
**ICANN Transcription
IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group
Tuesday, 26 January 2021 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/kAJACQ>

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

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar/2021>

ANDREA GLANDON:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDN's EPDP Charter Drafting Team meeting being held on Tuesday, the 26th of January at 18:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Please note the Raise Hand option has been adjusted to the bottom toolbar reaction section. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I will turn it over to our chair, Dennis Tan. Please begin.

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.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone, to our fourth working group meeting here. So let's jump right in to the agenda today. So we are, one, Welcome and Review of Agenda, moving on to topic number two. So we are going to continue the discussion and hopefully finalize our [framework] how we are going to tackle the charter questions. I think we are getting closer. We shared the framework last week on Friday. I've seen Jeff's commenting on so we're going to start on that topic, then move on to discussing the charter questions under Subsection A. So we will continue looking at those. We started with I think a couple of questions where we are going to continue. There at the bottom of the meeting, we are going to look at a revised work plan just to reflect our progress and how that has affected the overall timeline. So I think we had to make some assumptions and adjustments based on where we are at this point in time. Okay. And then of course we're going to review our post meeting homework preview.

So I'd like to open a few seconds for Any Other Business that we want to tackle before the end of the meeting. Okay. Seeing no additions here, so let's go back to our item number two of the meeting, the framework. Okay. And thank you, Ariel.

So this is a copy of the e-mail that was sent on Friday. I'm trying to summarize our conversations about the assumptions, principles, and framework, how do we want to tackle the charter questions, the separation between the work on SubPro for future TLDs and the remaining work for existing TLDs.

So Jeff commented on one specific topic about the difference between "gap" and "no gap" as it relates to the body of knowledge that has been out there, the SubPro recommendations and TSG

paper and the staff paper. So how do we need to look at that relationship or overlap, if you will, in the context of future TLDs? Before jumping into that—yeah, I was going to ask for comments. Jeff, you are first in line, so please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. First of all, on the idea of a comment on the principles— with the principles, before we get to the gap stuff, I commented that I would rephrase the second bullet to, instead of the way it's worded, is to basically say, "The charter should include questions pertaining to whether the SubPro recommendations for future TLDs should be extended to existing gTLDs." I think it's a better way to phrase it because we're not looking at the impact of the recommendations on existing TLDs. We're trying to look at whether the recommendations should be or not extended to existing gTLDs.

And then the third bullet, I was not a fan at all of the principles, and that comes up when you're talking about the gap because I don't think we should be including questions where the recommendations are inconsistent with SubPro. But we'll get to that when we talk about the gap, so I'll stop there and see if there's comments.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Jeff. Two-part comment. I think I tend to agree with you about the wording on the—I think you were referring to bullet number two. Yeah. I think that's our intent, right, that the implementation, because of the way the timing of the two efforts, I

mean the policy implementation of SubPro as pertains to future TLDs—I'm sorry, the other way around, right? The policy or recommendations, the way that the variant TLD management framework is implemented for existing TLDs consistent work with what SubPro is going work in a way.

Jeff is just posting from this e-mail the wording that he's suggesting. So if you can react, you all can react to it. That will be helpful for us to close this item. I think it's okay from my opinion. I'm looking for any other reactions. It looks like there is no wild objection to it, so I think we can adopt that into our principles. Okay. Donna said, "Yes, it seems okay." So we got an explicit okay here.

So moving on to the second item Jeff raised. It's about the gap/no gap. Is that correct, Jeff? I think that's the more substantive comment from you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yes, but it also shows up in the principle. So the third principle should just be, "The charter should include questions pertaining to the TSG/staff paper recommendations that are not addressed by SubPro."

DENNIS TAN:

Right. Okay. Got it. Yeah, I understand. There's a relationship between those two and, yeah, the gap/no gap question extends from the principle. So the open question for the working group, how do we—as a framework, right? Again, the principle that we are looking at, we don't want to repeat the process. SubPro has

considered all the work. I'll turn to you in a minute, Ariel. Sorry, I lost my train of thought. So, Ariel, please go ahead and I'll just come back when I regain my thoughts.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis. Just for context for the third point in the principles. Perhaps it wasn't worded very precisely. So when we review the mapping documents, in fact there's only one recommendation that potentially include that inconsistency. That's the Recommendation 5 from TSG paper and the corresponding Implementation Guidance 23.5. So that's pertaining to when a new gTLD application is applied, but this particular string where the gTLD hasn't been incorporated into the RZ-LGR what should be done in terms of that situation. So for the TSG recommendation is to put such application on hold, and then for the SubPro recommendation is to process such application to the point of contracting. So that's the only one recommendation that potentially contain this inconsistency we're talking about, and then the rest of the recommendations do not have the inconsistency issue. It's more about sometimes the TSG where the staff paper provides recommendations that SubPro doesn't address or hasn't gone into sufficient detail to address them. So that's what Jeff was talking about the gap. So just for context, that hopefully provides some clarification.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Ariel. Jeff, you have been patiently waiting. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, no problem. To respond to that, so it's good to hear that there's only one, so I don't think it'll hurt then to change the definition of gap. Because I still believe that even if there were more than one, that one PDP should not be reviewing the work of another PDP like this, right? So the SubPro just made its recommendations after considering the TSG/ staff paper, and I don't think it's appropriate to now have a second group say, "Well, I think SubPro got it wrong." It's already been through a bottom-up policy process that already considered the TSG/staff paper. So I would delete the inconsistent language and just keep the gap meaning—I think I put it in my e-mail—but essentially where it's not addressed or where SubPro address something at a high level and it needs the details behind it, essentially. So I very strongly believe that that this PDP should not have language in here that it's going to readdress areas, even if it's just one area that's inconsistent.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Others? Perhaps it's going to be a matter of how we phrase the questions in there. Since it's just one area, one topic, I think we can have this and look at how specifically we're going to address those questions. Donna, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: I'm in two minds about this, but I think your suggestion, Dennis, maybe we leave this as it is and let's get into the charter questions, and then come back and review. Because I do kind of think for completeness, it would be helpful if we had something

that spoke to the inconsistencies. And even if it's to say that given that the SubPro in their deliberations considered the TSG/staff paper recommendations, we think the SubPro recommendations should stand as they are. So I think I agree with you, Dennis. We can just hold this for now and see how the charter questions come out.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Can I jump in, Dennis?

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Jump in quickly, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: I completely disagree because as a principle—first of all, the SubPro talks in the report, it talks in its rationale about why it's different. I mean that's already been done by SubPro. Think about the principle of ICANN staff being able to draft a document that a PDP occurs afterwards, the PDP disagrees with the document, and then ICANN staff could then require in a future PDP that it be revisited just because they didn't like that the first PDP didn't take their recommendation. I think as a principle, it should never say something like the charter should include questions pertaining to the recommendations that are inconsistent. That, as a principle, should be eliminated. If there's one item that we want to ask a

question about, fine, we can ask it, but that doesn't need to be a principle and it doesn't need to be in the framework. It's just an added question. But I disagree with the question to begin with.

I don't know. Think about this with the EPDP, right? If ICANN staff had drafted something a year before the EPDP, the EPDP comes along on WHOIS, comes up with policy recommendations that dismiss the ICANN document, but now in a subsequent PDP before it's implemented, ICANN staff want a revisit? That's not bottom-up policy. To me, as a principle, that's inconsistent.

DENNIS TAN:

Donna, your hand is up. And perhaps just for the time, we will draw a line here. Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. Just for my understanding, I suppose, why was this originally considered? When the work was done to develop the document that we're looking at now—I guess I'm trying to say, why are we in this mess? I think it has something to do with the Board resolution but I'm not 100% sure. Are we here because of a timing issue, that there was a Board resolution, things were put on hold, we could move forward? SubPro did its work, took into account the TSG/staff paper? I just want to understand why we're in this mess. I don't necessarily disagree with Jeff but there are circumstances where policy can be overridden by another policy process. But I think perhaps we're in this mess because of a timing issue and I just like to understand whether my thinking on that is correct.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. I don't think I have an answer for you. It might be the timing issue, but I'm not sure. I don't speak to it. Jeff is chatting.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think we are in this mess for a couple reasons. One is because the Board passed a resolution asking the community—[SGs and the Cs]—to consider the TSG paper, and then the GNSO Council put it on hold. While that was going on, it was like three quarters of the way through the SubPro process where we had already been considering a lot of the items from the TSG paper and came out with our recommendations. So with this particular item, the one item that's in question, SubPro had a lengthy discussion on what to do with an application during this process. And it found again that the TSG had an issue with their terminology and that the TSG didn't really consider the entire process when it was making its recommendations, whereas SubPro actually went in and said, "Okay, well, even if we have this one issue, there's no reason why we can't do contentions to that resolution or do these other things, and as long as there's a warning and a risk known to the applicant." So this is squarely an item where SubPro had conversations, put it out for comment, accepted comments, and came up with the final recommendation, and now that's passed by a consensus. So this is an example where it just wouldn't be appropriate. Unless the Board came back and said, "You know what, I don't like the SubPro recommendation, go back and make it more like TSG." At that point, that's when we would have jurisdiction over it again. But unless and until that happens, it's just a really bad precedent.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Donna, real quick.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes. Sorry, Dennis. I know you want to keep moving. But maybe one way to do to deal with this is that the charter question is really about the timing issue, I think, and giving deference to the SubPro work. And that perhaps can explain away the inconsistency. So I still think let's just put a pin in this and come back to it. I'm probably mostly in agreement with Jeff. I think this is just a wording issue and we need to overcome that, that timing and the other stuff that's around this. But I think we can come up with a principle here that does address that concern or the original problem. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Yeah, let's park this issue. We know it's one topic, one specific question, so when we come to that, we're going to look at it very hard through the lenses that we discussed today. But I think the framework help us get to the 99%, if you will, of the charter question. It's just that one question that we'll come and revisit and look very hard at it based on the discussion today.

Okay. There's still a pending item here. Let's move on to the charter questions. So, Ariel, if you will. Thank you very much. Okay. So that's a7, that's where we left last time.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I just want to clarify that a3, we're also putting a pin on this for now because it's related to one of the framework questions, whether SubPro recommendations for future gTLDs should be extended to existing ones. So this is asking about the existing implementations. So we also haven't really had a conclusion for a3. That's where we are.

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, shouldn't a3 then just take out the word "future"?

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry, Dennis, if you're speaking, you may be on mute. And Steve has his hand up.

DENNIS TAN: Sure. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I was just going to respond in the absence, I think, in your muting, Dennis. I was just going to say that if this is following the principles that we just discussed—and perhaps it's just applying that principle here and it's more about just saying that—the SubPro recommendations should be consistent or extended, whatever the wording is precisely to the existing TLDs, and maybe that's how this can actually get squared away. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: I think that's the intention, that the SubPro Implementation Review Team conclusions or mechanisms and apology is applied to the existing TLDs. And when there's a gap, meaning SubPro did not address or discuss any of the items, that's where the IDN EPDP IRT will address that gap in the implementation, just because it's a matter of scope.

Jeff: "I thought we finished a7." Didn't we?

JEFF NEUMAN: I thought we had agreed, but maybe it was Edmon that might have had an issue. I thought we agreed that because, in the future, we're not going to ask for—

DENNIS TAN: Oh yeah, yeah. Yeah, I remember, Jeff. This is not a matter of future. It's a matter of really existing TLDs, how we treat those TLDs today that when they apply for their TLDs, they identify variant labels. So how the Root Zone LGR now, if adopted, as now the sole source to validate TLDs and variant labels, how does that affect the self-identified variants from the previous round? So yeah, it's not future forward-looking, it's more the current base of TLDs today. So I think that's why we kept it here, but it needs to be constrained to the existing base of TLDs.

Anyone has a different recollection? I'm looking at the hands or chat. No? Okay. So let's move on to a8.

So let's see here. This is when the Root Zone LGR does not certify whoever is applying to it or there's a disagreement for

invalid labels. And here, basically, what we are deferring to is for future TLDs is the SubPro process of whatever objection there is to an application, however that process to address those contentions or objections are work in the future. Can you highlight the exact question, Ariel, please, for the working group? Yeah.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I agree with your comments that this should be way shorter. We're almost going into the arguments as opposed to asking the question, and not that it's not helpful background and it probably should be provided to the group as background, but in the charter itself, I think all we need to do is ask the question. SubPro does recommend a challenged process or recommends having challenged processes and it can be extended. So shouldn't the question just be, what should grounds of a challenge be and basically filling in the chart from SubPro, which it's got a chart that says who can bring the action and where it's brought and what the remedy is. So, essentially, it's just pretty short.

DENNIS TAN:

Right. Since this has to do with implementation, let's quickly go back to the framework and look at what the framework we're talking about deals with implementation here as far as implementation questions. This is a situation where it's no gap, right?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Well, it's sort of a gap in the sense that there's no criteria for the challenge. So if there's no gap in the sense of having a challenged

process. The gap is the criteria for the challenges, who's the decider, and what the remedy is. That's the gap.

DENNIS TAN: Right. I think you're driving me to ask you—so you're suggesting we not fully defer to the SubPro IRT, but in this working group propose or suggest some questions as far as what the SubPro IRT or IDN EPDP IRT need to look at, as far as this type of use case or objection?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think it's what is the grounds for an applicant to successfully challenge the evaluation result? That's where the gap is, the mechanics of how it's done. That's SubPro IRT. You got to tell the SubPro IRT that we think that the challenge should be based on the evaluator got it wrong or the evaluator didn't consider this. Whatever that information is, that's what this group needs to provide, but not the how.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. I think we're getting closer. Thank you. I think it's Steve or Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Thanks, Steve. I think what Jeff initially was commenting is about the extent of context in the charter question that's related to the fourth point in the framework, how much context we really need for each charter question, and there were four options

provided. So I think what Jeff was suggesting is that we probably do option three, is to include a summarized version of it instead of word-by-word excerpts from the relevant document paper to include in the question. So I just want to confirm if that's the correct understanding, and if so, we can make that adjustment for other charter questions to shorten the contextual language to make it more concise. So I think that's the main comments that we heard from Jeff previously.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I think, though, for something like this, the only thing you need to summarize is—so instead of going, like TSG says this and SubPro says this, since they were in agreement, you could say in a short way, both SubPro and previously TSG recommended there be a challenged process in cases where applicants believe the LGR table—whatever. You guys can work better, but it could be like one sentence instead of any of that context, and it can combine the SubPro and TSG stuff because they are in agreement.

DENNIS TAN:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. Yes. As far as addressing questions, concerns, or observations about how long do we want the context of each policy or charter questions that we want in the document, yeah, we kind of put these together, options one to four. I mean, one and four are kind of the extremes, so we don't want option four, for sure. Option one seems like also a discard. So it's between two and three. And I think what I'm hearing is that we're leaning towards three, a rather short, very short, succinct

summary of the context, and then the charter question. So I think that's where we are now.

Okay. So going back to—relating to the implementation question related to this specific item on the charter a8, just to recap what Jeff suggested about the gap/no gap, which is kind of a dual situation here, right? So gap in terms of the grounds to object or challenge an application or decision by the Root Zone LGR, but there is no gap about the mechanics of how that challenge or objection need to be processed and worked through the evaluation process. So I think I tend to agree with him. I like to hear from others. And that's how this EPDP can frame the question as far as when it comes to objections to that Root Zone LGR, being the sole source, authoritative source to validate, and if an applicant, whether future or existing do not agree with the Root Zone LGR, what are the grounds by which they can submit an objection or claim or what have you. But for future TLDs, of course, the mechanics of such process is going to be dealt by SubPro IRT, and for existing TLDs, somebody has to think about a process and potentially consistent with what SubPro will come up with or different things. So are we in the right path here as to what we want to ask in the charter questions? Again, there is no gap as far as the mechanics that's basically going to rely on SubPro, but about what are the grounds that an applicant can base their objections to the Root Zone LGR can be. Yes. Jeff is suggesting the actual wording of his idea.

Any observations, comments? So, I think we can copy that and paste there in the documents so that we can look quickly capture it. There you go. I think that's going to be helpful because there's

at least another case in which there is another use case about objections to the Root Zone LGR.

Okay. So I think we nailed that one. Maybe not so fast. Donna, I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Maybe not so fast, Dennis. I have a little bit of a problem with the language in order to file a successful challenge. There's an assumption there that if you provide certain information that the challenge will be successful, and I don't think that's an assumption that we should make. There should be some kind of criteria developed that the evaluators base their decisions on, so I think that that assumption that if you provide this information, your challenge will be successful, is not correct.

DENNIS TAN:

That's helpful, Donna. Yes. I think that's fair. Thank you. Okay. Any other thoughts before moving on to the next item? Okay. And Jeff agrees. There you go. All right, so let's move on to a10.

So you notice we are missing some numbers, but I think that's just a product of us editing and changing to make sense of the document. All right. This is the implementation question. And implementation question is the—I think based on our framework, we can quickly decide whether the question here is appropriate or not.

JEFF NEUMAN: This is the inconsistent one.

DENNIS TAN: Is it? Yeah. If it is then we just park it. Okay. Yeah, so let's park this one because we need to come back with a more thoughtful—yeah. Thank you. All right.

So a10 then we move on to a11 then. Okay. So this is one that has a gap. It has to do with the question about the number of variant domain names. And this is the part that we're going to get a little bit techie, and so bear with me. Just quick context. Variant labels can be allocatable or blocked, meaning allocatable have a potential path to delegation, and those that are determined blocked by the Root Zone LGR do not have a path to delegation. They're just forever and ever until the Root Zone LGR says otherwise are going to be reserved or blocked from registration from any party. So nobody, no one gets that name allocated such that it can be activated later at one point in time.

Okay. So we're talking right now here those variant labels that are determined or tagged as allocatable, meaning that they have a potential path to delegation because they're deemed valid to some extent. So we're talking about those, not the blocked ones, but just the allocatable ones. So it so happens that because of the variant calculation is basically a mathematical algorithm, permutation transaction, if you will, you can end up with several hundreds or maybe thousands, in some cases, of variant labels calculated based on a single label. And so the problem that is causing here is the permutation. Imagine you have several variant TLDs, and then under the second level you have others, several variant labels.

That permutation just along one level is large. Imagine if you compound two levels of the root zone, the top level and the second level, and then you have an explosion of variant labels. Of course, we're talking about top-level domain names here, but you just need to extrapolate a little bit in terms to understand the gravity of the situation.

So the policy question, how we get around this—I think the question goes to whether it makes sense or not, is it advisable or not, to put a limit to those allocatable labels that can be activated in the root zone? So that's basically the gist of the issue here and how SSAC in their document SAC060 advises the number of variant labels activated and need to be as small as possible.

I think there is a proposed language here. I think some of you have already commented to it so there is a version of it that—let's see if that's good enough or not. I see hands. Jeff's hand is up. Please, Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Now, does the SSAC—I have to read it again. But if there's a rule, the same entity rule and even the same backend provider rule, the SSAC concerns still ... In other words, is there some dependency on that same operator rule, same entity rule?

DENNIS TAN:

Yeah, good question, Jeff. I need to review SSAC paper myself, but I think, yes, the underlying assumption on their recommendation is that there is one entity managing all the variant—domain names. And we're talking about the second level,

right, that everything goes to the same registrant and registrar. And even then, there is a potential for problems. But I see Sarmad's hand up so maybe he can keep us honest here, and then I have Edmon. Sarmad, go ahead.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you, Dennis. When SSAC talks about this, they are talking about a single registrant, so I think inherently there is that potential, I think, understanding that they are all going to the same entity. But even with that, if there are hundreds or tens of such labels—not labels but domain names—it may be actually hard for one entity to manage all those, so [inaudible] to contain it. Thank you.

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

EDMON CHUNG: I put my hand up not specifically on this issue. I'm just reading this part again. So the first sentence, "Should there be a ceiling value to the number of allocatable TLD labels?" Is that supposed to be allocated TLD labels? Because allocatable TLD labels are calculated from the Root Zone LGR. Did I get it correct? Maybe it's just a minor change. If that's not the case then we might have to talk about it a little further.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. I think you're right. I think I put this language. Yes, I think we agree, Edmon. Just the way it came out, it may be not clear enough. I think it's the value number of allocatable TLD labels that may be permitted to be delegated, so it's the whole set. Again, going back to the distinction between which labels have a path to delegation are the ones that are allocatable. So we'll work the wording. But yes, I hear what you're saying and you are right. It talks about the numbers that can be activated based on these allocatable labels, but yeah.

Edmon, is that a new hand? You mentioned you had another—okay. All right. Just looking at the traffic on the chat box. Yeah. The question is, [what is] small? Small can be zero or one. That's a possibility. Yeah, Jeff, I see your hand.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, just thinking ahead. That's likely one that's going to have to go back to the SSAC because it's really poorly worded. "As small as possible"—what does that even mean? Here you have registry operators that may want for whatever reason to allocate variant strings or have variant strings allocated to them. Anyway, yeah, I think we're on the same page, but this is one we might want to flag as knowing that there's going to have to be some coordination on this one back.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. Again, just strictly to the letter possible, it's one or zero. Yeah, I can see how many registry operators would like to have, for example, I know in the case of Arabic, there are ways that you

can have three or maybe four because of the notion or concept that they have in their [LGR] about international reachability. If you put a limit to—an arbitrary limit, what does that number look like?

I'm not sure about going back to the SSAC question or what the process would be like, but maybe what the working group needs to think about is the considerations that the policy needs to suggest or recommend consideration for registry operators whenever they need to come up with a number. I don't see strong feelings about this one or that we are getting closer, so let's note the questions about the context about SAC comment as the number as small as possible.

Donna says—yeah, exactly. That's where most likely the ccNSO are going to be. I'm just guessing here, but I think they are most likely to be more interested in discussing about the number.

Okay. So let's come back to this one. I think there's no objection. It's more of, what does SSAC understand? Just thinking off the top of my head, Ariel, Steve—of course, I think we have the ability to ask SSAC for clarification, but is it something that we should do now at this point in time? So that to inform our working group how to move forward on this one. Yeah, Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

I can't raise my hand. But I think Edmon also mentioned in the chat and I think also consistent with staff's understanding is when the future EPDP working group deliberates on this charter question, they can inquire SSAC for further details.

Of course, the first paragraph, the context is abbreviated version from SSAC's paper and there's much more detail in the actual SAC060, and there's also another Appendix C in the staff paper that talks about this particular topic. So there are a lot more context for the future working group to digest. And then in that way, when it's a good timing for the working group to work on this question, they could pass inquiry down the road. But I think for this drafting team, the main task is to make sure the question itself is warranted clearly. So that's our opinion.

DENNIS TAN:

Okay. All good. Just going back to the chat box into some of the comments here about coordination with the ccNSO work. I think pretty much everything we need to make consistent. ccNSO and GNSO are expected to make consistency policy recommendations. So I'm not sure you know, but I was appointed by the GNSO Council as a liaison to the ccNSO PDP 4, and I was already a member of the working group so this is kind of just added responsibility to flag all these coordinating items that we need to pay attention to and just flag those to the ccNSO whenever the time comes. So, yes.

Time check here. Three minutes to the top of the hour. So let's draw a line here on the charter because I want us to look at our revised work plan. Based on the progress, when we kind of had a preliminary work plan, we said we were going to adjust this work plan based on the progress that we made, if we go quicker, we go quicker, and if not, we need to adjust. So based on current progress and projections as to how we're going to take on the work in the following weeks, we need to adjust this. Unfortunately,

we needed to extend the working group meetings for a few more weeks, again, because of the way we are progressing and the expectations of what we're going to cover in each of the following weeks.

I think Ariel put the link to the work plan here. Yeah. I agree with you, Jeff. I think I'm hopeful that now that we are getting closer as to define how we're going to tackle 99% of the work. Yeah, we're going to move fast and maybe we can beat the clock here. Donna, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Dennis. Also I can suggest is—I mean I can be available to do this call at this time for 90 minutes as opposed to 60 minutes, so maybe that's something worth considering as well.

DENNIS TAN:

That's actually not a bad suggestion. Personally, I wouldn't mind extending 30 minutes. I do still have the time available. So what do others think? I feel for Edmon maybe. Go ahead, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG:

It can be a little bit tough for me. But if that's required then I guess that's fine.

DENNIS TAN:

Let's not decide that for now because, yeah, I know the toll that's going to put on you guys. So let's see how our pace progresses and hopefully it improves based on—now we're kind of running a

closely tight agreement as to how we are going to go with each of the items. So let's see how that goes and make a decision in two weeks' time when we are kind of in solid ground as we move.

That's another good suggestion, Donna. Yes, maybe we could start 30 minutes earlier. Okay. So let's have that question here and revisit in two weeks' time if we need to increase our meeting time here. But for now, let's keep it as is. Hopefully, again, we'll run picking up the pace as we progress here. So with that—I just don't want to lose anything on the agenda.

ARIEL LIANG:

Sorry, Dennis, if I may interject quickly. I just want to confirm with the drafting team. One of the plan is to cancel the ICANN70 week meeting because our meeting time falls within the main schedule time and it potentially conflicts with the other stakeholder groups' meeting, constituencies' meeting, etc. So we just want to let the drafting team know that's the plan, but if there's any objections, we can revisit this. But we want to have a confirmation today if that's okay.

DENNIS TAN:

Right. I think we lost the majority of our working group here. I think I'm fine with having it, yeah. Edmon agrees. Okay. Sure.

All right. With that, I think we can close the meeting.

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

DENNIS TAN: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]