about the framework as to—

JEFF NEUMAN: Hey Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: Hey Jeff. Sorry about that. I have changed configuration so I don't have [inaudible].

JEFF NEUMAN: That's okay.

DENNIS TAN: So I have Jeff and Edmon.

JEFF NEUMAN: No worries. I would like to see something in this part—I agree that more of the framework needs to come in, but I'd like to see more emphasis on SubPro being policies that have been adopted. Here, it just kind of groups SubPro in with everything else. You have SubPro you should review and the [variant—the] staff paper and the recommendations on the label generation rules. It's almost like everything is on equal footing. But the SubPro is actually adopted consensus policy now. Obviously, the Board needs to approve it, but assuming that that happens or either way, I think there should be more of an emphasis on SubPro and then you could say that "and you should be familiar and read these other sources too."

I want it clear that the burden for coming up with something different than the consensus policy should be much higher than grouping in with all these, if that makes any sense.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. That's a very good point. I think it does make sense. Largely, this language is from the original draft, and things have progressed, so we need to update [inaudible]. Those are very good points, Jeff. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: I think Jeff covered what I want to say. I think the SubPro results should be emphasized a bit more. But yeah, that's all.

DENNIS TAN: All right. Thank you. I agree with that approach. Thank you. So we'll update [inaudible]. So basically, a scope and charter question needs to look at the body of knowledge with the right weight, the weight they have, [their core merits] and also speaking about our framework as to how we tackle all those—use that information, source of information and then go into our own deliberations.

All right, so I think now we move on to deliverables, the next item. And let me ... We are arranging my setting here so I do not miss the hands here. Okay, so deliverables. And I need to change my screen now, because I made a number of notes here.

So I just wanted to highlight, and those you see highlighted are the actual items that we're going to deliver. I think this is kind of a boilerplate language, but nevertheless, let's go through this to make sure we're all on the same page. So we are to deliver an initial report which I believe is going to go to public comments or ... well, not us, the next working group. To public comments, then a final report, and then issue a number of recommendations if they apply, which I think they will, but nevertheless. So any recommendations.

Here, I highlighted something that I'm not familiar with about the language and how this goes as far as the recommendations of the next working group that—it says the working group shall recommend its subsequent policy implementation review team to conduct a policy impact analysis and identify a set of metrics to measure the effectiveness of the policy change. So this reads to me as a post-implementation of the future IDN EPDP. Is that what I'm reading here? Steve or Ariel. Oh, I see Jeff's hand. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'll wait for that answer and then I'll jump in after.

DENNIS TAN: Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: So actually, we borrowed this text from boilerplate content that's something written in other working groups' charters, so we borrowed it. But if it's not appropriate, we can adjust it or remove it or replace it with something else. So just want to let you know where we got this. And I'm not 100% sure whether this is appropriate, so maybe Steve can enlighten us too.

STEVE CHAN: Hi. I wouldn't mind taking a look at the GNSO operating procedures. I think it actually does include something about an impact assessment. So I'll dig for the reference, but Ariel notes, it's usually in the charters, and I think there's a reason why it's usually there. So I can try to find a reference as noted. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so if you want me to jump in now.

DENNIS TAN: Go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so it's not for ... I don't think that this charter should say that the working group shall recommend anything. It's really the council that will—or actually, it's really the Board and the council that are responsible for chartering or whatever you want to call it an Implementation Review Team.

I think the impact analysis is supposed to be done by the working group, number one, not by a subsequent IRT. And now we have this whole concept of an ODP, which I'm not sure how that fits into this. I think I'd rather have it say that the working group shall try to identify a set of metrics to measure the effectiveness rather than it shall recommend an IRT do it. That's the first comment, and then—well, Maxim is just saying the ODP is on the ICANN side. I think that's right. But I do think that it's part of the working group's activity should be doing an impact analysis even before it gets to the council to adopt it. I believe that's in the operating procedures.

And then the other thing is I think we should indicate that these are the mandatory deliverables but that somewhere in here, we could say that the working group may conduct additional comment periods—or I'm not wording it very well this morning, but working groups should have the discretion to do additional public comment periods like a draft final report or something like that. So I don't want this to, in any way, seem like it's limiting if the working group feels like it needs to do additional or have additional deliverables. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, adding on what Jeff said, I think probably, the working group should provide some—I don't think guidance is the right word, but at least a framework or a set of aspects that the IRT should look at if we are to figure out further the impact, because I think from the policy development work to the IRT, there is a difference, as in the staff would have thought through the implementation implications and so I think the IRT would have some role to play in figuring out the final impact analysis. However, the working group should give a sense of what those impact assessment should include. I don't know whether I'm making sense here. I think there are parts of which the working group should outline, but not until the staff goes through the implementation considerations. Would the IRT then be able to finalize the impact kind of assessment. Hopefully, I'm coming across meaningfully.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. I think we are rallying around impact analysis, metrics to measure the effectiveness, efficiency—not the efficiency, more so on the effectiveness of the policy, because we do policy to solve problems, and so it is just reasonable to measure those, the effectiveness of the policy after the fact. So I think we are agreeing that there should be some

kind of measurement of the effectiveness of the policy after a certain period of time or over time if that matters.

But the question here is who [inaudible] and also who defines those metrics or measurements that need to be taken, at what point, and who decides when to issue it. Right? And then also, I heard that not to limit the ability of the working group to issue additional—I'm going to call those interim reports besides the initial and final reports. If the working group feels that they need to open up public comments or issue an interim report, they don't see themselves limited to not doing that.

And I think Edmon's point talks about the first one. To set up a framework such that the working group defines a framework that the IRT can follow as far as metrics and measurements and impact analysis. I hope that's what I'm capturing here. And I see a comment in the chat. This has to do with—Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so Steve posted, I think it was paragraph nine of the operating procedures where it does talk about that it is the role of the PDP working group to carefully consider the budgetary impacts, implantability and/or feasibility of its proposed information requests and/or subsequent recommendations.

So I think that that needs to—so this paragraph, this boilerplate I guess, should be changed. And also, the manual does provide for additional potential deliverables if the working group so chooses. For example, it can have a draft final report, it could have a whole bunch of other things. So I think let's just make that discretion or discern in here what's mandatory versus what's at the working group's discretion.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. So I see Steve and Ariel. So let's do that, make clear that there are must-haves as far as deliverables, but there's also certain flexibility or latitude for the working group to decide if they so choose to do other interim reports.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, Dennis, sorry, one more comment I had. I don't think—maybe I'm wrong, but I don't think there's an EPDP manual. I know there's a PDP manual. I think maybe somebody just did a global replace. But I know that there's certainly a different annex that governs an EPDP, but I don't think it's a separate manual. Is that right, Steve, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Actually, there is a manual. I was just going to post that in the chat. It's annex 4 of the operating procedures, so it has some difference from the working group—from the PDP manual. Some of them are similar, but there are some highlighted differences in that annex. So we can take a closer look at it and see whether anything else needs to be included.

DENNIS TAN: But I think to Jeff's point, this is an annex from the PDP model.

ARIEL LIANG: No, sorry, it's an annex of the operating procedures, so the PDP manual is another annex of the operating procedures.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, so we're just tripping over any ... I think we should be fine. Jeff, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I'm just seeing this now, but I don't think ... Yeah, it's just a weird title, I guess, calling it the EPDP manual. I guess it is an annex to the PDP manual in general. But okay, because I think it does ... I'll take a look at it, but either way, thanks. We'll just move [inaudible].

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Yeah, so we know where the concern stems from. So yeah. We'll take a look. Okay, so that's deliverables, then we go to data and metrics, right?

Okay, so data and metrics, so as we went through the policy question—and I think we touched on this very briefly at the very beginning, within our first two meetings, that we were going to identify any items or data points that might be useful for the working group to know in advance or as they go through the policy questions so that they can be better informed as to what are the ... or the concerns that they need to be thinking about as far as the policy [consideration.]

For example, knowing whether within the existing TLDs, there are variants, if any, using the root zone LGR so that they can [inaudible] that they need to worry about grandfathering any items at this point or they just need to future proof the policy recommendation as far as next rounds or what have you.

So this is a short list, so I think we have time to go over those bullets here. So the first one is to—and I changed the language a little bit just to be clear as to what they need to use to determine what. So using the latest version of the root zone LGR determined the variant labels, if any, of two groups, all delegated gTLDs and group number two, all ICANN reserved TLDs. So they know what's the universe at hand at this point as far as existing TLDs and reserve TLDs and what they need to do with those. Right?

And that refers back to C4 and H1B as far as the questions in which they have relevance. The second bullet is using the latest version of the root zone LGR to determine the variant label of the 2012 new gTLD round and determine whether the list of calculated variants matches those that

were identified by the applicant. So remember the [item, we will discuss these self-identified variants out,] whether they have any legal standing in the whole process we recognize that were used in certain processes back then. I believe they don't have any legal standing now as far as legal rights of the registry operators to apply for those in any fashion, but anyways, a data point that may be useful for the working group to look at.

Maxim, I see your hand, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I wanted to say that I suggest removal of those red items for the following reasons. First of all, it will require an analysis of all working methods of all registrars for some unknown yet reason, and it seems to be a fishing expedition without any benefit.

Because what to do with [inaudible] is prescribed by ICANN, and when it's not prescribed up to ... The particular registrar or registry, what to do with their internal IDs. So I don't understand how it was added there, here or for what reason, but I do not think that this investigation adds anything but spending of time and money unnecessarily. Also, registrars do not have to answer your questions. If it's confidential or if it's too deep inside of their technical platforms. They just will not share and they have a right to do so. So I suggest we remove those red items.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. I have Ariel. Please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. I just want to give Maxim some context why we have these items is because we have charter questions that ask what will be the method for identifying the same [registrants by registrars,] whether [ROID] is an appropriate mechanism and if not, what else they can do to identify the same entity at the second level.

So as you see in the brackets, we have noted the chartering question item number. That's the origin of these points. And we're fully aware that these data points are not available right now and if we want to collect them, most likely, it will result in some kind of ad hoc survey among registrars, and definitely, there's no guarantee of responses from them. And if they do have responses, we don't know how big the responses would be, whether that would be statistically significant to derive some kind of conclusion. So that's why we have them highlighted in red and hopefully, that'll give you some context why we have these here.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Just short answer. Because some contracted parties do something, it doesn't mean that others will do the same, because they're not affiliated. So it's a bit questionable. Also, I remind you that the same registrant in different registrars' platforms, it's different technological records. And until you try to pull the passports or IDs of persons, you will never know that it's the same person or not just the persons with the same names. And there is no way, other than illegal way, to establish that it's the same person. So I'm not sure we have clear benefits of such [inaudible] expedition. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah, just want to quickly—because I think we are—so the reason they are in red is because we recognize—Steve, Ariel and I kind of went through those and yeah, we're on your side, Maxim, and Jeff's, [Edmon's,] that these are hard datapoints to find out. And if there are any out there, they're going to be really not meaningful because I don't think that we're going to get either the quality or the quantity of it.

So at the end of the day, I think we might want to highlight so that the working group might think about it, but it's not going to be ... I think we're leaving over to not going to be an official request

to try to get that information, because the information, there is low expectations that we're going to get quality information out of this. So I think hopefully, that makes more clear as to the direction we want to take.

But with that, Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I'm kind of on the fence on this whole section. We have a set of deliverables. I'm not sure why we, in drafting the charter, are telling the working group what data and metrics they need to collect. I think we can offer suggestions and say the charter drafting team felt that some of this information may be helpful, but at the end of the day, the working group should, on its own, determine what data and metrics it needs when it starts.

So why don't we just—if we have this section, we should not be saying that they should do this as soon as possible. We should be saying to them that if anything, staff and/or the charter drafting team thought this data might be helpful to determine or to answer some of the questions, but ultimately, it's the working group that decides for itself what data is needed or not needed. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Jeff, for actually bringing this point. So the reason why we have this section is because of PDP 3.0 improvement. Based on some other PDPs, the observation of the council is that some of the metrics and data were not clearly defined in the chartering process, and when the working group is deliberating the questions, they figure out they certainly need all this data and then they scramble to figure out what's the way to collect them and then send the request to the council to collect this data in the middle of the working group deliberation, and that could contribute to some kind of timeline extension and workplan change.

So due to these circumstances, PDP 3.0 has made the improvement to clarify what data metrics might be needed for the working group to effectively understand and deliberate on its charter questions. And sometimes it may be the case that ad hoc requests may need to be sent out for a third party to collect this data, and that can happen either at the inception of the working group or during the deliberation phase, but in any case, the charter should have some kind of guidance in terms of what data would be helpful for the working group deliberation. So that's why we have this wording in the charter. This is basically a revised version, and we can include what Jeff suggested, that these are not hard requirements but up to the working group to decide on. But at least we should have something for them as guidance. So just to provide some context here.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. So I have quite a queue here. We'll have Edmon, Jeff, and Maxim. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Based on what Ariel just said, I think it's probably good to include these suggestions—well, yeah, I think it's called suggestions. And probably have two lists. One is that we think at least you should consider this type of data, and the red ones would be something that the working group would need to think through whether they would want to get some data from it, understanding that that data may not be conclusive or exhaustive.

But I think the red parts are useful so that I guess both the working group and the staff has some expectations on what might be collected. So yeah, that's what I think based on what Ariel just said.

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

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So Ariel, you just reminded me too of something. Shouldn't we make the first deliverable actually a workplan in the deliverables section? I think you mentioned it, so I think we should have that as the first formal deliverable, is a workplan.

And then the second thing, I know that there's a checklist and criteria for evaluating the data gathering, but I did not remember—I know it's that we should make sure that the charter questions are clear and unambiguous, but I don't think that—I can't remember where in PDP 3.0 it said that the charter needs to set out the actual data that's needed.

So again, I think this should all be kind of suggestions if this is what the chartering team feels like, but it should be made clear that it's up to the working group to determine and then they have to, if they want to get this data or get any data, they have to fill out the right form and then the GNSO council will evaluate it under those guidelines. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think adding something about contacts and identification of contacts is really a toxic item, because it will have something to do with the personal information and identification of persons, which is not a good topic under GDPR. And if we don't want to have another overlap with the current—I don't know when it will end—EPDP, I suggest we remove it and shorten the sentence to what other items should be identified to do this and that, because without it, we will just make this PDP effort almost endless, because you will have the topic—currently unknown how to resolve topic of legal entity versus private person, and other items which are really toxic. Just try to check what's going on in EPDP 2A.

Effectively, it was supposed to be one EPDP, but currently, it's the third iteration, and we don't know when it will end. Thanks. So I suggest replacement of these items with what else should be

found to do this and that. Because if we do it right away, we will delay the delivery of this working group products, I think endlessly. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. I just want to answer Jeff's comment about the project plan. So that's in another section of the charter which is dedicated to project management, so we have all these project management related items listed here, so we can discuss those here and basically, these are all boilerplate content and I don't think the chartering team is primarily responsible for developing that, and it definitely can ask the working group to develop this, so we will have that covered here.

and then above the checklist, it's right here under these bullet points. So this only needs to be used when the working group for example decides to request budget from the council to conduct a data collection exercise enlisting help from a third party like a survey provider or something.

Then that's the occasion when this checklist needs to be used to figure out the requirements and budgetary kind of estimations and those things. So I think in this current context, it may not be actually needed, because we as staff don't think at this chartering phase there is a need for this third party to collect any of this data because the green ones are actually obtainable from ICANN Org's side, the red one as we discussed for a period of time already, it's not really obtainable and if we do so, it would be some kind of ad hoc survey, maybe doesn't even require a survey provider to do that. And then we heard from Maxim, he doesn't feel comfortable this needs to be asked, so probably, we need to figure out the way to either remove it or replace it with something generic.

So in short, I think the checklist is not really applicable in this case, unless the working group in the middle of deliberation decides to hire some survey provider, then they will need to check that. Hopefully that's helpful.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Okay, so we need to draw a line here, so I'll allow Jeff and then we need to close it out.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think if in the project management section, it's very kind of ... It's not really worded as a deliverable, it just kind of says the working group leadership shall use a standard set of project management work products. I think it should be clear that the council does expect a workplan from the group to evaluate that, because I know we have these dates in here as the first deliverable shall be or somewhere—sorry, I forgot where it is, but there's—oh, right below it. There's placeholder text which I never thought really is appropriate in a charter because it's really the working group that will deliver the work plan for the council to consider.

So anyway, that boilerplate section has always been kind of confusing to me. But we can go on.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. So I think we heard various good points. I think what I get is that we are fine describing some data points that might be useful for the working group—they don't have to use them, but it will help them be informed as they get into the policy conversation.

Now, I think the majority of the pushback is on the red ones, right? Because they were identified as this is going to be hard to find and even if we find some data points, they're going to not statistically relevant. So I think I'm leaning towards removing those in order to go on this conversation, because I believe, again, the next working group will pick it up, because as they are asked to find a method or what's the policy recommendation on how to enforce or how to implement the same entity at the second level, they will need to think about all those things that we have posed that question as well. So I think it will come back to them anyways.

Ok, so let's move on. I'm sorry, let me go through quickly the other green ones. I believe none are going to be controversial. So I think we went through the first two, then we got deviated. So the third one, data point to time needed [to create] an LGR script. Although I think we talk about this in the context because the TSG paper does have that data point there, but this is kind of a refresh. Then we go to the last three bullet points, number of registries that use the machine readable LGR format, 7940. I think that's a scan of the IANA repository [that I believe staff] can find rather reasonable with some low effort.

And the last two, I think they are the same. I don't know, Ariel, Steve, can you remind me the difference here? because when I read those, they use different words but I think they tend to have the same information, what are the [qualitative] breakdown of IDN trademarks in the TMCH. And I know that's public information to some extent, but don't recognize what's the difference between the two.

ARIEL LIANG: Now that you pointed it out, it seems it doesn't have a big difference. Maybe we can just consolidate these two bullet points into one. This seems a lot of similarities, yes.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, then I was not crazy, because I was reading those three times and I couldn't figure out what the difference was. Maxim, is that a new hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's a new hand. I think we have something which is more important here, is the question of is it possible to identify variants via the current design of TMCH? Because the answer most probably is going to be no, and it will read to potential new requirements for TMCH. And I think it should be a separate question.

DENNIS TAN: I'm sorry, Maxim, could you repeat? I was taking notes.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think that the current representation of some data in TMCH is not as important as the question if it's possible to establish the variants of the same string using TMCH in the current form. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, I don't know if I'm disagreeing with Maxim or not, but based on what Ariel was saying, I think probably something that would be useful for the working group is some data on not just statistics on the IDN but also if there is some statistics, let's say, based on the variant—like the LGRs, the reference LGRs, what might be the variants, that might be—if there are lots of those versus there's not a lot of them, that might be a useful data point for the working group.

It would be useful to add something in these three bullet points to include that, but I don't think it's critical. But I think it might be useful to add that it's not just the IDN but the variants of those IDNs in the trademark clearinghouse based on the reference tables.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Noted, Edmon. Thank you. So I'm doing some time check here. We need to get moving to the next session. I think we got the gist of it as far as the data points here.

so we now move to the next item of our agenda, which is the structure, the working group model. And so what we see here in the working group model is a recommendation from staff based on

the three types of models that we have. First is the representative, second one is the open model, and the third one is a combination of the former two.

[I see a] recommendation here [to achieve two objectives.] One is to have a good representation from the community as well as having participation from the wider community here, so having the representative and the open model combined, the third option should be the—or it's seen as the best option for this model, because on the one hand, if we choose for the representative model, you kind of limit the number of participants, and since IDN kind of [inaudible] there's interest in the community, then they will not be able to participate. But if you choose for the other side, the open model, then you might not have the right expertise and representation that you might need. So having the two combined might be the best option.

Perhaps we can—I'm not sure if that's useful or not, but open up the table in which we can see the three options there and what's the difference. While we wait for that, I have Maxim and then Jeff.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I support the idea of representative plus open model for the following reason. Yeah, for the same reasons, because we might need some experts who effectively do not participate much in GNSO life and on the other hand, yeah, they know what to do with IDN tables, etc., or maybe ...

And the representative part will allow us to have the part of community who know how to. It's going to work, I mean registries and registrars, and also, it will allow for participation of those who understand the legal side of things, adding the trademark owners. So I support this model too.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I'm with Maxim. I support this model. I want to make it clear that the only reason I'm supporting it is because it's also open. Like I would not support it if it just said representative. I think we need to make it clear that—for whatever reason, we've always been defaulting now to the pure representative, and I think this is a perfect example of something that can be open as well.

I also have an issue with the first sentence of that rationale in the second paragraph. I'd actually like that to be deleted. I agree with pointing out that there's experts or a limited number of people that are experts in it, but the council already passed the resolution that basically said there should not be any other dependencies, and this would sort of run contrary to what the council's already said in SubPro.

So I think that first sentence of the second paragraph that I've highlighted should go. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, I'm supportive of the representative plus open model, with one caveat, is that when the working group actually goes into the work, how do we consider quorum in terms of having meetings and going forward? My experience is that it's always, of course, good to have some representation and it's almost a must to me that it remains open, as Jeff has mentioned.

My only concern is that as we go along, there could be meetings where we just don't have enough people from all the representative groups, if you will, to have a meeting. And I'd hate for us to have to wait for that. So I think a representative plus open model is useful as long as we define a kind of quorum that doesn't hard require on the representative model.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Those are good points, and maybe—we've run out of time, so next meeting, we'll pick up from here and go over the questions. Or maybe if we can do it offline to answer the question about representation and how does that actually work operationally, from work session to work session, how quorum—I know the consensus call is for the representatives and not for the participants, but how does it work from an operational standpoint as working sessions go and what have you? I note there's already some formality around those, so that will be helpful to understand such that [we know what we're signing up for.]

So with that, [inaudible], so next meeting, we'll pick up from here, and we'll send a homework on the mailing list, so please look out for those. So with that, Any Other Business? All right, seeing none, thank you very much. Good conversation today. Thank you. We'll speak to you again next week. Have a good rest of the day. Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you for joining. This concludes today's call. You may now disconnect your line. Have a great rest of your days. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]