ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team

Tuesday, 30 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/6ICUCQ

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 and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team call on Tuesday, 30th of March, 2021. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room only. This call is being recorded to 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 Tan Tanaka. 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 TAN: Thank you, Nathalie. And good morning, again, everyone. So I hope you enjoyed our little break, although we still have some work to do with ICANN 70 and all that. So let's go to our agenda first that we have in front of us. So we are going to continue our review of the charter. We will resume on membership structure and look at other items as well. And as usual, we're going to review our homework for next week and then we'll open up for any other business. But at this point, I would like to ask if anyone wants to flag anything for any other business so that we don't forget when we get there.

Okay. Seeing none, let's jump right into our drafting team. So we resume on membership structure. I think just as a recap, with the working group model, I think we honed in in the representative plus open model, which brings best of both worlds, I would say-- gets the minimum representation from the different constituencies but at the same time, opens up the participation from the community at large, so that those that are interested in the IDN work, they can participate in it.

But now, we're moving on to specifics about the structure of that membership. So let's go. I think this should be straightforward because I think we are meant to look at what are the different roles here for members, alternates, participants, and observers and the liaisons from the ccNSO and then, knowing that, decide what the number of representatives for each group that this group proposes or recommends to have in the next working group.

So, Ariel, let me tap on you. How do we want to do this? Do we want to go line-by-line, as to the members? So do you have a

EN

short version that can explain what is the role, rights, and obligations for each of these different characters here?

ARIEL LIANG: Dennis, I'm happy to provide a quick introduction. And I see Jeff has his hand up. But I just want to note that the paragraphs and bullet points under the role description is standard language and that is extracted from the PDP 3.0 improvement document regarding the working group model. So it's not a lot of customization, in terms of their general description.

Just one point is about the participants. The PDP 3.0 improvement is asking the chartering team, basically, to consider whether to set an upper limit for participants, if we're going to use this representative plus open model. So that's something I think the drafting team can discuss.

And a second customization here is the ccNSO liaison. And I think we already know there will be a ccNSO liaison to the EPDP. And I'm wondering whether we should specify whether this liaison will be part of the ccNSO membership or needs to be a separate person. So, that's why I have highlighted the last bullet point right here.

And then, of course, the membership structure table down below is a staff proposal that we start—three members for each of the SGs, and Cs, and SO/AC groups, with the exception to ASO. But definitely up to discussion for the drafting team to decide what number would make sense. So I'll stop here.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel, for that brief explanation. So, Jeff, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. So a couple things. Number one is if we have a hybrid model, then I'm not sure we need any more than one member and one alternate from each of the groups because really, the only role for the member will be, at the end of the day, to be there to measure consensus, right? So I think the one member will have the responsibility of representing the view of the stakeholder group, constituency, whatever. I don't think we need three and three. That just doesn't make sense to me in this hybrid-type model.

And, at the end of the day, I think we need to try a PDP with no upper limit. I think that before we artificially start putting limits on sizes of working groups without any data, since we've never done a hybrid before, I think we put no limit so we can learn from it but also because I don't think, in reality, there's going to be a huge influx of people for an IDN EPDP that's this technical. And of course, the Council can always … If things are going down a bad path, the Council can always revise that at any point in time. So my thinking is one member, one alternate, and no upper limit. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I'm seeing, Edmon, on chat, supports the one plus one, meaning one member, one alternate, and no limit seems to make sense. Maxim, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: From the point of mathematics, having one granted seat and one alternative and no upper limit for outsiders, we will make a situation where we have—for example, you have 30 persons and only seven of those persons have something to do with the GNSO, ccNSO. And other 22 persons are just wandering around and it's not reasonable. Basically, it means that a lot of time will be devoted to ideas and what persons from outside say when they, in reality, do not represent groups.

So I think we should focus on some reasonable amount of—reasonable number, like 30, or like 25 or something, because in situation where you say, "Okay. Registries have one vote—yes, and one alternative. But if you say that you're representing car makers, you can have seven," it's going to be quite unbalanced.

If you do not say that all those persons have to choose their representative and all of those have to agree somehow, we will have unbalanced approach, where the registries—small registries, large registries, those who have IDNs, those who do not have—are represented by one person. It's even worse for registrars because their models are way different than registries use. So, for them, having one is a big downside, most probably. We should talk to them.

And yeah. So I think, first of all, we shouldn't limit it to one because one is basically … Yeah. It makes hard to represent all varieties, I'd say. And the upper limit should be some reasonable number. But in reality, I don't think that we will have more than 20. But thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Dennis, you may be on mute if you're talking.

DENNIS TAN: Yes. Sorry. Thank you, Jeff. Thank you, Maxim. So let me just recap to see what are the options that we have here so we can keep the conversation forward. So, on one hand, we have the one plus one, meaning just one member and one alternate, right? Maxim, I think what you are suggesting is that one is the minimum but an upper limit might be higher than one, just to make sure that, depending on what group is being represented, they have more representation. Is that …? And I think Edmon is, on chat, also suggesting not limiting to one, at least one. So that's different, right?

                      So on one hand, we have minimum of one for each of these groups that are listed, that we see on-screen—if we can scroll up a little bit—because we have all groups from Registries Stakeholder Group, all the way to RSSAC. No, no. Yeah. There you go. Thank you. So on one hand, we're saying, for all these groups, one representative and no more than one—that's the option—one member and one alternate. On the other hand, we have the option, at least one. But then, the question is do we put an upper limit or not?

                      And we're just talking about members. Let's try to just focus, now, the conversation on members only. And the difference between members and participants, the members are the ones that will have the right for consensus call. The participants, they

EN

participate. They can come into the calls, express their opinions. But as far as consensus, their opinions will not matter. It's just from the members and the alternates, if that's the case.

So I have a queue here. So let's go with Donna, and then Edmon, and then Jeff.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. Can you hear me okay?

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, Donna. Go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Great. So I kind of understand Maxim's point about an upper limit. But, Dennis, I'm a little bit more interested in what you said about the consensus call is only for members, not for participants. So if this is a truly open hybrid model, then why doesn't every person that's participating in this working group be entitled to be part of the consensus call? I don't understand, if this is an open model, why there is a distinction between a member and a participant. So can we have a bit of a discussion around that? 'Cause I think that's really important, as to who has the right to be involved in the consensus call.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. And that's a very good question. I'm hoping I was right. I think I'm right. That comes from the PDP manual— PDP 3.0—as far as the roles and responsibility of each of the

EN

roles? And I think, Ariel, you raised your hand to explain that. If that's the case, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. And thanks, Donna, for bringing this question. Indeed, that's the difference between representative plus open model to the open model itself. So open model, yes. All the members … Basically, they don't have the concept of participant. So they just have members and observers.

So all the members in the open model, they're welcome to participate in the consensus designation process. But in the hybrid model, because we do have the representative and distinction from the participant, the only representatives will be participating in the consensus designation because the participants, they could participate in the deliberation, contribute to the input, but they won't be able to carry weight in terms of decision making. So that's exactly the distinction. We're not using an open model here and that's why only the members, they can participate in the consensus call and not the participants.

And then, when you go down to the charter content, you will see there will be a detailed description about the criteria for the members and also the expectations for the participants. So the members, they will have more hard requirements, in terms of knowledge, and skills, and experience.

But for participants, they're encouraged to have such knowledge, skills, experience. It's not a hard requirement. So that could make sense that only representatives that have the knowledge and

understanding of IDN subjects should be able to make decisions, not the participants that they may be involved due to interest or they want to learn a subject. So hopefully, that helps explain a bit of the difference.

DONNA AUSTIN: Dennis, can I follow up?

DENNIS TAN: Sure.

DONNA AUSTIN: So, with that being the case … I wasn't opposed to Jeff's suggestion of one member plus participants. But if it is the case that consensus call is only for the members, then my preference is probably to try to have at least two members from each group because I think that the burden on just one will be enormous but will be significant for a PDP like this. And I'm thinking of this from the Registry perspective in particular, that is somebody has to follow this all the way through as a member—and I appreciate there's an alternate.

But I think it's going to be really helpful that the Registries, that there's at least two members on this group, then I think that becomes more important because of that distinction between a member and a participant in the consensus calls. So my preference is to have more than one as a member from the groups. Thanks.

EN

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I think we are developing something. So I have Edmon and Jeff on the queue. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. So I might have completely misunderstood the concept. But if you ask me the ideal structure, I would say at least one member from each to make sure that there is participation. And when we do call for consensus, we try our best to get some feedback from each of the groups. But then, not to limit the member at all. There can be 10 members from one group and five members from another group and I think that's fine. And the general consensus call should go to everyone.

With a topic like IDN, which is somewhat specialized, I think that that might make sense. But I don't know whether—at least my ideal scenario would be there would be at least one participant and one alternate from each of those groups to make sure that we have a reasonable participation from each of the stakeholders and then just leave the entire group open.

Maybe the working group concept has gone beyond this but at least the working group concept for GNSO has always been that it should be an open membership, participation, and all that. I know we can make it different. But I think for this particular topic, it should make sense that way. But given that, we should have some participation from this.

And I know this is an outdated model but if you look back at the joint IDN group and the JIG, for GNSO, ccNSO, we actually

adopted that kind of model, where the membership is open. But when we tried to have a consensus call, we at least make sure that the GNSO, ccNSO, ALAC, GAC, SSAC has responded before we call for consensus. And I think that model might be most open and accommodate the things that we want to do. So while I don't know whether this would work with the new PDP format, I think that at least I'll put that forward as an ideal format for us.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Good point there. I have Jeff and then Ariel.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. So yeah. I want to state, for the record—I think I did the last time, too—that my preference is always for a completely open model. So that would always be my first choice. But it was my understanding that that model has not gotten so much favor from the Council lately.

So yeah. My first choice would be, Edmon, completely in line with you. But to the extent that they want to do a hybrid model where someone is on record, representing the official stakeholder group, constituency positions or SO positions, that's why I came up with the one plus one because you at least have one person representing the official view so that you're not … Like you said, you did this in the JIG group anyway, to make sure that you had their official position.

I also don't like the fact that we're giving people titles in this group to make them feel like they're more important than everybody else

EN

or that their vote doesn't—or that their views—I shouldn't say vote. Their views don't count. So that's why I wanted to limit the number of members and alternates as much as we can so that the other people in the group feel just as important in participating.

Then, when we get down to the number of alternates, because we have participants and at any point in time, any participant could be elevated by the group if a member drops out. We have participants in the group so they can be elevated to member, or alternate, or whatever. We don't really need many, if any, alternates. So, that's my view. Again, first choice would always be open. But second choice is a hybrid where the number of members are significantly limited so we don't feel like we're making them feel more important than everybody else. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Just wanted to react on your last point. In practical terms, I think I agree. If a member or alternate are not able to keep participating in the working group, somebody ideally will have to step up to represent and fill that gap—that void. But I believe … I read through the charter and I think we are getting some boilerplate language as far as how that actually works or what's the process or what's the expectations of somebody replacing a member or alternate.

So while, in reality, that could happen, we need to make sure that they really see that when a person is selected as a member, they see that they have the expectations that they will have to start and finish the work—that they cannot drop at any time because somebody will pick up the responsibility later on. So then, you

EN

start watering down the responsibilities, and the engagement, and so on and so forth. So just to raise that flag there.

Okay. So I'm going to keep on the queue. So Ariel and then Donna.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. And perhaps staff can provide just a quick overview why we have this PDP 3.0 improvement on alternative working group models. And I just pulled out this document explaining the origin of this improvement. So you will see the bullet point down here. So basically, when the GNSO has employed the open model, it did observe some challenges with regard to timeline.

If you have participated in the webinar on PDP on 3.0, you probably recall there was a comparison between some of the PDP working groups against the EPDP on Temp Specs. And the working group model itself isn't the only factor that makes EPDP finish so much faster than the others. But it could be one of the contributing factors, that having an open model may extend the deliberation and discussion and we'll not be able to have a speedy completion of the working group process. So, timeline could be one of the parts impacted—the working group's speed. And then, one of the [inaudible] of this working group model alternative for consideration.

And also, expertise because in the introduction of this model, what we wrote is the IDN subject is quite technical so it may not be necessarily widely known among the community. So maybe each

EN

group will only have limited number of people who actually have the expertise to contribute and deliberate effectively. So having a representative model, perhaps, will help limit the number of people making decisions and help facilitate the deliberation.

So due to these different factors, that's why we have an alternative model to the open model now. And hopefully, that is still something this drafting team can consider, beyond the open model. So staff just wants to add that. And welcome, Steve, if I missed anything important, if you'd like to add onto this.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel, for that background. I get Donna, and then Steve, and then Jeff.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Dennis. And thanks, Ariel, for the background. I think we need to keep in mind here that this is a little bit of a specialized topic. Jeff, I don't know, during SubPro how many people you actually had actively engaged in that IDN stuff. So it'd be interesting to hear how many people were directly engaged in that part of SubPro and also, Dennis, work that was undertaken prior to getting to this chartering phase. So I don't know that this PDP working group, even if it was a purely open model, is going to run into that problem where you have enormous numbers. I really think this topic is niche enough that we're not going to have that problem.

But what we do need is people that have the expertise. And that might be a little bit harder to come by than just making sure we

EN

have the right—trying to work out what the best composition is in terms of members.

The other thing I want to understand is if we have members, alternates, and participants, can alternates participate in the PDP working group on the same level that a participant can? And the reason I ask that is because we don't … It's a challenge for an alternate, if they really want to be involved in the discussion but they can't, if they're only there to sit in the wings for a member. So, I think that's an important consideration here, if we've got somebody who actually has the expertise in this topic but can't contribute on a regular basis because they're simply identified as an alternate rather than a member or a participant. So that's something else I'd like to understand, too.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Ariel, Steve, Jeff, and Edmon. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. Sorry I think it was an old hand. But just to quickly answer Donna's questions, the alternates will only participate if a member is non available but they will be responsible for keeping up with all the relevant working group deliberation to ensure they remain informed and contribute when needed. And they are also required to have a similar level of expertise as members.

So that's a model that was what we used in the EPDP on Temp Specs. And I haven't heard, from staff side, any negativity or

EN

negative experience from that alternate yet. And I did see that carried out in action. So we're just following what they have used in terms of alternate and what they require for alternate. Hopefully that answered Donna's question.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Ariel, I appreciate what you're saying but I don't think it's reasonable to compare what this PDP is going to cover compared to what the Temp Spec did. And I think we have to recognize that there's two very different subject matters and that different people will … We're not comparing apples and apples. So we really need to appreciate that this IDN topic is really narrow and it's not going to have that same breadth of wanting to be involved. And I think that's my concern with setting this up—looking at the Temp Spec to draw parallels—because I don't think that's going to be the case here. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. I have Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Dennis. So taking into account Ariel's answer and Donna's comment, I think there is potentially a logic breakdown there for the limitation on the participation of the alternate, when you actually have a participant model as well. So I think that might warrant a little bit of discussion on that one aspect.

But why I actually raised my hand earlier was just supplement what Ariel had mentioned about the trend towards this model of

EN

more limited participation. And it was not rooted, necessarily, only in experiences from those open models but rather some more general analysis of group dynamics not necessarily specific to ICANN. And what the Council saw—and it was the basis for this trend that you're seeing is … I think the term was actually social loafing.

So the larger group that you have, the less engaged some of the members might seem to be because there's a larger group and pool of folks that appear to be able to do the work. But when you see that large of a group, you're less likely to engage and less likely to commit to actually doing the work. I'm paraphrasing horribly, probably. But that was essentially the reason for—at least one of the driving forces, at least—in moving towards a more limited model.

So it was in part because of the experiences that they saw from the PDPs but it was also the more general analysis that they conducted and reviewed. So I just wanted to bring up some of that history as well. I think Maxim and Donna would probably recall from their time on Council. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Steve. I have Jeff, Edmon, and then I'll put myself on the queue.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. So I appreciate that, Steve. One of the things you know I made the point of many, many, many, many times was that the group making a decision on all of these things was so small

EN

and didn't go out to the community for their participation. So I have never been a huge supporter of PDP 3.0 and the way that it was done.

But that said, if you do look at improvement number two of PDP 3.0, it does say that none of this is the "bible." I basically says, "However, elements of different models can be modified and/or mixed/matched as deemed appropriate." So none of these descriptions are sacrosanct. Every one of them can be changed if the Council wants to. And if it's our recommendation that an alternate be a participant, we can do that. There's nothing that says we can't.

And I don't think we need to stick to these exact words. If we think this is crap and it makes no sense to have an alternate when you have participants—or, I should say, it makes no sense to have an alternate not be a participant—then we can absolutely change that. That's what this hybrid was supposed to be. So I don't think we need to be bound by any of this, as to what it says.

And let's remember that we've never done an official hybrid group yet. This has never been done. So if we think it's wrong and we want to try something different, then let's do it. And then, we can get some data, rather than making assumptions. I still am of the belief that it's not the size of the group—that it's the charter, and it's the dynamics, and frankly, it's the leadership that can impact the length of time that a PDP takes. And we'll never know until we actually try it out.

So let's stop making assumptions. Let's go with the model that we feel is best. And if we want alternates to be participants, we can

EN

recommend that. It's up to the council to ultimately decide whether to go with our recommendation or not. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. And thank you. You actually answered the question I had. In practical terms, do we want to select one of the models or can we do something different? And I think you answered my question, that we can select certain elements as to how we think this working group would work more efficiently.

So instead of us going back and forth as far as what's the membership or not, or who is the alternate, or participant, or what have you, let's focus on what we're trying to solve for here. And we'll talk a little bit of that. But I want us to really focus on the problem that we want to solve and then think about what are the options, as far as how we structure the working group.

So let me just say this. I think we want to solve for expertise availability. And as you've seen in the charter, it's not just expertise on IDNs but also on processes, ranging from string similarity, to RPMs, UDRP, EBERO, you name it—so how these new requirements, as far as same entity principle, how does that effect in the different procedures, processes, and policies that are up there. So the expertise is not just the technical aspects of IDNs and how they come about, how they are created, calculated, what have you, but also the implications of the other processes in our consensus policies and contracts.

And the other thing that occurred is we want to solve for efficiency. We want the working group to be as efficient as possible. So I

think those are the two things that I've heard. And I really want us to talk about what are we solving for? And then, we look at the elements that will solve for those problems. So hopefully, that will help us frame our conversation in a better way so that we can get out of this call with a more clear path as to what we want to do.

So with that, let me … Jeff, is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay. Thank you. So I have Edmon and then Maxim.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Building on, Dennis, what you said, and also Jeff, I took a quick glance at the language and I picked up the same thing. I think we can go either way. One member plus one alternate who's also equal participant. Or if it's easier for it's easier for everyone, we can just say there's two members and no alternates and just make it that way. And when you call for consensus, any voice from that stakeholder group would do.

I know I'm repeating myself but I still think I haven't heard anything that's against the model whereby, instead of a maximum membership, we have a minimum membership. If we can craft a structure, whereby we have a minimum participation of one member and one alternate or two members—however you want to put it—that would just still work. I understand the motivation and the concepts behind why we want limitation and encourage—on one side, encourage participation. On the other side, balance input into consensus.

But as many people have said, this is a very specific topic. Maybe what we can do is set a new trend and make it more participatory,

EN

and start with this group and set an example. I think we could take a little bit of risk and try to do an interesting thing, which is to create a hybrid model, whereby it's a minimum model rather than a maximum model—a minimum model for participation and then leave it open as a hybrid. So that would allow us to take in as much expertise from the community as possible. So I know I'm repeating myself but I'm putting it out. If people agree with it, we could try to craft it that way.

I do have one question, though. If we go about this either way, how do we define quorum? Or is that part of the charter or is that something else altogether? That does concern me, if we go about it in any way, shape, or form this direction. If every call, we need all the members to participate, then of course we have a much bigger problem. So I don't know whether the quorum has any role to play in that.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Sorry. I was hunting for my mute button. Thank you, Edmon. Good point. I have Maxim, Jeff, and then Steve. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I'd like to support the suggestion of Donna, that since the alternatives are effectively the persons who have the right to replace the appointees from constituency in terms of some kind of voting, or polling, or whatever we do to measure consensus. Not limiting them in participation is good because limited participation came from the EPDP idea, where it's only a representative model

EN

and there was not time to discuss with all persons, just to save on time. And I don't think we should put this harsh restriction on alternatives here.

But speaking about the number of persons who participate, from one hand, we most probably will need persons with understanding of IDNs in Chinese language, in Arabic languages, etc. It means few technical persons, not necessarily from GNSO community, most probably more from ccNSO community. But not sure.

And from the other hand, if we have 30 persons bringing really bright ideas, those at least have to be heard. And the more persons you have, the more time you spend even to formally check if the ideas are compatible with what's required on the particular step of the work.

So thus, I would like to support Donna in that we don't need to restrict alternatives from participation. And second, that some reasonable limits should be set. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Yeah. I think it's Edmon, then Jeff, and then Steve. Or, Edmon, was that an old hand?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Sorry. It was an old hand but I did want to put my hand back up again. So I'll lower it and put it in again.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you, Edmon. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. I was just going to … A couple things. One is the quorum. I put it in the chat but I don't think quorum's a huge issue because it's always been left to the leadership team and generally … And I would love to see this written into some sort of, at least, informal procedures. But generally, decisions are not made on one call. Usually, leadership does a call where things are discussed, and then there's time on the mailing list, and then you have a second call so that hopefully, you don't have a small number of people making decisions for the entire group. So I know that's not necessarily documented anywhere, I don't think. But generally, that hasn't been a problem.

I also want to respond on the number of members because, Edmon, you put in the chat three plus one is fine, too. I don't like giving people elevated statuses in a group because it makes everyone else feel less important. And we don't want to send that message. So if it's one or two people that can represent the official view or views of a stakeholder group, then we should do that. Having more than that, I think, just sends a message that you, as members, are much more important than the participants. And then, you'll see participants drop substantially.

I also don't like the minimum because, again, you could then see 20 Registries and one IPC, let's say, and then the IPC argues that there's a perception of the Contracted Parties making all the decisions. And I don't necessarily agree with that, especially if you have leadership that can cut through all of that. But I think perceptions are still important. So I think if we have membership included, we need to set a maximum, give everyone the same

EN

number, but also make that as low as possible to not give them an elevated status.

And finally, I haven't heard anyone on this call disagree that alternates should be participants or can be participants. So I think we should just move on from that issue—put that language in. And we don't need to discuss that again. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. I have Steve and then Edmon again.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Dennis. I had originally raised my hand, just about the concept of a minimum, which … Sorry. There's a cat attacking my wire. Anyway, the potential concern with a minimum is that it's practically hard to enforce if a group just doesn't want to participate. You can't force them to. And you'll see groups, where groups elect to not participate. And that's just the reality of how working groups operate sometimes. Ideally, yes. You do want, for a presentation, for all perspectives to be taken into account. But it's just not always possible.

And just to add a little bit more to the Council discussion about why they had moved … Just take one step back. So Jeff is right that the model and the rules here, they're not prescriptive. They're intended to be tweakable, as needed. So I think if there is a logic breakdown here, by restricting alternates—why they're also not participants—I think that's prerogative of the drafting team to suggest differently. So I don't think that's a problem.

But did want to talk a little bit more about some of the rationale for a more limited membership. I think that the studies had shown at the time that by having a more limited degree of what you actually created is more accountability for the folks that are expected to be there every time. And you can see this in how the EPDP operates. What you see is consistent membership, and attendance, and engagement from all of the members because there's an expectation for them to be there.

So that's some of the additional rationale for why a more limited model might actually increase the level of engagement, is precisely because of that accountability aspect, which you don't necessarily have when you have a free-for-all open model.

And the last thing I would say is just—and I don't mean to open Pandora's box here—is that the group is actually … This drafting team could elect to suggest something totally different. But then, you would also be subject to Council approval in the end, too. So if you all agreed that the open model made sense, you could actually suggest that. That's actually okay, too. But I just wanted to provide the context and background for why the Council had moved towards a more limited representative model in PDP 3.0. Thanks.

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

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. I think, after the discussion and listening to the different perspectives, my view is back to what I put in the chat in the first

place. It seems like, based on all that, one member plus one alternate and alternate participates at par with the member, and then open up for other participants, I think that should work for this group.

Having multiple members would … Given what Steve said, if there are certain stakeholder groups that don't find people to participate, then that would still have the optics issue, if we have more than one. So it'd push us back to what Jeff's argument is. If we have just one plus one, then we avoid the issue of optics if there are too many of one particular stakeholder group. So I put my hand up to advance the original suggestion that I have, with the maximum model now, with the concept put forward. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Sorry. My mute button again. Thank you, Edmon for that. So I think we get … A least I have an idea of what we need to do here. We need to gather all the information, input from you guys, and come up with options, I think. Hopefully, we can do that before our next meeting and then we can discuss those options based on the elements of the different structures, knowing what our objectives are—expertise, efficiency, representation, all of that. So hopefully, we put that into the mixer and we get a structural recommendation for us to put in the working group. So that's going to be our objective next meeting.

So Steve, Ariel, and I will work on putting everything in writing and put the options there so that we can see more clearly and then have a decision by next week's meeting. Edmon, is that a new

EN

hand? Sorry I didn't see you lower it. Did you lower it? Thank you. Okay, Jeff. Yes. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So maybe it would help us to have some options, like if Dennis you sent out or staff sent out an email with the different options that we've been discussing. Then, we can, online or on email, talk about which ones we prefer and why. I think that might be helpful before our next call.

DENNIS TAN: Yes. That's the plan, Jeff. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: And also, if we could have … I'm sorry. One more thing if we can have the alternates, to the extent there are alternates … If we can change that language before we send out the email with thoughts to say that alternates can be a participant at their discretion or whatever—something like that. Because I think we all agreed on that. Yeah.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Thank you. All right. So I think that brings us to the end of item three on the agenda. Four was homework, which we just basically discussed that because our homework's going to be to discuss some options that we have discussed at length today. And in the interim, we'll put something on paper so that we can see clearly all the options of the alternate language that we have been

EN

discussing. And on next week, we can see that and make a decision as to what is the structure that we want to recommend.

So with that, brings us to any other business. Is there any topic? Okay. I see no hands and no chat, no comments. So I think that is all and we can wrap this up for today. Thank you very much. It was a good discussion, good conversation. So keep an eye on your email inbox to look for that options paper, I think. And then we'll meet again next week.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's call. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings. Goodbye.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]