EN

ICANN Transcription

IDNs EPDP Team

Wednesday, 11 August 2021 at 14:00 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/gwTpCQ

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, good evening. Welcome to the EPDP on IDNs call taking place on the 11th of August 2021 at 14:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. All members and participants will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and participants, when using chat, please select "panelists and attendees" or "everyone" depending on your Zoom update in order for everyone to see the chat. Observers will not have chat access, only view chat access.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you

need help updating your statements of interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the EPDP IDNs Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public Wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and over to our chair, Edmon Chung. Please begin.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, and thank you everyone for joining. It's definitely very exciting for me. This is a PDP that is in my mind 20 years in the making., So, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone, and thanks for volunteering your time.

Before I really jump into a little bit of a welcome, what the staff has put in front of us is a brief agenda. I'll spend a little bit of time getting us started, and then we'll talk a little bit about whether we want to have a vice chair for the working group, and then we'll have Steve help us, especially Steve from staff, walk us through the charter and a little bit of the operating mode and approach, and then hopefully leave a little bit of time for starting to get the workplan started. So it's a little bit more of an introductory session for today and I understand that staff actually has a hard stop at the top of the hour, so we'll have to end a little bit less than an hour from now. So that's sort of the agenda. Anyone want to jump in before we get actually started?

EN

Okay, seeing none, I'll push ahead. As I said, welcome, and this is something that's really dear in my heart, seeing the IDN policy and discussion develop through the ICANN from bottom-up and a little bit of a top-down process or a combined process to take us to where we are now where both the GNSO and ccNSO are working on I think one of the very important last pieces of the puzzle, which involves some of the maybe more difficult questions about IDN variants, although a lot of work has been put in place in the past to get us here.

But still, how we deal with IDN variants and especially at the top level, and a little bit at the second level as well, will make IDN real in my mind and really elevate it from what I would think right now almost like a second-class citizen to at par, hopefully, with ASCII TLDs and domains that we can use together. So this is, in my mind, an issue that's really important and it's not just about the usability of IDN, it's not just about universal acceptance, but also some of the policies that surround IDN variants.

And even very early on, for those of you who I guess were with me 20 years ago going through the technical process, there was some discussion there that these IDN variants need to be addressed even though as a technical issue, it has to be addressed at the policy level. And here we are, sort of 20 years from where we'd started. I'm really excited to look to everyone's active participation and trying to make it work really here at ICANN. Because certainly, the technical folks for IDN at IETF, I wouldn't say threw in the white towel on these issues, but actually correctly punted it to here for us to solve because it involves legal

EN

issues, it involves policy issues, operations issues, and it involves a tiny bit of technical issues, of course as well.

So that's my introduction and what I have in mind hopefully to really get this through. Thank you, everyone, for giving your introduction through the mailing list. And for those of you who haven't actually sent in your short introduction, I think it would be useful—I know we have the SOIs and whatever for everyone, but it would be useful for everyone to get a sense of where you are and what you think about IDNs to the mailing list.

So with that, unless there are any questions or problems you find with my welcome message, I'll keep forging on. But I would like to make sure that I'm not setting the scene completely out of your expectation. So, anyone wants to speak up? Seeing no hands, I will keep us going.

The next part is the vice chair. From the charter—which hopefully everyone has read, but I'm sure not everyone has completely read, but hopefully soon you will read all of it—the group can identify and appoint a vice chair. And I really would encourage having a vice chair. I do note that there isn't a hard requirement for having a vice chair, but I think this group is going to go on for a little bit. Even though we are called an EPDP, the only reason why we're called an EPDP as in expedited is just because we have enough documentation that staff doesn't need to create another issues report.

So it's called an EPDP, but if you saw my e-mail of introduction, there are tons of background documents for it. So I think really, I expect it to run for a little bit, definitely more than a year. So it'd be

EN

very useful to have a vice chair just in case I wouldn't be able to join meetings, that it won't be disruptive to the process.

So I guess the question is to see if anyone is willing to volunteer themselves to be a vice chair, but just note that in the charters also said that to be a vice chair, you need to be a participant rather than a member, and the difference there is the voting and so on, which is what is called the PDP 3.0 process for GNSO. But if a member is interested to be vice chair, that is definitely possible as well. But you would have to change yourself into a participant in order to do that.

But I guess that's my introduction to this, and I see that Anil has his hand up. Please, I'd like to get your thoughts in terms of vice chair and whether anyone is interested to throw their aim in for consideration of being a vice chair. We could decide here, or we could also put it to the mailing list. I'd like to [inaudible] from you. Anil.

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Edmon. Thank you, and welcome to this group as chair, Edmon. I fully agree with you that although there may not be any requirement, but it is always good to have a vice chair which will take care in any eventuality. The role of vice chair may not be there in regular things, but it may be there in any eventuality.

So I second what is suggested by you, to have a vice chair. Thank you, Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Anil. Anyone else with thoughts or would be willing to throw their own name in or try to volunteer or voluntell someone else to be that? I see Lianna agreeing with having a vice chair as well. Thank you, Maxim. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi Edmon. I am a participant of this group, I'm not a member, and I'm willing to put my hand up to be vice chair.

EDMON CHUNG: That's great. Love to have brave souls. Anyone else have thoughts? Anil?

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Edmon. In case there is no volunteer, then I volunteer myself to work as vice chair with you. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Anil, I wasn't sure whether you're already a participant or a member. Donna mentioned that she's a participant. Can anyone help me with whether Anil ...?

ANDREA GLANDON: Anil is a participant, Edom.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay, so both are. I guess Steve or Andrea, do we have options for multiple vice chairs, or are we supposed to select one?

STEVE CHAN: Hi Edmon. The way that the charter is worded, it says one vice chair. So it's expected to be a single. That said, I think if there was a strong sense that there need to be two vice chairs, I think it could be explored. But the wording is actually pretty explicit in the charter that it's one chair plus one vice chair.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Not a problem. So I guess to make things simple, it should be one. If we really want to, we'll explore that further. And I note Maxim's suggestion, and that's exactly where I was going to push for it. Thank you, both Donna and Anil, for putting your hands up for willing to take this role. I think it will be useful and very important for us to do that.

I would suggest, as Maxim has suggested, to take this to the mailing list right after this meeting and probably following—this would be something that we'd try to come to a conclusion at our next meeting. But I'll put this out, and I note that there are some people who haven't joined for today's meeting as well. But I would note that both Donna and Anil have volunteered for it and we'll discuss on the list further how we would come to agreement and probably agreement in our next meeting for the vice chair, if that's good for everyone.

All right. Any burning question on this before we move on to next ...? Seeing no hands, I guess I'll pass to Steve to first walk us through the charter, because I think that really helps us set the scene for what we would expect, and then we'll go into how we

might work and then start to think through the workplan. I don't think we will have a lot of time to discuss a workplan. I expect the next couple of meetings to really flesh out the workplan, but at least as we walk through the charter, please feel free to throw in the chat if you have any questions, or even put your hand up. I'm guessing that Steve won't mind us interrupting if it's a pertinent question as well. So with that, I'll pass to Steve to help us walk through the charter so that we have a good sense of the types of questions that this PDP would be looking at. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks very much, Edmon. It's nice to meet you all. I guess just before I get started, I just wanted to note that I really enjoyed reading all the introductions on the list. I've not worked with a fair amount of you before, so nice to work with you, and also really heartening to see the level of expertise on the subject amongst the members and participants. So like I said, I just wanted to say it's great to work with you, and I look forward to working on this project. It's always exciting to start a new project.

So, what I want to do for the charter is actually to provide a little bit of background and basics on how we got to the charter, how it took shape. So I think with that, I just want to start with a little bit of background and note that there is a variant TLD management staff paper which included nine recommendations, and chief amongst them—and that will factor into our work significantly—is that the root zone label generation ruleset is the sole source for [inaudible] TLDs and their variant labels.

And the other key principle is that IDN variant TLDs as well as the second-level variant labels and also within IDN variant TLDs, all of those are subject to the principle of being allocated to the same entity. Significantly, that paper also analyzed the impact of all nine recommendations on various policies, procedures and agreements.

So that paper and its nine recommendations were taken into consideration by the SubPro PDP or new gTLD subsequent procedures when they're looking at the topic of IDNs with respect to new gTLDs and new gTLDs only.

So in the "homework" that Edmon sent out, we provided a link to the SubPro final report, and if you have taken a look, it's topic 25 in the report and you'll see several recommendations related to IDNs. And if you've taken a look at those recommendations, what you'll note is that SubPro adopted the two key principles I'd just mentioned about RZ LGR as a sole source and that variant TLDs and variant labels all must be allocated to the same entity. So those, again, you'll keep hearing me say those are the two key principles. They were made as recommendations in SubPro and that SubPro final report has been approved by the GNSO Council.

So where that went next is those outcomes from SubPro, that variant TLD management staff paper, those were taken into account during an EPDP chartering process which obviously led to the charter for this group. That chartering group was chaired by Dennis Tan, who's a member of this group now. So welcome back, Dennis.

One of the things that that group did was perform a gap analysis between the SubPro recommendations, that staff variant management paper, another paper called recommendations for the technical utilization of the RZ LGR, a couple of SAC papers, 52 and 60. And what that helped do was identify exactly that, the gaps between the SubPro recommendations and what maybe still needed to be worked on by this EPDP. So that was the whole purpose of the exercise, to try to make the charter for this group as concise as possible so that there was not duplicative work being done. So in other words, redoing the SubPro recommendations for instance.

So that gap analysis also helped the charter drafting team get to some key principles, and the first amongst those is what I just mentioned, that this working group or this EPDP should not revisit the SubPro recommendations, especially in the context of future new gTLDs. But this EPDP will consider extending those recommendations in reference to existing TLDs. And what the gap analysis was also able to do in terms of key principles is that where SubPro does not have a recommendation that corresponds to the staff paper or the technical utilization paper, the charter will include questions about the impact of the recommendations on both future and existing TLDs.

And then lastly, there are some issues from those staff paper and technical utilization recommendations. That might end up being more operational or implementation focused. Therefore, it's possible that the SubPro Implementation Review Team, once they are initiated, and this working group or perhaps even its future IRT, they might actually overlap in subject matter. So if that does

EN

end up being the case, the expectation that is whoever basically gets the issue first they should alert the others to make sure that the groups are not working against each other, I guess.

So those were the three key principles that the drafting team agree to, and that helped provide the framing of the charter. So with that, I just want to very briefly go into the charter itself. As Edmon mentioned I think we'll do a deeper dive into the charter so we actually look at not only the sections but some of the specific questions in the charter. That's for a future meeting. So for today, we're just going to look at the charter at a high level and really look at the structure of it. So let me click over to that. Hopefully, you can all see it.

Here are the key principles I just described, and what I want to do is go into the sections. So there are, I think, A through G I want to say, so that many different sections in the charter.

So the way that it's structured is really around those two core, key principles I mentioned about the RZ LGR as a sole source for determining valid TLDs and variants, and then the second one was about the principle that variants both at the top and second level and all the combinations that come out of that should all be allocated to the same entity. So again, those are the two key principles, and they're really fundamental to the rest of this charter.

So section A is about the implications from utilizing the RZ LGR. It's about implications and how you would do it, and so that is at the top level if I'm not mistaken, and then section B is continuing with the RZ LGR. Actually, sorry, section B moves on to that

second principle of the same entity. Sorry. So section A was all about RZ LGR and all of the implications there.

Section B of the charter is moving on to the second principle about same entity. Section B is about how it would be implemented at the top level, and then section C actually moves to the second level, which you'll see as the header here.

There's obviously a number of sub questions which like I said, I didn't really intend to go into any detail. That's for the future and will actually connect to how we design our workplan. So moving on with just the high-level review, section D is about implications form the same entity requirements at the top level. So that's in respect of things like the registry agreement, registry services, transition process and the domain lifecycle. So a bunch of processes, procedures that would be likely affected from the principle of same entity.

Section E is primarily about the implications from the same entity requirements on the new gTLD program. So there's a number of processes within SubPro that would be implicated, like string similarity, objections, string contention, reserved strings, so a number of elements in SubPro once that program has been designed, we'll have to take into account how variants will be considered, and the same entity principle.

There's two more on this whirlwind tour through the charter. About rights protection mechanisms, so this is obviously going to be about the second level. So again, when you have all the variants applicable to the same entity, there may be some effects to the

EN

rights protection mechanisms like the UDRP and URS, etc. from having the same entity principle.

The last section is a different topic, it's not about those two top-level principles I mentioned about RZ LGR and same entity. It's about the IDN implementation guidelines and specifically about the process by which they get updated from time to time.

For those who aren't familiar, the IDN implementation guidelines are requirements for the contracted parties to adhere to, and they are updated from time to time, and the latest that was developed is version 4.0. Those were at the doorstep for the Board to consider and adopt, but the GNSO Council and the RySG had concerns about some of the contents, especially in the respect that they overlap actually with some of the topics within this EPDP. So version 4.0 is currently paused, 3.0 remains in effect. Again, the topic here is really about the process by which those guidelines will be updated in the future.

I see a question, and I'm not sure I can multitask effectively, but that's where I guess I want to stop on the charter, really just about the structure of it, that it's centered around those two core principles and then really, the rest of the charter is going to be about what does that mean if we have RZ LGR as the sole source for identifying TLDs and variant labels and same entity principle, what does that mean for all the policies and processes and procedures?

Thanks, Maxim. That might be a little bit of a detailed question for—and maybe actually one for deliberations in fact anyway. So with that, I'd want to stop there, and like I said, it's really about

high-level structure of the charter, and I know that there's a lot of folks on this call that took part in developing the charter so I of course welcome any of them to provide comments that they thought might be useful to help set this group on a good path. So with that, I'll stop there and hand it back to Edmon for now.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve, and thank you for a very concise and thorough walkthrough of the charter. It does tell us that there is quite a bit of range and scope that we're working on.

In response quickly to Dr. Gopal, I think this particular working group is very focused on IDN, especially IDN variant top-level domains and how they are to be implemented with the policies to be set for gTLDs, especially IDN gTLDs.

I note that universal acceptance and internationalization concerns are very important, but they will play a little bit into our considerations, but the larger part of our considerations would be very focused on appropriate policies for registries to maintain. The advocacy, the outreach part may or may not—in fact mostly might not be—part of what we discuss.

So, anyone, any questions, thoughts? And if Dr. Gopal, you wish to raise further, please put up your hand as well, but anyone else? Oh, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks very much. I'll be very brief. Thank you so much. That was really useful. Really just a question on the SubPro. This is not a

technical question, I just want to get my head around what is permissible, if you like, under this charter and what's not permissible. So the SubPro obviously gave some recommendations and I briefly read—I think it was section 25 or whatever. I can't say I understood every part of it, but I did read it. So the question I have from that is that we're not obviously going to go against that. And Steve usefully pointed out there some fundamentals that are in our charter, and that's our baseline, if you like.

But if we wanted to go further than the SubPro, i.e. not contradict it but add on to it in some way and talk about the way that variants might be handled in the future or whatever for continuing application scenarios or things like that, is that okay, can we discuss that, or is that outside our remit? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Nigel. That's a very good question. I think if Jeff is online, he's going to kill me for what I'm going to say, but I think in reality, it's that if—and only if—we discover something different from the deliberations from SubPro, we can certainly not only extend but make some adjustments to the recommendations. But that's only a very extreme "if." And I think the scope should be generally that unless—the idea is not to rehash the deliberations and discussions that have already been had at the SubPro, but if we discover through the discussion—and because we are going to do some data collection and analysis with the current situation and what might happen as well, I wouldn't completely close the door to potential extending or even enhancing, if you will, the recommendations.

EN

But I think the basic concept is that unless that is a very strong case, I think myself and generally looking at the charter, we would be resisting reopening these type of conversations. Does that make sense?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. I understand entirely. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you. Steve, you have your hand up. And I note Maxim's note on the chat. I hope I put it reasonably within what you mentioned. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Edmon. Just to add on to what Edmon was saying, I think another way to look at it is that the way this charter is structured, it's necessarily going to be looking at some of the implications in greater detail that SubPro didn't look at. So I'm not sure if you had specific examples in mind of what extending might look like in reference to the SubPro recommendations, but I think what this working group is going to do is be looking at a lot of the topics—well, sorry, it'll be looking potentially to extend the recommendations from SubPro to existing TLDs, and then more importantly through sections I think D through F of this charter, it's really all about what those impacts will be from having to rely on RZ LGR and requiring same entity requirements. So some of those more detailed conversations didn't take place in SubPro, and that's why it's here in this EPDP.

EN

So I think I wasn't sure what you had specifically in mind in terms of extending those recommendations, but I think there will be a much more detailed conversation here versus SubPro as IDNs were just one topic of a whole number of them in SubPro. Hopefully, that helps. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. And I think we're in agreement. Yes, unless in very extreme cases, we're not looking at revising or revisiting what was in the SubPro. But again, if we identify something—like for example, this just came to mind, if the appeals mechanism makes sense for some of the things for IDN, maybe we can add to the SubPro because the SubPro appeals mechanism doesn't have anything specifically on IDNs, but if this makes sense on some of the things that part of the questions that are asked, maybe that would be a kind of appropriate extension to that.

Any other questions about the charter in general? Obviously, I participated in developing the charter and just before this meeting, I glanced through it but I would admit that I haven't, specifically for this, reread the entire thing in depth. So I would encourage everyone to actually do that before we come to the next meeting. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Edmon. Just a question. I understand the ccNSO has already kicked off their ccPDP on IDNs, and I'm just wondering if, before we get into our work, whether it's possible to get an update on the status of that work. Obviously, we don't have to mirror

what's going on there, but it would be good to understand where the CC IDN effort [inaudible].

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Donna. As we talk about the workplan and operating mode, I would go into the coordination work as well. But I wonder if Steve or anyone from the staff—and I also note that Anil is the vice chair for the ccPDP as well, whether any of you want to quickly touch on where the ccNSO is on this. Steve, do you ...?

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. I would be happy to defer to Anil, or also actually Dennis who helps support the variant subgroup too.

EDMON CHUNG: Right. Okay. Anil, did you want to add?

ANIL JAIN: Thank you, Edmon. Right now, the working group which is dealing with IDN ccTLD, we have already covered a good amount of area in variant management. We have discussed about the definition of variant management, who should be dedicated the IDN variant TLDs. We also discussed about the second-level variant management distribution and how it has to be done, and the sacrosanct of [inaudible] LGR also in the process. So we hope that we should be completing the discussion on variant management in next one month.

EN

By that time ,the subgroup on variant management will submit report to the full working group, and the full working group will deliberate on this and come up with a report. So I also suggest that whatever the report that IDN ccPDP Working Group 4 brings, we can look at those suggestions in this EPDP also so that we can take some clues from that working group. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Anil. Hopefully, that answers part of your question, Donna. But I guess I've inserted myself into the mailing list as well. We'll try to keep up to date on the work there and definitely will be coordinating further.

With this, I'm looking at the time, and we're quickly running out of time, so jumping back to—unless there's anyone who has any burning question, I will jump back to Steve to maybe walk us a little bit through some of the working methods, because we have a few PDP 3.0s already, and I guess those of you from GNSO are probably going to be familiar, but we also have people from ALAC and ccNSO, so it would be useful to get a sense of the working group model and unless you want to take questions or anything, maybe jump to a little bit of the workplan too as well, looking at the time. So I'll pass this time to Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks very much, Edmon. Exactly, we don't have a whole lot of time here, so I just want to briefly touch on the structure. And actually, the structure for this particular EPDP is different. It's a member plus open, which is not present in other groups at this

point. So what that means practically is that this group has members, participants and observers, and the difference here is that members and participants are able to participate on essentially equal footing. That means that participants are still able to join calls, still able to provide input substantively on calls and/or on the e-mail list. So that's the big difference here, is that participants are able to join in the deliberations for the EPDP.

So where there is the big distinction between members and participants is primarily at the stage for consensus designations and taking part in the consensus call process. And so that's where only members are able to participate.

The one other part and distinction for members versus participants is that when this group—and they may not be, but when this group is looking for an official position from any of the respective groups, it will be coming from a member and not from a participant.

So the really big difference is about taking part in the consensus designation process, but really, the recognition from the drafting team was that this subject of the EPDP is of wide interest and they felt it wasn't sensible to limit it just to a small subset of members. So that's the structure for this group. We have a big happy family of members and participants that are all able to contribute to the outcome of this group.

So that was one of the first things I wanted to cover. I had mentioned the consensus designation process. Let me click over to the charter again. I think it's near the end. Yeah, there it is.

So as I've mentioned, some of you are coming from different groups, not necessarily GNSO. So we have ccNSO and At-Large and GAC at least that I know of. And so you may or may not be familiar with what consensus means within GNSO procedures.

So what you're seeing here is actually language that is lifted from section 3.6 of the GNSO's working group guidelines. But it's also captured here in the charter verbatim. I think it's actually more or less verbatim.

So what you'll see here is that there are varying levels to what consensus means. Full consensus means that all support or at least do not object to the outcomes of the recommendations.

One level below that is consensus, where only a small minority object but the majority do support the outcomes.

The level below that is strong support but significant opposition, and it is exactly that, so most support but there's a significant number that do not support the outcomes. And then the last one here is divergence where there's no support for any particular position but nevertheless, the group thinks it's important enough to include the issue or outcome in the report.

The one additional thing I wanted to add here is that we're obviously a long way away from doing a consensus call, but when we do get to that point, the consensus designation process is not based on counting votes or number of hands, and votes in particular are actually strongly discouraged explicitly in this language. So it's more of a qualitative analysis performed by the chair.

And what happens at that stage is that the EPDP team has a chance to challenge the designation of consensus from the chair and then those two steps are basically iterated until the assessment is accepted by the group about what consensus level exists for either the recommendation as a whole or potentially a recommendation by recommendation basis.

I guess the only last thing I really want to add is that while it's probably not ideal, it's a valid outcome for a group to not reach full consensus or consensus on recommendations. It's a perfectly valid outcome. Like I said, it's probably not ideal. Groups want to consensus, and especially full consensus on its outcomes, but nevertheless, procedurally it's acceptable that a group may not get to consensus.

And I'm not sure that this particular topic is quite as contentious as some others, so we'll see when we get to that point, probably 12 months from now or more. But I think that is where I want to stop on the operating model and working methods for now. If there's any questions on that part, happy to take them, but otherwise I wanted to briefly talk about the workplan that Edmon mentioned. So I'll pause for a moment and see if there are any questions.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. And I'll just add briefly that yes, of course, we hope to have full consensus or any kind of consensus, or in some places a rough consensus, but please feel free, if you feel strongly about certain points, definitely speak up on the issue. That being said, please listen to others' viewpoint as well as we proceed. Any questions on this? If not, Steve, please take us into the workplan.

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks. Actually, just wanted to reference one thing—I'm not going to spend any time on it because we're running low on time here—and that's the consensus playbook. It comes from a recognition that policy development and consensus building can be very difficult, particularly for contentious issues, of course.

So the consensus playbook stems from PDP 3.0, which Edmon has mentioned a couple times. And that was a Council effort to increase the effectiveness of PDPs, including the Council's oversight and management of PDPs.

So just a quick plug to the playbook that it's a great tool for participants in the PDPs, or in this case EPDP, as well as leadership. So it's there for both members and participants in this case, and leadership, to be able to recognize when there might be challenges experienced by the group and to help navigate those challenges.

One of the key principles is really recognizing the objectives that every member is trying to achieve and then realizing that it's not necessarily a zero-sum game where someone has to lose necessarily, but that there may be an opportunity to come up with outcomes that are mutually beneficial. So negotiating for mutual gains is the way that they frame it in the consensus playbook.

So like I said, not going into any detail, it's just a useful resource for any group, not just in the GNSO but for use anywhere within the context of ICANN business, you might see some usefulness in utilizing some of the principles there.

So with that, as Edmon alluded to, I will speak briefly about the workplan. The idea here is that in the next couple of meetings, what we'll probably do is look at the charter in far greater detail, make sure that folks are familiar with the questions and the different sections in the charter as that will all serve as the basis for developing the workplan.

We have a skeleton of the workplan already, which is sort of a template we use for any PDP or EPDP, and so what we're going to be eventually filling out is the detail around how this EPDP sequences the different elements of work that it needs to tackle.

And I think at least in conversations with Edmon, it's probably going to be no surprise that the first order of business will more than likely be making sure that this group agrees with those two key principles about the RZ LGR being the sole source for valid TLDs and variant TLDs, and then also about the same entity principle for variants, and then building out the rest of the workplan to make sure that all those—as I keep calling them— implications from those key principles, making sure that they're sequenced in a logical manner.

So I think what, at least in brief conversations with Edmon, the idea is to go through the charter, and as I said in more detail and make sure that we have a sequencing that seems to make sense. And we can only really do that if we're all on the same page about what's in the charter.

So hopefully that makes sense. Like I said, over the next couple of meetings, we'll be going through the topics and charter in greater detail, and then building out that workplan. And I'd say that

probably would happen in maybe the next two to three meetings where we then have a solid idea of what the workplan should look like.

So for any PDP or EPDP, one of the very first things that we're supposed to do is prepare that workplan and share it with the GNSO Council for their acknowledgement. It's generally not subject to formal adoption or anything like that, but just making sure that the Council as the manager of PDPs and EPDPs is aware of how this group will operate, and more importantly when it expects to deliver its outcomes.

So that's all I really want to share on the workplan. You'll see on what's shared on the screen that there's a couple of other things that generally take place at the beginning of efforts. One is that we'll be preparing a request for input from all of the groups in the community, so supporting organizations, advisory committees, stakeholder groups and constituencies. That's one of the required elements of PDPs and EPDPs, so we'll be working on that in some of the first few meetings as well.

Delivering the workplan is something I just mentioned. And then something that we all want to discuss now is about the meeting frequency and schedule for when this group will meet.

So with that, I want to stop and see if there's any questions but also turn it back over to Edmon for that last one about meeting frequency and scheduling.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. I guess I'll add a little bit to what Steve just said. So in terms of preparing for the next few meetings, especially next meeting, a very important part is to think through how we want to organize two areas. One is going through the charter, each of the questions. It seems like it makes sense to go through them sequentially as it's laid out, but if you look at it, please take note if you think that certain things should be put forward or certain things should be lumped together. This is the time to bring it up.

The second part that's important is how we organize our coordination work with some of the other groups, some of the implementation teams like SubPro, like the rights protection mechanisms and also the ccNSO work. So to me, those are two important things that we would immediately look to work on So please take a look at the charter and think through how we should organize the work.

And as Steve mentioned, one of the things that I think is important is that right now if you see section A and B, those seem to be, at least to me and also as we develop the charter, those seem to be key principles that have tails, if you will, into some of the other questions that we need to come up with recommendations for. So that's the sequence that we're thinking through. If you think that's not the right one, please bring it up.

So now to the frequency, I'd like to at least start off with suggesting that we do a weekly call, and also seeing that most people seem to be able to join around this time, I'd like to suggest around this time, maybe about half an hour earlier. As Maxim just mentioned, there are some meetings that seem to be happening

right at this hour. So if we start about half an hour or even an hour earlier, that would give us a little bit of time for others to get to the second meeting.

Does weekly meeting work for everyone, and does roughly this time make sense for most people? Abdulkarim says he would like a rotating time. This particular time was chosen so that everybody has a little bit of pain, but if this is very tough ... It seems like— please keep typing and I'm reading, or put up your hand. We would definitely do a Doodle poll based on some of the suggestions now, because I don't think we have a very strong consensus around this time.

But I guess, Steve, is it okay that we probably look at a little bit wider options to do a Doodle poll and then try to reconvene? If it's okay, we'll do one more meeting next week right around this time, but we'll do a Doodle poll to take a look at the different time slots that work best for everyone. And then at our next meeting, we would lay out a schedule that may or may not have rotating times.

Okay, that seems like a possible way. Steve, did you understand what I was saying? Hopefully everyone did.

STEVE CHAN: On the staff side, we understood. I don't think we'll be about to round out a time before the next meeting, so it makes sense to stick with this for at least one more meeting.

EN

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Let's stick with this. We'll try to start 30 minutes earlier and so the time works a little bit better next week, and then if we can do a little bit of a survey to see what times might work, then we can try to finalize the future schedule at the next meeting.

Sorry to overrun for a minute. Thank you, all those who have to join the RySG call and other calls. Staff, I know you have a staff call as well. Not seeing any hands up, thank you for joining. Anil, please.

ANIL JAIN: Edmon, can you reconfirm what are the timings for the next meeting?

EDMON CHUNG: Same time 30 minutes earlier.

ANIL JAIN: All right. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: All right. Thank you, everyone, for joining. Sorry for going over time. Talk to everyone next week. Bye.

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 TRANSCRIPT]