EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group

Tuesday, 05 January 2021 at 18:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/84UmCQ

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

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IDNs EPDP Charter Drafting Team Group meeting, being held on Tuesday, the 5th of January, 2021, at 18:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you.

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I will turn it over to our chair, Dennis. Please begin.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone. This is Dennis Chan, your lead during this workstream. So thank you for the vote of confidence. Let me start with that. And happy new year to everyone as well. So I think we have a majority of the team here. Again, just a couple of regrets from Mark and Maxim. I think they're still in holiday celebrations. So we'll have them next week.

So we have the proposed agenda for today. We have the one check, welcome. I'll just go through real quick on the agenda items and then I will turn over to Ariel, who is going to cover section two and three. Today's meeting, basically the purpose is to just get us together and know what is coming in the next few weeks—well, maybe more than a few weeks. And trying to explain the work plan that we have shared a few weeks ago and the reason, purpose for it. And then, we'll get into explaining the charter itself—the template and the baseline information that is there and how we're going to work it through that.

So with that, turn over Ariel to cover items two and three.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Thanks, Dennis. And happy new year to everyone. I will provide an introduction to the charter template and PDP 3.0 Improvement together because this new charter template has incorporated these improvement documents in the relevant sections. So it will make more sense when I go through each of the sections and then provide a quick overview, what PDP 3.0

does here and that we should keep a mind when drafting a charter.

I will just also put the link in the chat. I know we have circulated this Google Doc before the holiday. And thanks to Jeff for already making extensive comments and redlines in the document. But I don't know whether everybody else had the chance to look at them before the call. So I will provide a quick overview, what are the sections that we really need to focus on as a drafting team.

So the main purpose of PDP 3.0 is to ensure that the future PDP can proceed in an efficient and effective manner. So one of the most significant emphasis for PDP 3.0 is to make sure the charter questions are narrowly drafted and be very comprehensive, at the same time specific, so that the working group will have no questions or confusions when they go through the charter questions, and try to answer them, and then subsequently develop recommendations.

So basically, section two, mission, purpose, and deliverables, is the most important part, in staff's opinion, of the charter. So, it starts with the background information. That's something not super substantive. It's just to provide a necessary context to the origin of this PDP. And as you see, staff already provided some draft content here. But of course, that's up for review by the Charter Drafting Team later on.

And then, the next section, the scope and charter questions. That's basically the most important part. And so what staff did prior to the call is to look at all the existing research, analysis, and work on the IDN subject, specifically the IDN Variant TLD

Implementation staff paper—their recommendations for technical utilization of root zone label generation rules—and some asset papers, as well as some IDN-related recommendations in SubPro.

So we looked at all these existing works and then converted the recommendations from this research into relevant charter questions, based on a logical order of the subsections, you can see. So starting from the use of RZLGR to the same entity, definition and requirements for the top and second level, and then following that is changes to Registry Agreement and other ICANN rules and procedures, things like that.

And then, we're trying to be very consistent with all the headings and titles in those existing research and try to cover as comprehensive as possible for all the topics that have been mentioned in all these existing works, so that the EPDP group will be able to deliberate on them in a comprehensive manner.

And then, I know that Dennis will provide further information on the review of this section. So I won't go into detail. But as you can see, I'm scrolling down. It's quite a lot of questions that, basically, the drafting team needs to refine, and deliberate, and finalize. And that will become the charter questions for the EPDP, should the GNSO Council approve this charter.

And following that section is deliverables. That's really just boilerplate content that doesn't need to be changed a lot. It's basically laying out what this EPDP is expected to deliver. Usually, it's an initial report, followed by a public comment on initial report, and then a final report. But then, for some PDPs, they may include additional deliverables, such as the EPDP Temp Spec. They have

expanded on this section two. So maybe this is something the drafting team would like to discuss later on.

The final part of section two is data and metrics requirements. So this is a part that has always been in the charter of a PDP. But what PDP 3.0 did is to introduce a procedure. So for example, if the Charter Drafting Team deems that some of the data metrics needs to be gathered before the initiation of the EPDP, in order to answer the questions effectively, then sometimes those resources for gathering data cannot be provided by ICANN work. It needs to rely on a third party to do a survey, for example.

So this is an area that the drafting team needs to deliberate and consider whether some of the data points that can be collected internally within ICANN or it actually requires funding from Council or ICANN and then use a third party to gather those data.

And in here, you will see there's a yellow box here and also a guidance reference document. That's the PDP 3.0 improvement, related to this data request process and what kind of questions the Charter Drafting Team needs to consider, in order to make such requests. So this is an improvement here. But also, it will be helpful if the drafting team is taking into consideration the data while developing the charter questions. So this section and the charter questions can be developed simultaneously.

So as you can see, staff have took this first cut on some of the data points. We think it may help answer some of the charter questions but they're definitely not the complete list and then need further work by the drafting team. So that's a quick wrap-up of section two.

And then, section three is about project management. Most of the content of this part doesn't really need to be changed. They're mostly boilerplate content. And the main purpose is for the future working group leadership to understand they need to use the set of project management tools to manage the EPDP, including a summary timeline, a project plan, a work plan, and some tools to track action items. And PDP 3.0 has improved and provided a list of work products that a future PDP can use when managing the project's progress.

And then also, if the work of the PDP has got off track and needs to extend its timeline, then it's necessary to submit a project change request form for the Council, in order to consider whether a timeline extension is warranted. So these are some of the new improvements from PDP 3.0.

And much of the content here doesn't need to be changed. But one thing that the drafting team may want to consider is to perhaps develop a really rough timeline for the EPDP and consider when will be ideal to, for example, complete the initial report? When will be ideal to complete the final report? So set some expectations so that the working group understands there's some kind of draft summary timeline to work with at the beginning of their work. So basically, that's the only thing that drafting team will want to work on in this section.

The next section is section four, formation, staffing, and organization. And in staff's view, that's probably the second-most important part of the charter. So this part is for the drafting team to consider what will be the appropriate model for the working group, how the membership structure will look like, whether the members

needs to meet certain criteria to demonstrate they have the skills and background to do the work in the EPDP, as well as the leadership structure, whether it should consist just one independent chair or should consist of a leadership team and what kind of criteria those leaders should possess.

And also, establish a timeline for the review of leadership. That's a new thing from PDP 3.0, is that to hold leaders accountable, there needs to be regular review of the leaders. And then, the cadence or the frequency of the review depends on the overall lens of the PDP or the EPDP. So the drafting team needs to also propose that frequency here.

And then, last but not least, the Council liaison for the EPDP. Here, we need to put the specific requirements for the liaison— what he or she is expected to do and what kind of criteria or skills this liaison needs to demonstrate.

So this is a pretty substantive part of the charter. And much of these improvements stem from PDP 3.0. And when we're working in this section, we can provide more detailed review of the different options for the working group model that is proposed and then what kind of structure we should propose here, in terms of how many members from each group can have, if that's the drafting team's wish to have a representative model. So we will look at it in more detail in this section and then the reference, document in the yellow box, provides the link to the PDP 3.0 improvement document that you can see later, offline, to learn more.

And following this section is section five, rules of engagement. So this section is also boilerplate content that doesn't require much change or customization by the drafting team. So basically, lay out some of the requirements that when someone joins the working group, they need to submit an SOI and also submit a statement of participation, which is an improvement from PDP 3.0. And here, you can already see the content of the statement of participation is already here. And it doesn't really require revision or customization for this EPDP.

In addition to that, there's a conflict resolution process. And these are the resources that's developed from PDP 3.0. That's linked in this charter. But usually, for the charter drafting team, you don't really need to develop additional process for resolving conflicts. So this content can just stay as-is.

And then, the last part, formal complaint process, that's regarding the section 3.7 of the Working Group Guidelines. So PDP 3.0 has developed a very comprehensive document to explain how to use that process and some improvements related to that. So this part also stays as-is and doesn't really need further work. So just as FYI for the future working group members and leadership.

Section six, decision-making methodology. So this part is also mostly boilerplate content and then references the information from Working Group Guidelines 3.6 about the consensus call process. So this part basically stays as-is and doesn't need customization.

But the part that will need some work by the drafting team is the section under who can participate in consensus designation. And

that is linked to how—what's the working group model for the EPDP. So if it's an open model, it's one way to basically decide who can participate as the whole membership. But if it's a representative model, then that will be a whole different setup. And basically, only the members, they can participate in consensus designation and observers, they cannot. So when we have developed the content for the working group model, this part can be filled out subsequently.

And then reference what the PDP 3.0 document has provided here. It provides further information on who can participate in consensus designation, based on the working group model. And then, the rest of this section doesn't really require customization.

And then, the change history, that's basically if the charter is going to be amended as part of the formal charter amendment process, initiated by the Council, then we need to document the changes here. And that's not applicable at this moment.

But I do want to give folks a heads up that, as you probably already know, and also in the previous call we talked about, there is the IDN Implementation Guidelines which is being discussed in a different track. It's called the operational track. And if the operational track has identified certain elements from the guidelines that needs to be deliberated in a policy process, then most likely, the Council will consider that recommendation and will request this future EPDP to deliberate on those potential policy questions related to the IDN implementation guidelines.

So that may cause a future revision for the charter. But of course, that's a TBD at the moment. So if that happens, then this section will need some record and to document what changes will be.

And then, the charter document history is basically if there's revision to the charter, then we will document the versions, and date, and description of the changes here.

So that's basically it for this charter template. And I went through it pretty fast. So if you have comments and questions, please feel free to chime in. And I will stop here. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Ariel, for going through the structure of the charter. So as a way of summarizing, I just want to ask to focus … Certain parts of the document, we're not going to have so much to discuss because as Ariel explained, there's going to be boilerplate language that we are going to be able to choose and potentially wordsmith to certain extent. But the large majority of our work will be concentrated on section two, which is the mission, purpose, and the policy questions that we need to come up with for the next working group. And a way for you to have the idea, what are we dealing with.

It's basically two groups. And this is coming out from the IDN Scoping Team that submitted its report to the GNSO Council. And Edmon, please, I will ask you to keep me honest here. There are two topics that need to be discussed. One is the topic of the managing variant TLDs, so labels at the top level and how they

are going to manage. And that's going to be the large majority of the policy questions that we are going to be discussing.

There are two main pieces of work products that you need to pay attention to and get familiar with. And the first one is the staff paper on Managing IDN Variant TLDs—the framework. It's a total of six documents. I think we're going to see, in the work plan, what we recommend reading and you get prepared for the next meeting. But all along, you should be familiar with all of it. But we are going to go in, in a piecemeal fashion so that it's easier to digest.

The other piece of work product that you need to be familiar with is the Final Report from the Root Zone LGR Study Group. So those two pieces of documents are going to be useful for us to discuss the topic of managing IDN Variant TLDs.

The second topic that we are going to be discussing, but it's going to be the minority of the time, I think, is the change process of the IDN Guidelines. And as Ariel already mentioned, there's going to be a potential follow-up policy questions that will derive from the operational track. And that relates to the implementation of the IDN Guidelines. So that's in a separate tag. It's not policy. But it may be possible that there are going to be certain policy issues that are going to be identified in that operational track that may flow in, into the PDP. So that pertains to the IDN Guidelines.

And Edmon is asking on the chat, "Have the operational track started?" I don't think, Edmon. I don't think. I know that … And maybe Steve or Ariel can chime in here. But my understanding is that it's upcoming. But no. It has not started yet.

Donna, is that …? Okay. So I think Zoom is using a new icon. So I think your hand's up, right? I thought it was an emoji thing.

DONNA AUSTIN: It is.

DENNIS TAN: So I have Donna and Jeff.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank, Dennis.

DENNIS TAN: It threw me off.

DONNA AUSTIN: That's okay. Just to follow up on Edmon's question, how important is it to get the operational track work started? I'm just trying to work out, from your perspective, whether you think the two are going to work in parallel. Obviously, they're separate tracks so there'll be different people working on it. But what contingencies or what crossover is there between managing the variant TLD labels and the operational track? Because if there are dependencies there, then I think we need to make a push to get that operational track started pretty quickly.

DENNIS TAN:	Thank you for the question, Donna. If I can just reply quickly. My read of the guidance, the novelty that introduced version four from version three is the managing of second-level variants. So that's maybe one piece. The management of second-level variant labels, that could be something that … It intersects with the policy work that we're going to be discussing—the policy questions that we're going to be discussing. So that's one aspect.
	So that's maybe something that's going to be putting pause or what have you after the policy work takes place, so that the solution implementation is one and consistent across all of the contract obligations. You have the Registrar Agreement's already having variant language, this new PDP work, and the Implementation Guidelines. So I think all of us want a consistent, predictable—one implementation and not piecemealing or doing it over and again. But that's one example I can think of right now.
	So with that, Jeff, go ahead and then Edmon.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. So as you can see, I've made a lot of edits and a lot more to come. A couple points I think we should all get on the same page. Number one is that our purpose is not to redo all of the work that's been done previously, whether it's been done by the study group, whether it's been done by SubPro or anyone else.
	So the way that a lot of these questions have been worded are, "Do you agree?" and then, "explain." It shouldn't be that. The question to ask to the working group should be, "Is there any

reason why we need to revisit this issue?" And this is especially important for the work of SubPro because SubPro was, or is, an official PDP working group and it's done a lot of work on these issues.

And so we need to make it clear that this group can revisit issues but there needs to be a pretty good reason. It shouldn't just be that every issue is now just up for grabs and we're going to just start discussing it as if it was from the beginning. Otherwise, these things can become way too complicated and way too difficult.

The other thing is that by the time this PDP is constituted, the SubPro report will hopefully have been considered by the Council, and be to the Board, and could essentially be policy. And as such, it needs to be treated as policy and not just a suggestion.

So I noticed that there's a couple examples where it says, "Well, SubPro says ... Well, the study group said this but SubPro said that. Which do you think is right?" No. By that point, that's not what the working group has to do. The working group will be faced with existing policy and the working group will need to decide if there's a reason why the policy, which is what SubPro decided, needs to be revisited. Of course, I'm making some assumptions that it's got consensus and all that. But I think for this purpose, I think we need to make that assumption.

So a lot of these questions can just be crossed out. And that's what I've done in a lot of cases because, like I said, again, we're not going to … This working group should not be asked to completely redo and recreate the wheel from scratch—all the work that's been done before. If it provides a reason to revisit

recommendations, then by all means it can. But really, it should be emphasized that this is the subject. This is policy now and we should have some sort of value in precedent. So that's one.

Two is that questions seem to be asked over, and over, and over again in maybe some slightly different ways but asking the same question. And I think we can cut down on that.

Also, you'll see a lot of contingent questions like, "If the working group does believe that the Root Zone Label Generation Rules are the only thing that should be complied with, then …" So it keeps restating the ifs and the thens. And I think a lot of that can be cut down because it's obvious to the working group that if it doesn't establish number one, and number three is dependent on number one, it's obvious that that's … You don't need to restate that.

So there's just a lot of things in here that … I just want to make sure we're on the same page because to me, the way this is worded, it's as if this working group is just throwing every issue that's been studied before and done before back into the hopper to start from scratch. And I don't think that's the way we should be treating this. I know I'm forgetting a bunch of points. So when you look through my changes, you'll hopefully understand. And I try to explain, in certain areas, why I've made those changes.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Just let me answer quickly. I think we are on the same page. I think the intent is not to, as you said, revisit or relitigate issues. We are trying. And as Steve, Ariel, and I have

been discussing, we want to build upon the work from the staff paper, SubPro recommendations, and build up on that.

It's a fine line. How do we craft the questions? But know that the intent is to build upon the work that has already been done. And this is not about relitigating, or revisiting, or questioning decisions or whatnot but it order to build. SubPro, the way it is, is forward-looking for new TLDs. But this group needs to take into account a larger set of groups—existing and future TLDs and how, if we're talking about existing, how that impacts existing policy and such. So it's a fine line but yeah. We are on the same page. Edmon, please go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah. Thank you, Dennis. Quickly, in response to Donna and Jeff, I guess Donna's part first. Agree with you, Dennis, in general. I would highlight a couple points. One, there is some dependency—I guess more claimed than, I think, real. There's dependency on the IDN Implementation Guidelines process. What the operations track might or might not come up with could inform what we need to talk about in the IDN Implementation Guidelines. But I think it's very hypothetical.

There's also … Maxim, especially, has a big issue on the same entity situation, which includes both the top-level and the second-level, I think, but more so on the second level. And that has some dependency on the questions that we ask for the working group. Again, that's, in my view, very much hypothetical. But it's still a consistent issue that Maxim brings up.

On Jeff's question, yes. Again, I agree with Dennis. I don't think … I agree with Dennis and Jeff, in terms of not relitigating some of the issues, especially from SubPro and the other working groups, the study group, as you mentioned, and also other community-created work. However, I want to highlight one particular difference. There is a big piece, which is the staff paper that came out, which was a big reason why this is an EPDP versus a PDP, I guess. So that's more like an issues paper that comes in.

So I think part of the work of this group might be that we need to differentiate that for the future working group, which ones should really not be litigated and which ones are actually coming from— which ones are questions coming from the staff paper. And we should leave that a little bit more open. So I guess this is part of the work for this drafting team.

And finally, on the redundancy, I hear you, Jeff. And I have to say that I haven't read through the document yet. But I would agree, generally, to avoid redundancy. But we have to identify the dependencies, as you said. So rather than repeating ourselves, I guess we should have pointers in the final document. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Jeff, do you have new hand?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. Just wanted to point out it was a new hand. So a couple things to that. So the SubPro recommendations are more recent than the staff paper. So to the extent that SubPro has adopted it, and assuming it gets approved by the Council and

EN

goes to the Board, that is the policy. For those overlapping areas, the staff paper becomes … I don't want to say irrelevant. But essentially, it's replaced by the PDP work. So I think that's important to consider.

The other thing I wanted to also bring up is that there are certain questions that are asked in here that are implementation-related, that if the working group doesn't have an issue with the way that SubPro recommended certain things, then those implementation questions are not for this working group but those implementation questions are for the IRT that's set up for SubPro. So I've weeded out some of those questions as well, as not being relevant for our working group.

I think the amount of work that this working group has is not as great as what is represented in 30 pages here. In fact, I think you could cut it down to probably, maybe, 10, if at most because again … Ariel said it in the chat that staff drafted this in a way that the EPDP is asked to confirm what SubPro did. And that's not the role of the EPDP. Everything should be assumed confirmed unless the PDP comes up with a substantial reason not to confirm it.

So we shouldn't be asking the group, "Do you agree?" It's, "Is there an issue?" or, "Are there any concerns you have with that policy?" That's the way everything should be worded, as opposed to "confirm that you agree," because that's not the role.

Think about if in Phase 2 of the PDP of Rights Protection Mechanisms, if the group is asked to confirm that the UDRP, as a consensus policy, is still the right policy. That would just be ridiculous. You can review existing policy and make suggested

changes but you shouldn't be asked to confirm a policy. I hope that makes sense.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. It's funny you mentioned about the style of the questions because we went back and forth. I think, at the beginning, the original draft had the type of question that you were just mentioning—narrowly, to say, "Is there any reason not to agree with SubPro recommendations—" that kind of way. So I think we're going to default back to that one. It just felt funny, the way it was questioning. But I think it accomplishes the intent we want to see.

So let me take Donna and then move on with the agenda. So, Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. I'm not confused about what we're talking about but I do think there's a fundamental question here that we need to agree to as a group. And I personally think that … Because it seems like there's a timing issue here. So I really think it would be helpful if the staff paper could be updated to incorporate the SubPro recommendations. Because like Jeff, I don't think we need to duplicate what's been done already. And it's very recent so it doesn't make any sense to go down that path again.

But I just want to be sure that we're covering off what we need to cover off. So we don't want any holes in what we're doing but we don't want to spend a lot of energy on having the same

conversations that happened under SubPro. But it's still not clear to me where there is overlap or where there are distinct issues that need to be considered. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Edmon, let's do this quickly and then move on.

EDMON CHUNG: Yes. I think it relates immediately to what Donna's asking and what Ariel is putting in the chat. I agree with Ariel that I don't see any inconsistency there. But I don't think it's a good … Actually, I'm not sure it's a good idea to ask staff to update that particular report because then, the Board has to look at it again and it creates a confirmation of some of the things that was not covered.

So rather than that, I think either … I don't know whether the data metric collection or whatever part, we should include a part where we might need staff or other people to identify those parts and highlight it for the working group into the future. That would definitely be useful. But redoing the large staff paper, I'm a little bit hesitant on that. Thank you.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Edmon. Yeah. So let's draw the line on that topic and go back to our agenda. I think we have valid points as to the structure, the questions, and how to—the wording, especially. Right now, at this point, I think we all agree the intent is to build upon the information body of knowledge out there and craft the

policy considerations in a way that it's very specific what we are asking here.

So can we change to the agenda, please? I think we are now looking at the work plan, right? Yep. There you go. Thank you. So we also shared this work with you. What basically we wanted to do here is to share with you the vision of how we're going to work through this charter.

So the first thing that you see is on a weekly schedule. So the intent is for us to meet weekly, one hour at a time and propose chunks of information, or pieces of the charter, that we're going to go through each week, with the intent that most of the work will happen offline, with you reviewing, and providing feedback, and come to the meeting in order to discuss those ideas—those comments, observations, objections, or whatnot—and try to build up on the earlier week and move on and try to go through each as quickly.

For the next week, if we agree on this work plan, meaning weekly conference calls, we're going to rework some of the questions based on the feedback of today about how to—building, rewording, focusing, and whatnot—which Jeff already provided. So we'll look at that and provide a new version of it.

But while we sit here, we try, based on the earlier draft—and this may change based on the way that we're going to rework the first draft. We have a timeline that takes us all through March, with the objective or target to present the final draft to Council for the April 2021 meeting. And we said before, we discussed over email, we can beat this schedule, let's do it. But this is a conservative work

schedule so that we can meet the target. But again, if we can go quicker, I don't think there's going to be opposition in doing that. And we can beat the deadline that we've put ourselves in.

So, Jeff, you have your hand up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I think we can move a lot more quickly. If you scroll up, what I think we should do, if we can, so as to not confuse people, is everyone should be responsible for reviewing, prior to January 12th, all of section two. Even though it says "discuss intro, scope, and charter questions …" I know it says sub A through C. I think everyone needs to be prepared to discuss sub A through … What does it end at? Whatever the last letter is. L. Thanks, Edmon.

So I don't want people to just see this work plan and say, "Well, I reviewed A through C so we should just end the meeting early and that's it." No. I think everyone should be prepared with A through L. And this way, we can move more quickly. Otherwise, people will just be looking at this chart and just preparing what it says here.

Because I actually think that we can do this … Look, it's a small number of us. And I think we could agree. And these are just questions. They're not for expressing views or positions. I don't see why we couldn't get this done in two weeks, to be honest. But I see this work plan. I understand it. But I'd like everyone prepared to do all of section two next week and see how fast we can get through everything.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. That's a good suggestion. Yeah. Our intent, with the preferred reading or post-meeting homework is to prepare. But yeah. I agree with you. The most prepared and read that we are, the better we're going to be able to move quicker. You said, for example, we can go … Next meeting, on January 12th, we are to … Based on the work plan, right now we go through sections A through C. But if we are able to go farther than that in the 60 minutes that we have allocated, yes. It would be great to do that. Otherwise, we will stick to the schedule and never beat it.

So, yes. Ideally, everybody is well-read in all the documents. Like I said before, you have various pieces of documents. And here, there's a list of what is the preferred reading. But if you can overachieve and read all through it, then it's going to be very helpful for us to progress in a more rapid fashion. Jeff, is that a new hand? Okay.

So I think right … Let me just briefly finish on the work plan. So weekly meetings with a target amount of work. Again, the idea for us is to beat this schedule. So to the extent that everybody's prepared to go beyond their recommended work, we can go and advance. Otherwise, we'll be limited by the amount of ideas that we can exchange during a specific meeting. And also, it would be helpful for everybody to be on the same page—have the baseline information.

So please go read the documentation in its entirety. That's the recommended or preferred way. But we are going to target very specific sections on each week. So for example, again, next week, on January 12th, we will be focusing on sections A through C of the charter. And that relates to specific items on the staff paper

and the Root Zone LGR Study Group report. So make sure that you are familiar with the information and recommendations there. And I believe there's also reference to the SubPro recommendations, so you are familiar as well, too.

So first question, I think. Do we agree with a weekly schedule? Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: You'll see, as I've gone through this, that I've proposed merging B and C together and D and E together. I don't think we need two different sections, one talking about the definition and one talking about the requirements because you'll notice that it's just a repeat. So you basically say, where it says in the charter, for example, that … At the beginning of B, it says that, "ICANN and SubPro basically make this recommendation. Do you agree?" And it pertains both to the definition and to the requirements. It doesn't make sense to address them separately.

So you'll see that I've proposed merging B and C together and merging D and E together. So I'm hoping we can get through A through E, at a minimum, next week, or what's now E, which would be B and C. So I think that you'll see that they're … And again, we're just working on questions. We're not working on substance. So anyway, thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. Yeah. That's correct. We're working on the questions. We're not going to be discussing substance here. It's just to pose the right questions. And yeah. This is a starting point.

We expect that it's going to change. If we can streamline and have less work, we can do that, certainly.

So again, we're going to rework this first draft and repost it to the working group so that we can … And maybe that will change the work plan. It's going to be A through E or whatever letter it comes out to. So Edmon. I think maybe—

EDMON CHUNG: I put my hand up for Ariel. I think Ariel wanted to put her hand up.

DENNIS TAN: Oh. Yeah.

EDMON CHUNG: That's why I put my hand up.

DENNIS TAN: Yep. Sorry.

ARIEL LIANG: Actually, I'm happy to defer to Edmon first. I just have a general comment about the—

EDMON CHUNG: No, no. I put my hand up for you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Oh! Thanks, Edmon. I missed that but thank you. I just want to provide one suggestion for the drafting team's consideration. Especially Jeff is super helpful in proposing what to delete. But just for readability purpose, is that possible if you could highlight the part as a comment—say "delete this—" so that at least we can read what is being crossed out because it's a little hard, even for me, to read the part you are crossing out. And I'm not sure whether others will be able to read it, if there's redline over it. So hopefully that's an acceptable suggestion.

DENNIS TAN:

Thank you, Ariel. Yeah. For everybody, I think it makes sense. If you want to cross out a section, do it not by actually deleting the section but by highlighting it and put a comment here, "Recommend removing," and explain why so that other drafting team members can actually read the section and agree or not agree with the suggestion. So yeah. I think that's a good way because it does … Depending on your monitor size or what have you, it's going to be more difficult to read those sections. So, Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. I would normally agree with you. But there's so much repetition in here that to ask people to read … Maybe when you make these changes and you see the types of changes I put in, that you all could do this on your own and produce another draft. But you'll see that there's so much repetition. And if I just had them all in comments, it would take forever to go over the comments on the next column.

Right here, you can see what I've done. You can see what's been deleted. If it was just posed in a comment, your eyes would have to go—both read the draft and read the comment. And that would really … Then, we won't get through all this because then the person, during the call, will have to explain, "Well, my comment shows that I proposed deleted this word but not that word," and it'll take forever. I think normally I would agree with you. But this draft is so repetitious and so long that I'm not sure I agree with that approach.

DENNIS TAN: Yeah. We'll revisit that matter of logistics after this draft has been reworked, based on today's input. But yeah. We need to find a way that everybody has the chance to read the document and put their suggestions in the best way.

So I think we have a few agenda items yet so … Yeah. That's the reason, Edmon, yes. Okay. So Ariel, I think you already …. Yeah. You went through the sections. And we have already discussed section two, mission, purpose and deliverables; and data and metrics requirements as well. Is there anything else you want to cover before we …?

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah. So it seems Jeff is not agreeing with using that methodology. We can stay as is. But just for the rest of the drafting team that hasn't read this document, we'll produce another copy that's an original, clean version so you can see what Jeff is proposing to delete.

And at the same time, we're just wondering of the rest of the drafting team agrees with Jeff in terms of getting rid of those gating questions, asking for a confirmation of the policy principle because that's basically the difference between how staff drafted and how Jeff is revising it. So I will stop it here. And I see Jeff and Donna both have their hand up.

DENNIS TAN: Okay. I'm at the top of the hour. So I'll take a quick comment from Jeff and then Donna. Or not Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I'll just defer to Donna. I think my point's made. Thanks.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Jeff. And Donna, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Dennis. The chartering questions, I think this is too long. So not that I've done a good read of this but I agree in principle with Jeff about getting rid of repetition. And streamline this as much as we can. So don't necessarily repeat things that we don't need to necessarily …

There could be an overarching statement that covers off all those gating questions you want to cover, Ariel. Maybe there's another way to do it within the charter. But I'm a little bit concerned that there is a lot of text here and that is going to create a lot of confusion for the working group when they sit down to do their

work. So to the extent that we can streamline it and make it more easy—easier understood by those that are going to review the questions, I think that's what we need to do.

So I appreciate what you're trying to achieve but perhaps there's another way to achieve that, by just having one overarching statement and then take out the repetition that Jeff's referring to. But as I say, I haven't had a good read of this. But I am a little bit alarmed by the length of it.

DENNIS TAN: Thank you, Donna. Okay. So it's two minutes past the hour so I think we can draw a line here and adjourn. Just quickly, can we go back to the work plan? We are going to rework, based on today's input and trying to look for repetition and try to minimize that— reword the questions so we are narrowly-focused. And I think we're going to adopt our original approach, in terms of some of the questions in the narrative form.

And be on the lookout for a new post-meeting homework for next meeting. But you know that you need to be familiar with the work products of the staff paper, the Root Zone LGR Draft Report. And those are the main body of knowledge that you need to be familiar with, in order to get through this work.

And so with that, any final comments? All right. Hearing none, thank you very much for joining today. So we'll meet again, same day, same time. And any observation or feedback, we have the mailing list for the working group. So with that, thank you very much and have a good rest of the day.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]