EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group

Tuesday, 06 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/7ICUCQ

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

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team call on Tuesday, 6th of April, 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 multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With that, I'll hand it over to Dennis Chang. 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.

EN

DENNIS CHANG:	Thank you, Nathalie. Welcome, everyone. So let's recap from our last session that was prior to a good break, I think. So we were discussing membership structure, right? And we saw different alternatives as far as to solve for representation on one hand, being efficient on the other hand, and also accountability and sharing the load. So we ended up putting all the different alternatives. And those are in documents so maybe let's go with that. Yeah. I think the agenda is the usual structure so we don't need to do the agenda spot in there.

So let's jump right to the document—thank you—and look at the options. I think one of the qualifications that we need to make, or at least a reminder, is the different roles that we have. So we discussed also members, alternates, and participants. So let's start with the easy one. Participant is just those people participating in their own personal capacity, not representing any group, unlike, for example, members and alternates.

So members and alternates are people representing each of the groups. So they are appointed by their groups—the Registries Stakeholder Group, Registrars, IPC, what have you—all of those groups. The difference between a member and an alternate, based on the manual, is that members are the ones that carry the responsibility to make representations about their positions from the group. And alternates are the ones that, in absence of a member, they step up to fill that role, if need be.

So again, going back to what we're solving for—efficiency, representation, sharing the load, accountability. So we ended up with three options here. Let's scroll down a little bit. So option a is one of representative model. We're solving here for the

EN

representation part of the equation. I think we all agree that we want it open to allow for participants to join the working group. But we are solving for the representation model here.

So what's the right balance here, as far as asking for each of these groups to send someone to represent them? So we know don't want at least a number of representatives but up to. So not putting a minimum but putting a maximum.

I see Jeff's comment here, "Wouldn't a better way to define an alternate as a participant that is available to become a member at any point at time where the member is unavailable?" I think that's a possibility, Jeff. Just I think the working group, or charter, or anywhere, there needs to be a process or at least explaining how a participant can become a member. And I think there is something in the—

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, in the revision.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So but what's not in the revision, it just says that alternates are encouraged to participate but they're kind of in limbo. They have no designation if the member is in-place. So that's why I'm saying you should basically say that an alternate is a participant unless and until, wherever you have it in there, that the member is

EN

not available. So I think it's important to say that they … Yeah. Otherwise, they're encouraged to participate. They're basically participants that step up to member if and when their member is not available. It's a different way to say but I think I'd give them a label while they're participants.

DENNIS CHANG: I think, yeah. From a participant standpoint, yes. The only difference, this designation of participant is this alternate is appointed by the group. He's not doing in his personal capacity. So yes. I think what you just described—how their behavior during a working group session is that they are participating. But it's not up to them to carry the weight of the group they are representing if the member is present. And they step up only when the member is not available. Right. Okay. Yep. So what you're saying is just to make it clear what is the expectation of the alternate there, right?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. I mean, a working group technically is comprised of members, participants, observers, and liaisons. The alternate is just some sort of asterisk. It's a participant that's appointed by an SO/AC to step into the place of the member if the member is unavailable.

DENNIS CHANG: Mm-hmm. I have a hand from Maxim. Please go ahead.

EN

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think it's better to call It something like "representatives of constituency" to avoid the situation where we have a person who is being an alternate to some member is hopping in and out. And, for example, one week, he or she has to say something. Next week, no. So the representative, no matter who he or she is, just speaks on behalf of the constituency is my thinking. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Maxim. I think I didn't quite get it. So yes. So the members speak on behalf of the group they are representing. What was your exact concern? You are painting the scenario of more than one member and they kind of alternate in different working group sessions. And they keep shifting their positions? Is that what you were describing?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Something like that. For example, I represent some constituency. I'm available. But next week, no. And Jeff, for example, replaces— takes the seat for the constituency. And week after, we change. So if it happens too often, it will cause some confusion—or might cause some confusion. It was my thinking.

DENNIS CHANG: Right. I think I have clear the scenario. But can we control that, though? If we are, for example, asking for up to two members, we don't want to limit one member because things happen in life. And if a member is not available and then there's no—he's not available, then the whole group misses out. Whereas with two members, at least they can share the load. But yeah. What you

EN

are describing is very possible. But I think it's going to be up to the group and the chair—the leadership—to call out whether there is conflicting messages between members of one single group. I think that will solve for.

But I have a queue here and activity in the chat. So Maxim, is that a new hand or old hand? If it's a new hand, please go ahead, Maxim. Oh. It's an old hand. So, Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I put another way in the chat. I think a better way to say it—this way, we don't have to control the number of alternates that someone has. They have a certain number of members. Alternates are basically … You could say, "An SO/AC may designate one or more participants to serve as alternate," or, "an alternate," or, "alternates" for the member, if the member is not available. This way, you don't have to have a whole separate class of people called alternates. They are basically participants. And they are participants that have designated as an alternate if the member is not available.

It's kind of like what we have in most stakeholder groups. You have participants from stakeholder groups in your—let's say Registries Stakeholder Group. You have one voting member and then you have alternates that may—or not alternates. You have other participants that may step up to the voting member if the member's not at a meeting. This way, we're not creating another ambiguous class of participants called alternates. We have members, participants, and observers. That's it.

And then, you could say that the SO/AC may designate one or more persons to serve as an alternate if a member is unavailable. I think that's just easier than having this whole paragraph. Because otherwise, then you need to say the same things. Then, you're just repeating that participants are encouraged to have a level of expertise. You don't have to say that about alternates, ICANN policies/procedures. You just basically get rid of that whole paragraph and just say, at then end of the participant section, that an SO/AC may appoint one or more alternates, in the case where a member is unavailable.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Jeff. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Also, I think we need to underline that the representatives are not just the individuals who are in the initial pool. We need to have a sentence allowing the constituency to replace someone to avoid a situation which the Registry Constituency with one of their reviews, where the person appointed basically left the industry and we were not allowed to replace with someone else because it's the representative, not the particular person, in reality. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you. Okay. So we need to make a decision here. So we need to solve for … Okay. I'm sorry, Maxim. Is that an old hand? Just wanted to … Okay. That's okay, Maxim. Thank you.

So I think we are dropping the member/alternate thing. It's up to each group. If they want to really have a say in the consensus policy making, they will put enough people, up to the limit that it's set up in the charter, to really work on their behalf. So it's their responsibility and prerogative to put the right membership there—the right people there.

Okay. While I'm putting together my thoughts, Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Again, we are making this so much more complicated and bureaucratic than it needs to be. Every participant should always be at every meeting or encouraged to be at every meeting because participants can derail conversations if they only step in and out every month or two and rehash old arguments. So I just think we're making to so complicated with having these labels, which just aren't necessary. You have people that participate. In fact, members are participants except for the consensus designation. We should just have, really …

Like I said, we're making this way too bureaucratic and—what's the word I'm looking for?—prescriptive. Every person that participates in a working group should be encouraged and respected to be there, on the mailing list, following everything, and be at every call so that discussions don't get derailed. I don't see the difference between a member, a participant, or an alternate in the everyday working group call. It's only when you have a consensus designation that you're required to have members vote

EN

or express the view of the SO/AC. Other than that, we are just really getting way too bureaucratic.

And I don't agree with what Ariel just put into there, that participants don't have to sign a statement of interest. Of course they do. Everyone does, except for an observer. I don't know why or where that designation came from. This is just weird to me.

DENNIS CHANG: So let's clarify that. So yeah. It might be that this whole PDP 3.0 is … So if that's the case, then ... I know there is some flexibility around the requirements or guidance from PDP 3.0. But if that's something that needs to happen for the statement of participation—statement of interest. Okay.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. We should be making it easier for people to participant in working groups, not much more difficult by having statement of interest, versus a statement of participation. Come on. That just doesn't make sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, but these working groups are going to affect consensus policy and contracts. So there needs to be some threshold, right?

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. Members need, when they have a consensus designation, the members, yes. You care about who they are and a working

EN

group chair should balance the views or should be taking that into consideration when doing a consensus designation.

When you have a normal, ordinary, everyday, 99% of your meetings are regular working group meetings, then everyone should have the same statement of interest/participation—whatever you want to call it—that's required of every other person that participates in the discussions so that everyone else knows where that person who is in the discussion—where their interests lie. This whole thing about members and participants during an actual working group call, just to me, doesn't make sense.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay I have a queue building up here. Maxim and then Ariel is asking for a minute. Maxim, please go head.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Since we are talking about partial participation model, it's obligation of SO/ACs to sent someone because in real life, not all persons will be available 100 percent of time because we all happen to move somewhere, etc. So it's my thinking.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Maxim. And Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. So I probably need to help clarify what the statement of participation is. It's not the statement of interest. It's this particular statement on page 37. It basically has all these

EN

requirements for members, such as commitment to regularly attend the meetings, and act in accordance with the Expected Standards of Behavior, and things like that. And that's an explicit PDP 3.0 product. That is additional requirement for members to commit to. And the working group leadership and the Council leadership will be able to enforce that if there is noncompliance of any of these requirements above.

And then, for participants, there is no such hard requirement they have to commit to this. And that's different from statement of interest that showcases where their affiliations are. It's two totally different things.

JEFF NEUMAN: Ariel, thanks for that. In this case, "member" is lowercase. It's not meant to be the "formal member" that we define above. If you participate in a call, or on the email list, or anywhere else, you should be required to sign this statement of participation because you need to basically say … It wouldn't make sense if participants do not certify that they will treat all members of the working group with civility. That just doesn't make sense.

So I think, in this, case members are the lowercase "member" of just someone that is belonging to a group, not a formal member that participates in or that is counted for the consensus designation. Otherwise, it just wouldn't make sense. Are we saying that participants are not expected to act in accordance with the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior? Yes.

EN

DENNIS CHANG:	Is this the case? Is it a lower "member" or an uppercase "member," just to clarify?
ARIEL LIANG:	To my understanding, when this was developed, it's for the uppercase "Member" to sign and then one of the requirements is that they regularly attend meetings and send apologies if they are not able to attend. And then, for participant, it's kind of soft requirement in terms of that. And also, this requirement is to facilitate the case when the alternate has to step in so they know. When a member is not available, they can attend a meeting in their place. So that's why we have that.
DENNIS CHANG:	Why wouldn't it be called a statement of membership, then? Because wouldn't a participant sign a statement of participation? Everything on this form, with the exception of that one highlighted sentence applies to anyone who in on any working group call. I think this statement of participation was only drafted for the representative model. I think Maxim is right when he puts that in the chat.
	A statement of participation is different for a hybrid model where you have members, participants, and observers. Everything else has to be agreed upon by anyone. I can't join this drafting team call and start harassing you guys. You can and should kick me off if I did. So like I said, I think the PDP 3.0 documents are very flexible. They are not rigid. In other words, they're malleable.

EN

So if we were to say that this statement of participation applies to every participant, and then we would say members sign an additional sentence in there, or an alternate or whatever, that's fine. I don't think the GNSO would say, "Oh. Sorry, guys." Steve's got his hand up.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Oh, Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Dennis, if you wanted to add something first, that's fine, too.

DENNIS CHANG: No. What I was going to say is we need to draw a line—make a decision as to how we move forward because doing time check, we have 30 minutes in. And we have 30 minutes on this session and I think four more meetings to really wrap this charter up. So with that, Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Dennis. I was actually going to make a similar suggestion to what Jeff said, for the statement of participation in particular. It does seem reasonable that this would be something that all—I'm trying to think of the right words—the folks that are taking part in the working group would agree to, with additional responsibilities that are—these specific sentences about the members and alternates. Those would be additional requirements for the

EN

members alternates. I'm saying "alternates" because, again, that is the staff suggestion. We're clearly disagreeing on this.

But the rationale, from the staff side—I think Ariel would agree—is that … And I've said in the chat a couple times. It creates a level of accountability and responsibility that is not necessarily there for participants who, while agreed, Jeff, they are encouraged to participate the entire way through the process, there is not that expectation, necessarily, for participants versus an alternate who is expected to keep up and be able to step in at any time.

And so that, to us, is the fundamental difference, is that there's that expectation throughout the process that they will remain engaged the entire time. And it's great to expect that they will participate and hope that they will but it's a lot different when you set up that expectation.

So, I guess lastly, I'd just say that if this group determines that they want to pursue the other model, without alternates, that's your prerogative. But it's the staff's suggestion that the alternate structure be there. With that, I'll stop. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Steve. Okay. So, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So what I'm saying is that I think of this in terms of math logic. If all participants are encouraged to remain engaged and up-to-speed, and SOs and ACs are to pick a participant to serve as

EN

an alternate in the event that the member is not there, then by definition, alternates are encouraged to remain engaged.

I don't like the idea of putting labels on people when they are participating in the everyday discussions within a working group. You're almost creating second-class citizens, whereas if we just say you have participants within a working group for 99% of your calls. Then, when it comes time to do a consensus designation, you have designated members that participate in the consensus designation. If I member is unavailable for whatever reason, the SO/AC may appoint a participant to serve in that member's place.

This way, when it comes to numbers, you're not saying that an SO/AC may only have one alternate. They can have five people that are up and ready, in the case that a member's not available. And then, you just need a note from the chair or the SO/AC, saying who the member is for that meeting.

Like I said, I think we're just making this so rigid and bureaucratic. You have members, participants, and then you have certain participants that are designated as alternates for purposes where members aren't there. This way, basically everyone's signing a statement of participant. Everyone is basically the same for every meeting except for the official consensus designations. Regardless of what we say … We could say you're encouraged or you're not encouraged. A person's going to participate when they're going to participate, not because of what we say.

Thank you, Jeff. Okay. So, let's put something in writing here soon. So we have three options on the table right now. So maybe we can streamline these options a bit so we can hone in into

EN

what's closer to what we're trying to suggest here. Jeff, I'm sorry. Is that a new hand or old? I can't remember.

JEFF NEUMAN: I was going to try to rewrite that one part for alternates, right? All you have to do for that sentence, when you go back to alternate is you just say, "an SO/AC may designate one or more participants to serve as an 'alternate.'" And then, you have the next sentence, "In the event that a member's not available during a working group meeting or consensus designation process, his or her alternate will replace the appointing …" and represent whatever—that one sentence. Then, everything after that can be eliminated, right?

So you start with a sentence that says, "An alternate is a participant." Or no. Sorry. You would say how I said it before, which is "an SO/AC may appoint one or more alternates, in the even that a member is not available." It just gets rid of everything else. If you want me to write it, I'll put in there as a recommendation. I won't cross anything out. I'll just write it.

DENNIS CHANG: All right. That's probably helpful, Jeff. Thank you. And just to add to that so it's clear here, the reason being that alternates are what you described. I'm trying to paraphrase here. The alternates are only active or activated, if you will, in cases where there's a consensus call and a member is not available—what you were describing, right? The role alternate does not mean anything during a normal working group discussion because everybody has

EN

equal say, if you will, during working group deliberations. Is that …?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. All right. So, Jeff, I think that's an old hand, right?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: So Steve, I think your hand's up.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Dennis. I think the members and alternates would also be expected to represent the views of their respective SO/AC/SG/C throughout the deliberations of the group. So there is a function for them as well, throughout deliberations, not during only consensus call.

I did have a question for Jeff on his suggested approach. And that is if you have the appointing structure appoint members—I guess, assign one of their participants as the alternate to assume the membership role—does that, then, involve the leadership structure of the SO/AC every time a member is unavailable? And does that actually make it potentially more complicated? Because

EN

if you have a sitting alternate known throughout the process, then it's sort of an enclosed process. You have a pool of alternates to then sit as the member where needed. And as described, it's not only during the consensus call. It's potentially throughout the entire process. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Steve. So when the SO/AC appoints its member, they should designate who the alternates are. So we should say that they appoint at least one. So they would say that Steve is the member. And in the event Steve's not there, Jeff will serve in Steve's place, at the beginning so you know there's a hierarchy. If they say, "These two people can serve. So if Steve's not there, Jeff can speak. If both Steve and Jeff aren't there, then Dennis can speak."

STEVE CHAN: Sorry. I think we're on the same page, then.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah.

STEVE CHAN: I don't know where the difference is then because what you just said is exactly what I think we're suggesting on this paper.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: No. You're just not having a separate class. It's the messaging in what you're saying. You're not labeling it. And alternate should be active participants in the group. So here. Let me rewrite a paragraph. Or let me suggest a paragraph and then you guys can look at it and say yes, or no, or whatever.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let's do that. Let's see. That still does not solve for—

JEFF NEUMAN: We can move on, then. Yeah. I was going to say we can move on to the number of members and stuff, just while I draft this in the background.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Because that really underpins how we're going to structure, whether it's only members, members and alternates. So let's put a pin in there, come back to really nail down and clarify what we want to do with the alternates or not. So what's next? Membership criteria?

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry. This is Ariel. I think we still haven't decided on the exact numbers yet—the option a, b, c that's on the screen. So should we talk about that first?

EN

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. That's a good idea, Ariel. Thank you. All right. So I think on this one, we know we don't want to say "at least" because groups may just not want to participate so they don't have to put someone just because the charter says so. But we do want to limit the number of membership so that that group is not so big and inefficient, to some extent. So I think we'd all agree that we should put a limit on that, as to how many. But what's that limit?

So in option a, we have for practical terms, two. Here was suggested one member, one alternate, there we're trying to figure out whether that's the roles that we want to put in the charter. But basically, two people from a group. On the next one, it's two plus two in option b. And in option c, it's just up to two people, which depending on how we land on the member and alternate situation, basically option a and c look the same.

So really, here is to decide how many people do want up to, that have the level of capital M "Member" that we want to put. And I think one does not cut it because then it's difficult to fill up whenever that only one member is not available. So do we agree that at least … Or I'm sorry. You want to be able for a group to nominate up to two people? Was that a three? Number three?

JEFF NEUMAN: I kind of like Donna's comment there.

DENNIS CHANG: Which says two plus one alternate. So a group could nominate up to three people, basically, for the working group under [this participation model].

JEFF NEUMAN: But actually, again, if we go back to what I was saying, then all we have to designate is the number of members. It's totally up to the SO/AC if it wants to designate other participants as alternates. Again, that's why I think we're making it too complicated by having this second … All we have to say is that each group may appoint up to two members, let's say. And then we follow it with the statement that I said. An SO/AC, at its discretion, may appoint one or more participants to serve as an alternate in the case where a member is unavailable during a working group meeting or consensus designation.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Jeff. So I think we are honing into two members because the alternate participant to alternate situation, that's going to be clarified because that role has a specific role to play whenever a member is not available. But here, we really want what the groups—how many people they can appoint to the working group. I think we are leaning towards two people here. The alternate participants—alternate situation—that can be solved for later, based on what Jeff is going to propose. But they'll just become active whenever the member is not available.

So I think we're leaning towards up to two members for each group. Is that what I'm hearing and we are agreeing here? So just to make this … Option a is no. And either it's going to be, now, option b or c. Let's not talk about options. We're just agreeing that up to two Members, with capital M—up to two Members for each group.

EN

And, Tomslin, "In the event that a group has no alternate, does that mean they can't have someone representing the member who's absent?" So yeah. Thank you, Tomslin. So yeah. We were discussing the roles or how do you feel the gap or whenever a member—any of the two members, right. You can have up to two members. But let's say a group only appointed one member and that member—that only member—is not available in the case of a consensus call.

So what we are trying to solve for here is whether to have an official alternate role, who needs to have some level of responsibility to participate in all the working group calls and they need to be up-to-date as to the discussion or the alternate scenario where a participant is promoted—a participant that is participating on its personal capacity is promoted by a specific group to the role of alternate and step up whenever a member is not available. So to summarize simply, a group will have the means to put someone, in the case a member is not available. But they will have to find someone that they will appoint to whenever that consensus call needs to be made.

We are discussing here whether we want to make it in the charter—whether we make an official or more clear the different roles, alternate or participant that can be promoted to an alternate position. So we're trying to make that distinction yet. And I see a hand here. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we might need to add something like, in extraordinary circumstances where none of the members and alternatives for

EN

the particular SO/AC is available, the corresponding SO/AC has the right to replace one of the members, given the prior written approval—something like that. Thanks. So we don't have a situation where, for example, a group has three persons. They all—I don't know—participate in something offline and cannot be online at that particular meeting. And we have a consensus call. And to avoid situation where the information from SO/AC is lost because of this. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Maxim, for the question. I think Ariel is responding that that is included in the draft charter. Okay. So going back to the number of members. So do we agree, up to two members for this group? What is pending is to resolve the alternate situation—whether we have an official alternate position or it's a participant to alternate promotion type of a scenario. But let's agree on a number for Members with capital M.

Maxim says two plus one, like Donna was suggesting on b. Jeff, two members. Again, we're pending what's going to be the alternate situation. Okay. So at least we have an agreement on capital M member, two. Maxim, is that a new hand? Do you want to comment? Okay. No. That's was an old hand. All right. So I think we agree on two members, again, pending the alternate situation. How do we solve for that? But up to two members for each group.

All right. Steve, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

EN

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Dennis. I'm wondering if we're just getting caught in semantics. I'm wondering, Ariel, if you can scroll to the alternate description. I think we're not really that far apart here, as I think Jeff actually agreed, too. So that last sentence here … Maybe it's not. Yeah. It's actually the last sentence. So it talks about appointing the alternate. And it says that those alternates can be amongst the pool of participants of their respective group. And I think that's actually what Jeff is suggesting. I'm not sure.

JEFF NEUMAN: Kind of. I'm paring it down. I think what I've tried to do … So if you scroll up a little bit, you should have a statement saying, "All participants …" And if there's a better word than "participate …" "All persons participating in the working group are expected to abide by the statement of participation, which is enforceable by the working group leadership and GNSO Council leadership team." So I think you can cross out the first sentence of "members."

And then, in "alternates," it's just … If you scroll down to my comment, the only thing you need to say there is that one. "An SO/AC, at its discretion may appoint one or more participants to serve as alternates in the case where a member is unavailable during a working group meeting or a consensus designation. Alternates may be called on to provide the official position of the appointing organization, if a member is not available." That's it. And then you can delete the rest of that paragraph because they're just participants, otherwise. Yeah.

EN

And then, I haven't gone through the "participants" paragraph yet but … Okay. There is nothing about the statement of interest there. Yeah. So sorry. Steve's got his hand raised.

STEVE CHAN: It's actually an old hand. But since you just mentioned that, I'm wondering if you could switch the "at its discretion" something a little stronger, like at least a "should." The way that it's formulated now, it's more like a "must." And "at its discretion" makes it completely voluntary. So maybe a suggestion to adjust the "discretion" part of it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. That's fine. Can I edit my own comment? I think I can. Yeah. All right.

DENNIS CHANG: I think you can. Yeah. Okay. So I think we're getting closer to that point. So going back to number, we are on two members and then we'll solve for the alternate situation. What is left on this structure section? Is it the criteria? Next is the criteria for membership. And what we have here is participants and working group members. And just to clarify, Ariel, please help me here. We are talking about members overall, right? Not just the capital M members but everyone participating in the working group needs to have some level of expertise per these bullet points that we have here.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: Dennis, actually this is a capital M member because if you see, the leading sentence before the bullet point is "Members must possess these criteria." But then, alternates and participants are encouraged t possess. So there is a distinction.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So I'm just putting a capital M there. All right. And one thing to note here, collectively, the group needs to have these skills and knowledge. It's not just that every single member has to have all these skills because that would be very difficult to achieve. So I think we have five minutes. We can go quickly through these. I'm trying to see if it makes sense or not. I think mostly I've read through these and I think they do make sense.

So I think the first ones are customized for this IDNs EPDP. And of course, they are related to skillsets on IDNs, and the Root Zone LGR, and any other processes/procedures related to IDNs and variants. So technical knowledge of IDNs related to the SubPro recommendations, Root Zone LGR, the staff report, SSAC advice, and so on—so basically, all the papers that have been written on this regard.

Next bullet point, ICANN policies and procedures that relate to IDNs from the 2012 new gTLD program because there are a lot of parallels on those. And again, SubPro building or changing some of those processes—for example the string similarity review process and how variants now are not self-identified but calculated from the Root Zone LGR and so on.

EN

Third bullet point, technical knowledge of registry/registrar service on domain name lifecycle because we discussed that on transfers, and updates, and all of that in order to preserve the same entity principle. And I think the rest is basically knowledge of all the consensus policy—GNSO policy development processes. I think this is just boilerplate language here. Is there anything here that you see that is objectionable? Looking here for any hands. Okay. So I don't see any wild objections here so I think we can leave with this.

We have three more minutes. And Maxim, on the chat, "Writing skills." Oh. We're asking for writing skills? Oh yeah. Minimum, you have to, in order to articulate your ideas in email. I think you are commenting. You want to have some writing skills there, just to make sure you convey your ideas clearly.

So next, section b, is joining of new members after project launch. I think this is boilerplate language again. I believe here, what we want is that the members, of course, they need to go through their own groups to be appointed soon. I think that's what is reflected here. So I don't see any objections. And I'm mindful of time, since we only have one minute left. So we are going to stop here today.

What else do we have to continue for next week's meeting? I think the most important part here, it's section c, expert contributors. I think that's up to the working group to decide whether they need specific expertise within their working group definition.

So the next section is leadership structure. Thank you, Maxim. Thank you. Goodbye. So we are going to work on that leadership structure and then leadership criteria. And more boilerplate

EN

language as far as the responsibilities and expectations from the working group chair. So that's one we're going to review. Please do read that offline so that we can discuss that during next week. Again, most if it is boilerplate language. But let's discuss that, nevertheless, and also our pending discussion on alternates. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I've got to drop, too. But I was just going to ask staff to give us the examples from the Transfer PDP that was just done of how the chairs select all those areas that say instructions for our team. If you could give us the example of the Transfer PDP, since that's the most recent one, that would be great.

DENNIS CHANG: All right. I think Ariel and Steve heard that. So yep. We'll do that. All right. I'm sorry, Steve. Was that …?

JEFF NEUMAN: It was Jeff. I've got to drop. I'm late for another call. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, yeah. Sure. No. Thank you. Yeah. We're going to wrap up now. So thank you. We'll continue offline and we'll reconnect next week. Thank you and goodbye. Have a good rest of the day.

EN

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, everyone. This concludes today's call. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]