
ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group

Tuesday, 20 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/8ICUCQ>

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 IDN EPDP charter drafting team call on Tuesday, the 20th 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 microphones and phones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior.

With that, I will hand it over to 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, Nathalie. Welcome, everyone, to another working group session. Today we have our agenda here. It's packed, but otherwise I think we're going to make good progress. So we are going to start with reviewing Section 3, project management. Then discuss rules of engagement, followed by decision-making methodologies. And time permitting, we'll look at, review boilerplate language on Section 1, which is background and other, 7 and 8 as well.

And as per usual, we review our post-meeting homework for next week and any other business at the end. At this point, any comments on the agenda? Do we want to flag any topics for any other business?

Okay, seeing none, let's jump right into our document, Section 3, project management. So, on this one, talking with Steve and Ariel. This is a section which is not required. I mean, it's a nice-to-have here and these are the items that are listed that this drafting team could provide to the council on the next working group, going from summary timeline to situation with Board, project plan, work plan, action items, etc.

I mean, in my opinion—and I'm happy to listen to other views as well. In my opinion, I think it would be difficult for us, the drafting team, to define or determine a project plan that is going to be accurate enough [inaudible] in the future.

So, the only item that I see useful here is potentially a work plan and a high-level workplan, a suggested roadmap of topics that the working group needs to do, will map to the policy consideration questions that we are laying out in the charter and also point out

the dependencies between each other, because we know as we went through the questions in the charter, one question about how to use the root zone LGR may have an impact on—or not impact, but have a dependency as to other aspects later on in the charter, as for example how do you apply for a variant TLD and what do you do with those variant labels that you don't want to apply but they are going to be withheld for the registry operator for some point in time, how do you deal with those, and later on, what is the implication or dependencies as far as lifecycle management of domains?

So, all things are interconnected, so just potentially laying out the dependencies between each question so that, looked at holistically, it makes sense. But other than that, I don't think we can do a project plan or some sort of that.

I have hands and comments, so Jeff, I'll turn it over to you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. And I agree. Work plan should be the first overall deliverable of the working group. That said, I'm wondering if we can sort of put this into phases because there's so many questions here and there are some of these items that are needed or that may be needed for a next round, and I'm wondering if we could place a priority on certain items.

We've kind of always considered this as one PDP but I think that's one of the problems with a lot of the working groups, is that they seem to bundle everything into one PDP, whereas—and then they

wait for everything to be done before they have an initial report and final report.

The only question I would have—and the answer may be no because there may be too many interdependencies. But if there are items that are needed sooner than others, we could put this into phases, but if not, if everything is pretty much so interdependent on each other, then that might not be possible. I don't know if that makes sense.

Because, in theory, SubPro is supposed to be in the process of implementation, anything that relies on that or could have an impact on that probably should be done sooner than other items. Does that make sense?

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Jeff. I've seen the idea of phases or sequence resonates with me. As I put a comment in the draft charter, the workplan, something, a map so that the working group knows how to go through these questions and know the dependencies and maybe look at each issue in a holistic way. And that spans across multiple questions from top level to potentially second level, so that it looks at the breadth of issues so that they can issue a consistent, consolidated policy recommendations. Well, I shouldn't have said consolidated because you can have different policy recommendations. But consistent policy recommendations overall.

So, let's see. Jeff, do you want to reply back? Okay. I think Maxim commented, "Working group should create it," and I think that's what I was talking about project plan. I think we agree on that one.

Maxim, do you want to speak to your question about the synchronization with the operation stream? Are you referring to operational track and the issues that might be potentially flagged by this team [and impact] policy? Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Yes. I meant the operational part of IDN effort. Somehow, we need to ensure that the PDP has all the information which became available from the work of operational stream, and I'm not sure that if we set in stone the planning phases we will be able to make such synchronization later, because we cannot predict what we find there. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Maxim. I think I'm with you. Unfortunately, the operational track, we cannot control it. So I don't know what to say about that. But yeah, you're right. We don't know what we don't know. As the framework was laid out for the operational policy tracks, the operational track has some input that might come in I think at any point in time, but I think that will be ultimately the GNSO Council to decide how to deal with that, expedite or whatnot.

Ariel, your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis; and thanks, Maxim, for bringing this up. So, in the charter, we did build in some flexibility for future potential opportunity of revising or adding additional questions related to

IDN implementation guidelines. We also have Section L in the charter questions that's related to appropriate vehicle to update the IDN implementation guidelines. But this section can potentially expand and include additional questions that operational track identified that this EPDP should address, so we did create that flexibility in the future for charter revision or amendment.

And as Dennis rightly pointed out, that's up to the council to decide whether that's appropriate to include in the charter but we wrote it in a way to provide that flexibility in the future.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Ariel, for that clarification. Okay. So, I think we are around the idea of, on Section 3, provide a suggested sequence of topics, how they can deal with those so that it makes sense for the working group to deliver. Of course, this is a suggested approach and tool that hopefully the next working group will find useful. But other than that, I think that's what we can offer right now. Jeff, that's a new hand. Please, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. I think it's a little bit more than just a sequence. I know working groups haven't done this traditionally. Working group traditionally do every single thing to come out with one initial report. It's one of the reasons why it takes years and this covers so many different types of topics and it's a little hard to do this section because we haven't seen the fully revised Section 2—I think it's Section 2—with all the ... We took a bunch of stuff out. We reworded a bunch of things.

I think this PDP covers variants with respect to everything from how to evaluate whether two strings are confusingly similar because of the variant issues, to RPM issues which are so diverse and it's going to take this group a long time to get through everything.

If they have to wait until every issue is thought through and completely worked through just to get an initial report out, and then do all the processes after that to take in all the comments to do everything—all the work to get a final report—it's going to take forever.

It's one of the problems with the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP. And now adding in a section on updating the IDN guidelines is yet another completely diverse area that could take weeks or months.

So, when we say that there's a sequence, we could say ... Now, this is different and we would need to discuss it with the Council. But we could say that initial reports and final reports can be done on each of these topics individually so that you're not waiting until the very end to put out one initial report and one final report, especially if there are dependencies with the next round of new gTLDs or dependencies on other types of other external factors.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Jeff, for that clarification. I think I understand what you're saying and I think it makes sense. I'm not sure we, the drafting team, are the best working group to define how to slice and cut this work because we haven't gone through the substance

deliberations. So we don't know fully what dependency might have on the different [teams]. High level, yeah, I think you mentioned RPMs, the IDN guidelines, and you can clearly separate those two. But there are other items that I don't know whether we are going to be capable to break down in a consistent way.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Totally agree, but I think what we can do is say that we would like to see those items that are necessary for the next round of new gTLDs to be prioritized first, and then so the working group can discuss which elements those are and then we can say that the working group may choose to do initial and final reports on groups of topics or do a workplan that's got that. In other words, give them the discretion, but say that, hey, we might need the outcomes of some of these things earlier than the outcomes of the other things.

DENNIS TAN:

Understand. I see Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG:

I think that's an interesting thought, but if we are going to prioritize, it might actually go the other way around. There are registries in the wild today that is creating hurt. People are unable to access the IDN variant TLDs. So the priority might actually turn out to be we have to deal with fixing what is broken out there first, then deal with the subsequent procedures. Right now, for example, some of the Chinese IDN TLDs are having problems, people aren't able to access some of the domains because the variants are not

available. So I think it's an interesting thought, but the prioritization might not exactly go the way that I guess, Jeff, you just mentioned.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Edmon. So I think in principle or generally, that's a good concept and I like the idea that it's up to the working group. At that point, they can do that if they strongly believe that's the way to go, and of course, I think there's going to be some coordination with the GNSO Council and the GNSO Council will have to not do that approach. So I would not be opposed to say the working group might want to do something or they can set up the way they want to do the work, present the work and deliver the work. I think there's flexibility around this type of PDP process that allows the working group that kind of freedom, if you will.

I think what I see, ideas, concept, agreeing, Tomslin. Okay, Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. So, I agree. Let's just give them the flexibility of this project management approach to say that the first deliverable should be a workplan, and that the working group may choose to handle these in pieces and something that gives them the right—but not dictate that they do this—to do multiple initial and final reports. In other words, something that doesn't say it has to be one initial report and one final report. So just give them the freedom to suggest that in their workplan, the Council will approve that or not approve that to see if it makes sense.

And then the other thing is, the part I do think we can set a timeline for is just an end date. We should be saying that your first deliverable is a workplan but the Council expects that the working group take no longer than, I don't know, two years or whatever it is to finish this work.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Maxim, you're next.

MAXIM ALZOBA: In the current design, there is no such thing as multiple final reports, because final is something in the end of the process. And we cannot multitask here and create lots of different outputs of the working group, because we never know which item is going to be tied with something else. And giving a final report and then saying, "Oh, no, wait, it wasn't so final, please amend this output by these letters and this by this," it's not going to work. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Maxim. Jeff, you want to reply back?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Again, this should be a working group decision, and we should give them the flexibility. Who are we to say whether it's going to work or not work? I think, had SubPro been able to divide its work, I think we could have come out with initial reports and final reports for individual phases. We ourselves could have

broken it down to phase one, two, three and four, much like the WHOIS issues were being broken down by the Council.

there's nothing in the PDP manual or anything else that says that you can't break work down into multiple different parts. So all I'm saying is let's give them the freedom to put that into their workplan, and if the working group thinks they can do it, then let them try.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Jeff. I don't think we're saying, Maxim, multiple final reports. I think what we don't want to do is prohibit something that we don't have the right to prohibit. And on the other hand, let's give the working groups, the ones that are going to do the work, the deliberations as to organize themselves and provide value to the community, utility to the community in the way they think is the best. If that's one bundle of recommendations, then so be it. If they believe they can prioritize and dissect the work in distinct phases and GNSO Council approves of that approach, then I think the Council and the working group will speak on behalf of the community. And all of us are going to be able to, I guess, participate and find capacity to voice our concerns and whatnot.

So again, I think let's provide the working group the flexibility to organize themselves. That's all we're saying to do. We are bouncing around ideas as to what they're going to do, but at the end of the day, it's going to be the next working group, leadership and the members, that decide how they're going to do that. So I want to draw a line on this discussion and move to the next item.

Okay, so before moving on, Ariel, Steve, do you want to flag anything before we move on? Sorry, I should have raised that earlier.

ARIEL LIANG:

No, we have covered this pretty well. I think staff have the direction to know how to revive this part of section 3, and just note that the rest of section 3 is boilerplate content, it's more like FYI related information for the future working group leadership and members. So no customization is needed. So if we want to skip it, it's fine too.

DENNIS TAN:

Okay. Thank you, Ariel, so let's move on to the next item. All right, so section 5, rules of engagement. So here is mostly boilerplate language, so [inaudible] of participation for members, and I believe underneath, I believe it's one for participants as well. We talked about this briefly in our last meetings when we were discussing about membership. Can we scroll up a little bit? [We kind of wrote] each member needs to review and sign this statement of participation as well as the participants so that they know what are the expectations from each of the members as far as participation, how do they need to behave, preparations and whatnot.

So I don't think there's anything here that's really up to us to customize. Is that right, Ariel, Steve? Sorry I put you on the spot.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. So typically for PDP 3.0, the statement of participation is for members only, but due to the discussion at prior meetings, we understood it's probably better to have both the members and participants sign a statement of participation, so we did a little bit customization by creating two versions of such a statement. And the one for the members is slightly different from the participants because members have the responsibility of consensus call activities, so there's a bullet point about the need to understand what consensus means, like follow the consensus designation process in the working group guideline, things like that.

Participants don't have that responsibility, so that wasn't emphasized in their version of statement of participation, but everything else is required for them, like act in accordance with ICANN bylaws, ICANN expected standards of behavior, etc.

So there's a slight difference between these two versions and I just want to emphasize that.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Jeff, you're next.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Ariel, is there a way to combine them into one and just say that if I am a member, I agree to certain ... the one or two additional bullet points and just put it into one form? Because remember, participants can become members if members aren't able to perform it and therefore, you don't want to have them sign two different things. So I think you have all of the common ones

up front and then you maybe have a section for if I'm a member, these bullet points, if I'm a participant, these bullet points, and then have one thing signed. Just makes it much easier so you don't have to get a new one signed if the participant becomes a member or the member now becomes a participant for whatever reason.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, sounds like a good suggestion there. One single contract for everyone, especially when you have—I think we have one case where a member that is appointed vice chair needs to drop as a participant. So that's a good idea. Thank you. Any other thoughts on statement of participation, rules of engagement? Okay, so let's continue to the following subsection, decision making methodologies.

Ariel, do you mind walking us through this new section that you highlighted here? Is it new PDP 3.0 or new for this drafting team? I think it's the former but just want to make sure.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis. It's not really new content, its more like emphasis of additional resource for members and leaders to look at when they're doing the consensus call—well, actually, during the course of the working group deliberation, because the working group needs to work based on whether things can—try to build consensus along the way. So they have these new resources called consensus playbook, the output from PDP 3.0, and we just want to mention that in the charter. This is something we expect

the working group leaders and members and Council liaison to review. And then there may be opportunity in the future for training related to the consensus playbook, so the working group is expected to participate in that. So just kind of FYI, in a way, that this resource is available. And then the rest of this part is just copy paste of section 3.6 from the working group guidelines about the standard methodology. So boilerplate content.

It's not a legally binding document, for sure, it's just something that—there's an expectation at least for the working group leadership to review that. So yes, expected to, so we can use that language to reflect that, it's expectation, not a legally binding document. Yes.

DENNIS TAN:

All right. Thank you for that. So the next box just defines what are the different types of levels of consensus. So I don't think we need to go through that, that's pretty much standard. Then we come to who can participate in consensus designation. I think we touch on this while looking at the difference between members and participants, and it was clear that consensus call was only for members—with capital M—of the working group. So I think this section reflects that. Go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Can we just say consensus calls or decisions are limited to members? We don't need GNSO, SG/C and SO/AC appointed, because we have a definition of what members are. So just limit it to members.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah, I like that, in the spirit of streamlining the language. That's good. Thank you. Okay, so no other thoughts, comments on this section? I think that's pretty clear. We already prepped for this.

JEFF NEUMAN: I assume everywhere it says instruction for charter drafting team, we can take that out.

DENNIS TAN: Oh yeah. All right, so next section, [inaudible] termination, closure of working group. I think this is pretty much boilerplate language.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, but remember, we gave them a little bit of flexibility whether it could be one final report—I think there's a way to revise this to just say typically, the working group will close upon the delivery of the last final report, or something like that. So I think—yeah, in order to keep that consistency, just say the working group will close upon the delivery of the last final report, or something like that.

DENNIS TAN: Right. Good point, Jeff. [It's made according to the language on] expected from the working group and how do you close it. All right, sounds good. So next section, I think, is section 7, we're not skipping to other parts of [the change history.] I think that's pretty straightforward how to capture, record changes of the charter, if

any. And then I think that's it. Change history and charter document history. Is that it?

ARIEL LIANG: Dennis, the last one is just [the section on] working group identification, but it's like nothing, really, we need to discuss, this little form on the top. But boilerplate, and then the customization is the title of the working group.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. Before going to respond to Ariel, yes, Jeff, question, we don't have a change history, do we? I believe not. We're still in draft. We haven't issued a formal or version controlled type of document. I guess once we sent to the Council and they want some revisions, maybe we will start a history there. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. So on that point, if you go back to the instructions on that, it said instructions for the charter drafting team. It should really be instructions for the working group, right? Or whatever, because it's just weird. "Please document significant changes to the working group charter." Why would the charter drafting team do that? Since we've just drafted the charter. The only way we would do that is if the Council sent it back, I guess.

Anyway, but the real question on the last section is, shouldn't we have, instead of the important document links—sorry, going back to section 1, why would it just be the general working group ones?

Why wouldn't we have all the previous IDN documents that we talk about in the background as important document links?

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Okay, so going back to section one, you are referring to that box, important document links?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. If it's just going to be the background, then we should just say background or process links or something like that, because I think the important documents, yeah, they should sort of be familiar with that, but the important documents are what we put in the background, isn't it?

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. I think you have a good point there, we can list off the documents that we have reviewed from the SubPro recommendations to the TSG paper to the staff paper and the SAC reference as well. All right, anything else here? Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. Just want to make sure staff understand this clearly. So, is Jeff suggesting we put the SubPro report, the staff paper and TSG paper in the important document links in this section? Is that the suggestion? Because we do have a mention in the background section and also the introduction paragraph

before the charter questions. So, would that be a little duplicative? Just want to make sure we understand the suggestion clearly.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. So, thinking back as a former chair, if we're going to call something important document links, I would actually put in the documents that are related to substance as opposed to the process. I expect the working group chairs and liaisons, leadership team, to be familiar with those documents, the GNSO expedited PDP stuff, but if this is going to members, I would much rather call the substantive documents important document links, putting them up front, as opposed to the process ones.

DENNIS TAN:

So in other words, if you're going to put important links up front, you should put the substantive ones and not the procedural ones. Thank you, Jeff. I also put a comment in the chat agreeing. I think it also stresses the importance of those documents and references, background, and also, it's a quick way to find those instead of going through the sections and trying to fish those from the text.

Okay. Ariel, yeah, the scoping team final report, that makes sense too. Yes. Thank you. All right, any other items to flag here, Ariel? Section one.

ARIEL LIANG:

Nothing else in section one needs to be flagged, and just want to let folks know that with respect to the staff liaison question, I think

we have some discussion about that and then that's something policy staff has, in consultation with the GDS team and then they will get back to the drafting team in terms of the feasibility of appointing that and how many would be appropriate. So we'll provide an update hopefully in the next meeting, so just want to let folks know that we are in discussion internally about this particular position for ICANN staff to be engaged in this working group.

DENNIS TAN: all right. Sounds good. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Ariel, what is the ... I don't understand why this is discussion that we need to have GDS feedback on. This is something that we're saying should be in the group. Can you give us a little background as to what is actually being considered by GDS, whether they want more people or whether they can do it at all? Sorry, can you just give us a little more information?

DENNIS TAN: Thanks, Jeff, and Sarmad and Pitinan are also on the call, so please feel free to chime in as well from your perspective. So based on our internal kind of discussion, we understood that the expectation initially is GDS will probably have experts like Sarmad and Pitinan to provide support in terms of subject matter expertise related to IDNs, but then at the same time, maybe we also need GDS input in terms of implementation, like if the working group develops some recommendation, we may need them to provide timely input whether it's implementable and what the

implementation effort would be. So that may not necessarily be able to be answered by subject matter experts in the GDS but may need some additional perspective from the implementation side. So then this will be a question of resources and bandwidth whether GDS could provide that. So that's why we need to have some kind of internal consultation, understanding how that can be done. But Sarmad and Pitinan, please feel free to chime in as well.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. Jeff, is that a follow-up?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, but I'd rather hear from Sarmad first if we could. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Okay.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. So yes, I think as basically Ariel is pointing out, many of this work eventually translates into services and processes internally, so we may eventually need to reach out to team members internally to provide any additional feedback if it's needed. And I guess a question would be, would you prefer having some of those people on the team, or would you like, I guess, for us to reach out to them internally and get back to you? What would be the preferred mechanism? Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: I think for that, all the section says is that you should appoint two members, but anyone can be participant. So while I know you need to have a discussion internally as to who the appropriate people would be, I don't know if our section is really dependent on those internal discussions. So you guys can talk about how many participants you want and who'd serve as the members, that's great, but I don't think—is that really going to have an impact on the language of the charter, I guess, is my question.

DENNIS TAN: Okay, so I think I'm a little bit lost here. I think I lost the train of ... So can we go—

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, sorry, Dennis, if you want me to jump in. Can we scroll down to that section?

DENNIS TAN: Yes, and we were talking about the staff liaison, kind of, we discussed last time that GDS should have participation here. So we're discussing that here.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right, so we've put in two liaisons. I think we suggested two liaisons. If we didn't, and that's just a suggestion, that's fine. But I'm not sure, again, why it's TBD depending on consultation with GDS. Again, I understand you're talking about the who and who's got time for it and stuff, but there's nothing at all preventing other

people from being participants. So I'm just not sure why we have this as a TBD.

Okay, so the number of liaisons ... So let's discuss that as a working group, not as internal—that's a drafting team discussion as opposed to an internal ICANN staff discussion. So in here, it says two liaisons. For example, Ariel, we don't ask in here when we say the GNSO Council shall appoint one liaison, we don't ask the Council if that's feasible or not. Same thing with—we don't ask the ccNSO if it's feasible, that one liaison. So if we as a drafting team think two liaisons are good, then let's just state it. I don't think it's a TBD, I think it's our decision. Whether staff decides to appoint one or not and show up, that's ICANN staff's decision.

DENNIS TAN:

Okay, so what we'll want to do here is that staff is connected to the most extent possible so that they can flag any issues, whether it's technical or implementation-wise, and these folks are, again, consistently participating in the working group deliberation, so there's some continuity here. So we want [inaudible] people coming in and out. So I think we are addressing here what's the purpose of this liaison, to provide timely input on issues that may require ICANN Org input such as implementation-level queries or issues requiring slightly more expertise. So we've got that covered.

Now we are discussing, okay, how many? Can we just say it's up to ICANN to define that, or do we want a number? I think that's all that we're discussing here, a number, whether it's up to, at least,

or a specific number of liaisons. What is the working group leaning towards? Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I think we might use milder text such as ICANN Org, GDS, should be asked to appoint at least one liaison, something like that. So they're free to do it or not, depending on their understanding of the issue. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Maxim. Yeah, I tend to agree. At least one, you have one, and they can work out—depending on how the work is progressing, the working group leadership might ask the GNSO Council, “Hey, we need other people with other set of expertise in order to answer different questions so that the working group can progress more quicker” as opposed to sending questions offline, then coming back and kind of disrupts the discussion or the flow of thought. Okay, so I think we are down to that. Okay, so we’re talking now about the specific language there. So we get that one nailed down. Thank you.

All right, so this is closed, right? The liaison conversation. I think it is. I don’t see any other hands or comments. All right, thank you for that. Ariel, let’s continue. What do we have next?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Dennis. We have covered everything for today’s agenda. the next on the workplan is—maybe we can just quickly pull it out. It’s related to the EPDP initiation request, and then also the

councilors expecting the drafting team to report back the drafting team's view on the dependency between SubPro and IDN issues, so perhaps a drafting team can prepare a response with regards to that topic. So these are the two things that we can discuss in the next meeting. And then just want to give folks a heads up, the initiation request is basically going to repurpose the relevant content in the charter to fit in that form. It doesn't really have a lot of new content to discuss, so probably, we can review that very quickly next meeting and then the response about dependency question, that's something the drafting team can figure out the talking points and then staff can put together the response with regards to that. So I'll stop here.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Ariel. Before I go to you, Jeff, do we have the actual wording of the GNSO council question about the dependencies? Just want to ensure we do address their specific concerns and question on that one. And with that, Jeff, please, I turn to you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Dennis. That was one of my questions, is where this request came from. And the second thing is, now that we've gone through everything, can we get a new clean version of the charter without comments? Because I think most of them now have been addressed. Or if not, it's just really confusing as I go back to see whether comments have been addressed or not. If we can get a clean version and the only comments that should be in there are comments that are new or still areas that need to be addressed.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Absolutely. Actually, you stole my thunder. So we are in the two-week stretch now before we can submit the package to the GNSO Council. So for one, the EPDP initiation request, as Ariel put it, is a repurpose of the charter, different template. That said, we're going to circulate that in the next few days if not by the end of the week, so you get a chance to review it before our next meeting. And also, yeah, I'm going through another pass of the charter to clean the language, so that's on me, Ariel and Steve. Also, we are going to put a clean version by end of this week so that we can start reviewing on a clean version of it, trying to keep the language consistent, typos and whatnot so that everybody can review it. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. So, does that mean also getting rid of language like things that say gap and other areas? Because those are just kind of confusing because remember, we're kind of past the notion of reviewing, of comparing different documents and things. So it would help to just have all of that, and instructions to the drafting team, if we can have those removed. Like produce the next version as if it were our draft final.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah, that should be the closest version to what we're going to submit to the GNSO Council. Noted. All right, any other comments or questions here? Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Dennis. Back to the dependency question, I think that was discussed in a December Council meeting. Maybe staff would double check the recording and the transcript and make sure that was the right meeting. I think at that point, the Council didn't have an answer to it and so it got punted to the drafting team, but we will check the exact wording how this question is raised. But at the same time, staff is happy to perhaps chat with the Council leadership and then see whether they're still interested in hearing back about this dependency question. But we'll get back to the drafting team about this.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel. That would be helpful. We want to know exactly what the actual question was so that we can address their specific concerns. Okay, so with that, I think we're just left with Any Other Business. Do we have any? Okay, I see none, and I'll be happy to give you about 30 seconds back to your day. Thank you very much for joining today. It was very useful, and we made a lot of progress [on time, nailed it,] thank you for that. So we'll meet next week, EPDP initiation request and continue reviewing a clean version of our charter. So with that, thank you, goodbye, have a good rest of the day and week.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]