
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Temp Spec gTLD RD EPDP - Phase 2A

Thursday, 02 September 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/RgFmCg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the EPDP P2A Team Call, taking place on Thursday, the 2nd of September, 2021 at 14:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourselves now?

Hearing no one, we have listed apologies from James Bladel, Volker Greimann, Matthew Shears, Becky Burr, and Leon Sanchez. They have formally assigned Owen Smigelski and Matt Serlin as their alternates for this call and any remaining days of absence.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelist for today's call. Members and alternates replacing members, when

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.

using chat, please select “panelists and attendees” or “everyone,” in order for all to see the chat. Attendees will be able to view chat only.

Alternates not replacing a member are required to rename their line by adding three Zs to the beginning of your name and, at the end, in parentheses, your affiliation dash “alternate,” which means that you are automatically pushed to the end of the queue. To rename in Zoom, hover over your name and click “rename.” Alternates are not allowed to engage in chat, apart from private chat, or use any of the other Zoom Room functionalities, such as raising hands, agreeing, or disagreeing. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form must be formalized by the of way of the Google link. The link is available in all meeting invites.

Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance with your statement of interest, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the EPDP wiki space.

Please remember to state your name before speaking. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I’ll turn it back over to our chair, Keith Drazek. Please begin.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Terri, and welcome, everybody, to our final EPDP Phase 2A meeting, number 41. The proposed agenda is before us on the screen. I think it's a fairly brief agenda and I do not expect that we will need to use the full 90 minutes today. We may get out as early as 30 mins in but we'll see how we go here.

As far our agenda today, we really have two pieces of work. That's to give the team members an opportunity to provide any further or final input on the chair statement that I circulated a couple of days ago and the consensus designations for the report and the recommendations and also to confirm any minor edits that have been proposed. So those are really the two action items for the group today. I want to turn directly to that conversation. And then, before we wrap up, I'll have a few concluding remarks to make.

But really, the issues today are just any feedback that anybody on the team would like to provide on the chair statement—specifically, if there are any concerns—and then also just to go through and make sure that there's agreement around confirming any suggested edits to the final report. And I think the key point to the edits to the final report is that really, what we're looking for here is cleanup—nothing in terms of new material changes or anything that would generate additional conversation, discussion, dialog, or contention. This is really the final cleanup and just to make sure that everybody's on the same page as it relates to any suggested textual changes at this stage of our work.

So with that, let me pause. And, Merike, I'm going to turn to you and see if there's anything that you'd like to say at this stage before we head into the comments on the chair's statement and any inputs on behalf of our ICANN staff colleagues.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thanks, Keith. No. Nothing further to add. As you know, the only remaining pieces are basically the part of the e-mail that you flagged that would be included in the final report. I think there are already placeholders in the document that people have hopefully seen where this would go. I think the only other aspect that needs to be added is the dependent sheets that are part of one of the annexes.

So at least from our side, the remaining items, I think most of not all have already indicated that we expect to submit minority statements by the 10th. If any groups are planning to submit by the end of today, do flag that to us because it will help us for finalization of the report. But I think that's all that's remaining, basically. And of course, a few minor edits that were suggested, that we'll look at under item four.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yep. Okay. Sounds good, Merike. So let's just jump right to it. If we could scroll down on the screen to the proposed text to be included in the final report because that's really what I want to focus on. Yeah. Very good. So I think the key point here is that from a consensus perspective, my assessment is that the group reached consensus. I'm not going to recite or restate everything that I put in the e-mail or that is in the proposed chair statement. But I do believe that we reached consensus on the limited set of recommendations that we were able to agree to.

As I noted in my e-mail and in the proposed text, we were focused on a limited set, in order to be able to reach consensus. There's an acknowledgement that in the view of some—many, perhaps—we didn't go as far as they would have liked at the outset. But the final report does constitute what we were able to agree to, which includes, I think importantly, a recommendation to create a new standardized data element that will help move the ball forward and create the capability for the differentiation of legal and natural and whether personal data exists or does not exist as we continue to evolve either the SSAD or individual registrar consideration of the implementation of such a field.

I see a hand from Jan. So rather than me continue to talk, go ahead, Jan. Thanks.

JAN JANSSEN:

Thank you, Keith. A very short comment, as it's a compromise. There's just one word I see there that maybe should be edited because the text now reads, "The final report constitutes a compromise that is the best that could be achieved." I would rather say "that is the maximum that could be achieved" because "the best" can be read as a value judgment on the fact that this is a very good compromise. And I think that in view of the many minority statements that have been announced, that many groups do not consider this compromise as being the best.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Jan. I'm perfectly fine with that. I think we can either change the term "best" to either "most" or "maximum." So we can

take that on board. I think that's a reasonable edit to make, based on the language that I originally put down. So I'm perfectly happy to accept that suggested edit unless anybody disagrees. But I think that that's perfectly fine with me.

I saw a hand from, I think, Alan as well. Alan, were you going to make the same comment or do you have something else that you'd like to add? Go right ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't have a comment on the text itself. I was going to respond to the ALAC's level of consensus when we get to that. But let's finish talking about the actual words first.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Yeah. Would anybody else like to comment on the proposed text for inclusion in the final report? Sarah, go right ahead. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Thank you. I have a change to propose that I think is minor and I'm sure makes it a bit more accurate to the concerns. In the middle of the three paragraphs that is highlighted, the fourth line, where it says "associated with legal person registrations," that not really the only concern. I don't know if that's super accurate, basically.

I think the issue is just whether the benefit of publication was appropriately balanced against the risk of inadvertent disclosure. It

could be personal data associated with a legal person but it could also be personal data of a natural person that was mistakenly identified. So the concern is a bit broader than just associated with legal person registrations. And I would propose that those five words get removed. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Sarah. I'm just coming off mute there. So just rather than saying "inadvertent disclosure of personal data associated with legal person registration," we just say, "risk of inadvertent disclosure of personal data?"

SARAH WYLD: Exactly. My suggestion is to end the sentence there. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. Thank you, Sarah, for the proposal. I see a hand from Hadia. Hadia, are you responding to Sarah's proposal or do you have a separate suggestion?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Keith. Yes. I am responding to Sarah's proposal. Again, I'm not sure that this is the problem because removing the last "associated with legal person registration" doesn't also identify the problem. We are always talking about balancing the rights of the registrants and the rights of the Internet users in having a secure and safe online experience. What we've been talking all the time about is actually legal persons' data—whether it includes

personal information or not. But we were not talking about personal data in general or the fear of the publication of personal data in general. Again, if a natural person ... So I see Alan Woods' comment. Okay. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Sorry, Hadia. I could jump in here. You're more than welcome to come back in. But I think because—and the term associated with legal person registration data is actually repetitive in that sentence, now that I look at it, because it talks about ... Earlier in the sentence, it does refer to publication of legal person registration data.

And to Sarah's point, I think the question of balancing is versus disclosure of person data—the risk of inadvertent disclosure of personal data. So I'm thinking that because we've already referred to or I've already referred to legal person registration data in that sentence, perhaps the latter part is unnecessary. I think Sarah's point is also a good one, that it wasn't only the disclosure of those for legal person registrations. It was also personal data that might have been misclassified.

Anyways, I think because it was already stated in that, maybe we can just go ahead and delete those five words. It makes it more concise. If anybody disagrees or has strong objection to that ... I think it makes sense just to delete those five words, as Sarah suggested. It doesn't change, I think, the meaning of the sentence materially and it avoids it being repetitive. So thank you, Sarah, for that. I don't see any other hands. It seems like we've got support

for that in the chat box so I think we're good there. Sarah, thanks for that suggestion.

Okay. Any other comments? Any other feedback or thoughts on the proposed text for inclusion in the final report? If not, we will then move on and I'll turn back to Alan Greenberg for the comment about the consensus designations. So Alan, let's go back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you very much. The ALAC will support recommendation number one but I must say reluctantly. The reason we're supporting it is we strongly support establishing the technical basis for having the field. We felt that was crucial. And I think that's consistently what we said all the way along. We also understand—although it was not our hope—that the requirement to differentiate, and identify personal data, and all of those things was not the way we wanted it. But we're not objecting to the recommendation based on that.

The sole reason for wanting to object was the request that we've made multiple times in the discussion is to separate out the various aspects of the field, particularly the requirement or not-requirement to use the field if the registrar chooses to differentiate or has the ability to identify personal data. We know there are those who will have this field in existence. That's been said a number of times. But they are not required to use it. They can keep their own personal copy and not use it.

So that “may” instead of “must,” for those who are differentiating and do have values to put in the field—non-default values—we believe should have been mandatory. We are not asking the registrar to do anything in terms of differentiating or identifying. But if they are doing it, then it should be part of the field—not saying it’s published but it should be there as part of the formal field. And the lack of doing that gives us strong concern that although we’re establishing the technical basis for the field, it may not be used sufficiently to benefit the SSAD or anything else going forward.

So the inability to object to aspects of the recommendation and identify the lack of consensus, on our part anyway, with that part is a strong concern. I understand we are not going to rewrite the report today, and separate it into seven different parts, and get consensus levels on each one. But we are strongly objecting to the fact that that wasn’t done and we didn’t have the opportunity to do that. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. And thank you for the comment, expression of concern. Well-noted and understood that that is a concern and is a concern that ALAC has raised and others have flagged through the process. I certainly expect that that will be ... I should say the fact that it’s not mandatory for use, even for those who choose to differentiate, I fully expect will be the subject of commentary in minority statements that have been submitted.

I understand your point, though, is that because of the approach that I have taken in terms of the consensus designations, and my

assessment of our working through the “can’t live with” items, and working through to try to reach the most we could achieve—rather than the term “best,” the most we could achieve—at this point, is that I think we’ve reached consensus on what we have but we acknowledge that in many cases, folks wanted more and wanted it go further. We simply weren’t going to get there in terms of reaching consensus on the final report. So Alan, go right ahead. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you very much. To respond to Matt, of course, it’s going to be part of our minority statement. But the point I’m making is the process we used ... And Keith, I have great respect for you and you know that. But I think we, as a group, and you, as the chair, made the wrong decision in not allowing us to specifically identify what we are supporting because we really like it, and what we’re supporting because we believe the process was reasonably-followed, and what we are definitely not supporting.

Yes, it’s in the minority statement but we know how well minority statements that are read. There’s going to be a summary somewhere that says, “The ALAC’s supporting number one.” That doesn’t allow us the granularity that I believe should have been provided. There would have been no real cost to doing that. But it wasn’t done and I’m simply registering our displeasure with that. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. I understand the point and the procedural aspect of the intervention. So I completely understand and I also respect your views on that as well. Margie, go right ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. We agree with the statement that Alan mentioned, that the ALAC raised. One of the things we were talking about yesterday as we were thinking through the issues is that we would recommend having number one split, along the lines of the first recommendation being the data element and then a separate recommendation for the rest, because we have the exact same concerns that Alan has raised. Just to record on the record, we will also be following a similar approach in our minority statement.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Margie. Understood and all concerns noted on this particular point. I think the concern here, from my perspective, is that had we broken it out and had we been more granular in the approach, it could have resulted in a situation where other groups would not have supported other aspects or we might not have been able to reach consensus on, I think, what we do agree on.

So it was a balancing decision on my part. I take full responsibility and ownership of that. The concerns have been noted and I fully expect that, as noted, these will be included in minority statements. Like I said, I'm prepared to own that. Alan, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. As you were speaking, it dawned on me that maybe a minor edit—and I don't have the exact words but I can come up with something—within your comment, saying the granularity or the inability to split support on recommendation number one has been raised as an issue. That brings focus to the fact that it's not that just we're not supporting it or not partially supporting but the lack of ability to state our position in a more granular was problematic. If you think that's reasonable to put that in, I think that's a factual statement that no one can argue with. Then, I can try to propose some words in the next some time or in the next four or five hours.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. I am not opposed to including a point, noting the concerns that are being raised now. I'm not opposed to including a sentence that flags the concerns that have been raised here and the procedural issue. I'm not opposed to that. But I would ask that if—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. To be clear, I'm not talking about saying which point we're not arguing. We're not trying to relitigate the issue—just to point out the lack of granularity has been problematic.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yep. Understood, Alan. Thank you for that. I would ask that if we could try to get us some language here in this regard, to consider it as soon as possible. We're in the final stages here. We need to wrap this up. If we could actually have something to consider

before the end of the call, that might be helpful. I see a hand from Stephanie. Stephanie, go right ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I don't want to be difficult here but this raises the point that I raised in our last call—that the moment you start getting into the actual complaints, you raise issues for those whose complaints have not been addressed in the same language. Specifically, in this case, the lack of granularity is directly related, I would argue, to the issue of controllership and liability. And it is not for this group to spec out in that particular instance how somebody else, who's liable and is the controller, purports to deal with data for which they're responsible.

So if you want to throw that into your explanatory sentence, I can provide you some language, if there is agreement. Far be it from me to speak for the Contracted Parties. It's their liability and their controllership. But it certainly motivates us. And of course, attendant with that, is the issue of getting into granularity over registrants' rights. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Stephanie. I think the point Alan was making, as I understood it, is it's not on the granularity of the substance but the granularity on the consideration of the recommendations and the consensus designations that I've made.

So I think the point that Alan's suggesting is maybe one sentence that points out that concerns were raised about the lack of the ability to break out or break down the recommendations into

component parts for more granular consideration of consensus designation, which would have given different groups the opportunity to submit something less than consensus on component parts. But as I noted, I think doing so would have put the entire package at severe risk.

So I understand the concerns. I'm happy to acknowledge in the text that the concern was raised. And I think what that does, then, is points folks to the minority statements that will be submitted separately, focusing on the substance and focusing on the issues. So I hope that makes sense. Like I said, I think I'm okay with including a sentence to that effect, based on the comments that I've received here. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Keith. I have some concerns about what Alan's suggesting. It seems to be a little bit of a slippery slope. And chatting with my colleagues real quickly here, it's definitely making us uncomfortable. I think everybody's well aware of the Registries' discomfort with the use of the word "should" for guidance and our preference for the word "may." Would it have been necessary to break that recommendation out and have more granularity there?

I don't think it is. We voiced our concerns. We had an opportunity to raise our concerns with a specific aspect of that. We weren't opposed to the entire recommendation, just that particular aspect. And we agreed not to object to the overall recommendation but raise our specific concern in our minority statement. I think the same applies to the concern raised with recommendation one.

I certainly understand the concern with supporting some of a recommendation but having discomfort with parts of a recommendation. Indeed, this entire report is compromise and you're not going to be ... I don't think any of us are happy with the entire portion of every recommendation.

So having not seen what Alan is going to propose, I'm a little uncomfortable with this suggestion. I think we've all had chances to highlight portions that we're uncomfortable with and we have the opportunity to highlight our specific concerns with aspects of recommendations in our minority statement. I think that's sufficient.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Marc. Alan, go right ahead and then we'll probably draw a line under this. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't want to prolong this so I will try to propose some words before the end of the meeting or some time after it. I just have another meeting immediately after this, whenever it ends. The difference in my mind is that the various "mays" instead of "shoulds" or "musts" in recommendation one are essentially orthogonal. You can pick and choose them and each of them don't affect the other one. I don't think that applies quite to the one on "should" versus "must" on the guidance. But I don't really want to debate it. If what I propose is not acceptable, then we drop it and so be it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Alan, for that and thanks, Marc, for the input. I think there's a way to find the right balance in terms of the language. If not, then we'll just go with what I've already proposed. But I will take on the action to see if we can find the right language that demonstrates the delicate nature of the balance and the fact that, as I said, I made the call and I'm prepared to own that. If I need to acknowledge that further in the text, I'm willing to consider that. So let's take this one offline at this point. I'll see what I can do in terms of trying to address the issue but do so in a way that doesn't raise or cut crosswise with the concerns that Marc just raised.

With that, I don't see any other hands so let us then move to the proposed edits. Merike, I'm going to hand this over to you. Thank you very much, as always.

MERIKE KAE0:

Yeah. Thanks, Keith. We received three minor edits, two from the ALAC and one from the BC. The one from the BC came in on the mailing list and I think there have already been some reactions to it. The staff support team looked these over. We think that, on two, there seems to be a minor edit and it's hopefully acceptable to the rest of the group. But on one and three, we did want to confirm if that is indeed the case.

Number one seems to relate to the issue that I think Alan flagged. Of course, adding in "must" language is probably bigger than a minor edit. So we definitely wanted to check in with the group to see if there is agreement on changing or adding this as a minor edit. And then of course, on three, I think there was already a

response from Alan Woods, who indicated that this is not a minor edit and not considered as such.

So I think that the question really here is ... And I'm assuming we're not at a point to start wordsmithing or redoing some of the conversations we've had. So I think we just want to see here, are there concerns about, especially, one and three. Of course, if there's a concern about two, flag that as well so we can make a determination on whether or not those changes should be applied as minor edits or whether the report stands as it is.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Merike. I see a hand from Sarah and Sarah's also typed in to chat. Sarah, over to you.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yes. Hand was up to say what I said in the chat. I'm just confused about the suggested change. Thank you so much for embiggining that text because it is tiny on my tiny little screen. Okay. Yeah. Thank you. I'm looking at an older version. That explains my confusion. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Sarah. Marc had the same question. So, Merike, I think the question there was ... Oh, Marc. You have your hand up. Go right ahead. Thanks.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. Thanks. I guess I'm looking at the wrong version also so I was confused by the context. Can we have a moment to ... I can't quite read the screen there. Do you have a link handy to the version we should be looking at? And maybe, could we have a moment to read it to consider the context of the suggested change?

KEITH DRAZEK: Sure thing, Marc. No problem. I think Berry dropped the link in the chat just above or sent in e-mail notes. But yeah. Sarah says a five-minute discussion break would be helpful. Let's go ahead and do that for those who need to chat this one through. And then, Merike's just dropped the link into chat. Thank you, Merike. So if we need five minutes, let's take five minutes. What time is it here? Okay. So we'll gather back here in—

MERIKE KAE0: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, Merike. Go ahead.

MERIKE KAE0: Just wanted to note—and maybe the ALAC team can clarify. It is my assumption that that sentence is an addition. So it's additional language that would be added. Sarah's asking the same question. So probably the question for Hadia is if that sentence is to be added, where it would go.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks. Hadia, go ahead. I see your hand.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you. So yes. The suggestion is to add this language. However, if actually Sarah and others were looking not at the most recent version and they were fine with it, then we could also— because the version just before that did say that the field must be created in the RDDS. I think, also, they were fine with it until now when they realized that it's not there anymore. So yeah. it is an addition to what's in there now. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Hadia. I'm going to turn back to Merike for some help on this one. I believe what you've suggested is new language, substantive change. I see maybe Sarah has a suggestion. Sarah, I'll turn it to you first and then to Merike to help us work through this one.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Okay. I agree that something needs to indicate where the field goes. Yes. I think the footnote is trying to help do that. So it says, "Created means ICANN, etc., will define where it can be used within the EPP and RDAP protocol." So what if we just changed the words "and the RDAP protocol" to say "and the RDDS?" That would include the RDDS and the SSAD and then it's a very small little change. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Sarah. I guess, then, Hadia, does that ... Oh. I see a hand from Alan. Alan, go ahead. Then I'll turn back to Hadia to see if that addresses the concern that she submitted. Alan, go right ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I certainly have no problem with that. I would prefer to see the RDDS mentioned in the text so it's really clear what we're talking about. But a footnote is better than nothing and "RDDS" is better than "RDAP" because you have to go do a Google search to see what RDAP means if you're not familiar with the guts of this kind of thing. But RDAP is RDDS Access Protocol, essentially. So yes. We definitely think that would be an improvement. I would prefer to see it in the text but better there than nowhere.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Hadia, I'll turn back to you. And I see that Brian has said that he supports Sarah's suggestion as well. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Thank you. Yeah. I think Sarah's suggestion works as well. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Very good. Thanks. Sarah, is that an old hand. I think it might be.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. Sorry.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. No worries. Margie, go ahead. Thanks.

MARGIE MILAM: Is there a reason this can't be pulled up into the recommendation?
We note that in the IRT, there's often a discussion over footnotes.
It just seems like it's a significant part of the recommendation.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Margie. I guess that's a question for anybody that would
like to respond. I think at this stage, it's there. It's clear. It is a
footnote at this point. And I guess the question is does anybody
have strong feelings about making the change? Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think it's a good idea. Actually, it fits very well as a
sentence instead of just the footnote at the end of the first
paragraph.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Alan Woods, go ahead and then Brian King.

ALAN WOODS: Thanks, Keith. I'm just going to be the person that has to say there are so many different suggestions going on here in this last meeting that my head's spinning. I cannot say yea or nay to this because I genuinely don't know where we're putting this. So if we have a bit more clarity and a bit more time, perhaps we can come to a conclusion on this. But again, talk about last-minute changes that are causing issues. So can we be a bit more clear as to what we're actually doing here? I would really appreciate it and I think others would as well. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. I think—and I'm happy to be corrected by our staff colleagues—that it's a change to a word in the footnote and then lifting the footnote into the body of the text. So replacing "RDAP" with "RDDS" and then moving the footnote into the body of the report itself. Where exactly, I'm not entirely sure, I'll admit. I have Brian and then Marc and then I'm going to turn back to Merike to help us move through this.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Keith. I was proposing what I thought might be a more elegant solution there, which would be merely to add, at the end of the sentence that ends on line 109, just the words "in the RDDS." That would clarify the point that ALAC is trying to make. On, no. The screen went away. But that essentially would eliminate the need to have the footnote because that second sentence says what the footnote says. Just adding the words "in the RDDS" at the end of that sentence would take care of that, I think, and would be a light-touch way to convey that point.

I see that the screen is coming back now so maybe folks can see what I say if I ramble for a little while. There it is. That's what I was suggesting—a little bit of a lighter touch. Thanks, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Brian. A lighter touch and being concise is always good. Any reaction to this? I think I saw a hand from Marc Anderson. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Keith. I hear Alan's concern. This last-minute editing makes me super uncomfortable. This is an opportunity for us to mess something up. The proposed edit to add "RDDS" to the last sentence seems to make the footnote redundant to me. So at that point, the last sentence, with "RDDS" in there, it is essentially redundant.

I'd also like to remind everybody of the Registries concerns. With this recommendation, we're willing to agree to the creation of a standardized field that may be used for Contracted Parties that choose to differentiate between legal and natural persons or if personal data or non-personal data exists. We were willing to not object that it could also be used in the RDDS. Though we have some serious concerns with its use in the RDDS, we're willing to allow that if a Contracted Party chooses to include it in the RDDS, that they have this option to do so.

These last-minute changes really seem to be changing the meaning and going back to the suggestion that this is a field to be created in RDDS which again, this gets dangerously close to

losing our support for this recommendation. So I'm very uncomfortable with these last-minute edits like this.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Marc. I believe, based on Brian's proposed change to at "in the RDDS" at the end of that first paragraph is intended to replace the footnote, if I'm not mistaken. But I understand your point. We went into this today, looking to make any final cleanup edits. I said at the outset, we're not looking to make any material changes here. And I think if anybody strongly objects to changes that are being proposed or have been proposed, then we will remain with the status quo at this point, in terms of the text going into today's conversation. But I have a hand from Alan. Alan, go right ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I was going to confirm it was replacing the footnote, which now has disappeared on the screen. I was going to point out that the "in the RDDS" is a modifier to "will develop any necessary standards associated with the field." It's not talking about mandating the use of the field. It's simply saying that we will develop standards associated with it in the RDDS. That's what the RDAP group does. They develop standards for the transfer protocol of things in the RDDS.

So I don't believe this adds any level of requirement to use it. It just points out that we're talking about the stuff in the RDDS. And it's only talking about the standards associated with them, not how they're used or not whether they're used. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. I'm going to turn to Manju next. And then, what I'm going to suggest is that we draw a line under this one for the moment, move on to other edits, and then circle back to this question for a final determination of moving forward. I think now it's a bit more clear that this proposed text replaces the footnote. And if folks are comfortable with this, great. If not—if there's an objection to making this change at this point, then we won't. So, Manju, over to you and then let's move on to the next proposed edit.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I think people have expressed their concerns—serious concerns about moving this “in the RDDS” into the text. Actually, Alan, and for those people who suggested to change “RDAP” to “RDDS,” they were fine with putting it into the footnote. NCSG, I see Stephanie and I also typed in the chat that we would prefer it to stay in the footnote. So I don't see why we have to change to put it into the text because nobody was against putting it to the footnote and there are people who have serious concerns of having it in the text. So I would suggest we just keep the footnote and keep the RDDS in the footnote. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Manju. So I think we have three choices here—the text that is on the screen before us is one option, replacing the footnote; to leave the footnote, leave the body of the report as it is, include the footnote and change the terminology from “RDAP” to

“RDDS;” or to leave it as it was. So I think those are the three options before us. The default would be to leave it as it was, if there’s strong objection to making any substantive changes at this point. So if everybody could think about that while we move on to the next proposed edit and then we will circle back to this one for a final determination. Merike, back to you.

MERIKE KAE0: Yeah. Thanks, Keith. I’m scrolling and unmuting at the same time. The next edit was also suggested by the ALAC team. This is, I think—I’m trying to see—3.8.1. I think this was describing the language. I’m actually thinking this may have been in another document. I have to search for this but I think changes have been suggested to how the legal advice was considered. Instead of “applied the advice received,” I think the suggestion is to change it to “considered the advice received.”

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Merike. I think we, at one point here, switched documents or switched display screens. I’m not sure if that’s causing us some challenges or not. Oh. I see. Okay. On line 369, “applied the advice.”

MERIKE KAE0: Yeah. I think the number has changed a bit.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Yeah.

MERIKE KAE0: So this is the change. This is in the section that describes, basically, what the group considered or what information it used in coming to this conclusion. It says here, “and applied the advice received.” I think the suggestion here is a minor edit. Instead of “applied,” it should be “considered the advice.” So here I will show the change.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Merike. Does anybody object to changing the term “applied” to “considered?” I think that’s the proposal. Does anybody object to making that change? Laureen, go right ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks. Honestly, I can’t recall who made the suggestion. I do think in the guidance provided for those who may wish to differentiate between legal and natural persons, that actually, that advice was not just considered but very consciously and specifically applied in that guidance. So I do think that that’s the more accurate word. I’m happy to hear from the person who suggested the change. But I do think the original word is accurate.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Laureen. I see a hand from Hadia. Go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Let me tell you why the suggestion is to change “applied” to “considered.” Actually, we received Bird & Bird advice. We

considered it. In order to apply it, that means that we should have actually applied everything they said in our recommendations. But actually, this is debatable whether we actually applied what they said to our recommendations. I don't think, from some of us—some point of view. No. We did not apply everything they mentioned in our recommendations.

For example, when talking about differentiation between legal and natural persons—differentiation between the data of legal and natural persons' data—Bird & Bird do say that differentiation based on self-characterization lowers the risk that the Contracted Parties face them actually publishing data based on consent. So if we had actually applied their recommendation, we would have actually encouraged differentiation. But this is something we did not do.

So although we did consider their recommendations, we did not apply each and every thing they said to the recommendations that we put forward. And this is because, of course, of the discussions and the possible consensus or agreements that could be achieved. So we were able to consider everything they mentioned but we were not able to apply everything they mentioned because of disagreements within the groups. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Hadia, for the explanation. I have a hand from Marc Anderson. And Laureen, if you'd like to get back in queue, you're more than welcome to. I see your hand, still. But Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Keith. I discussed it with my colleagues briefly and we don't feel strongly either way and think "considered" may be a better choice of words. So we don't object to the proposed change.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Marc. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think a lot of this is semantics and what you think of as the advice part of the memo, as opposed to some conclusions about risk. What I would propose, in light of Hadia's remarks, however, would be "applied key aspects." That way, it is not saying we applied everything. So I'm hoping that that will address the concern.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Laureen, for the concrete suggestion. Let me just pause and see if anybody has a reaction to that. So instead of "applied," we would say "applied key aspects of the advice," rather than the term "considered." Alan Woods, go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: Alas, I'm going to be off Laureen's Christmas card list. Sorry. No. We're happy with "considered" or "applied." But changing "key aspects" doesn't really necessarily tell us what those key aspects were. It's reading into it. It's adding an awful lot of missing context.

It's adding missing context? You know what I mean. I would be much happier just keeping it as the original suggested change, just to consider it personally. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. It sounds like we have a bit of a difference of opinion still on the distinction between “considered” or “applied.” Would anybody else like to get in queue at this point? So I'm not seeing any hands. I guess the question here is, Laureen, would you be opposed, at this stage, of using the word “considered” instead of “applied?” I think, again, as we have from the outset, if there's opposition to a suggested edit, we will default to what was in the original text. Alan Greenberg, go ahead. Alan, if you're speaking, you're muted.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. I muted myself somehow. I don't know how. I'll propose something which I think is far too wordy but may address both concerns—is to say “considered and partially applied.”

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I can live with Alan's suggestion.

KEITH DRAZEK: So Alan’s suggestion was “considered and partially applied,” as opposed to “applied key aspects of.” Alan Woods, go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: I’m afraid not. Exactly the same concern on that. It is distinctly changing the meaning. We considered the legal advice. I don’t really like the suggestion that we’re saying here that we considered the advice but we ignored parts of it. I think that seems to be what is the outcome of this. So again, can we just stop going into the depth of this? We considered the advice. That should be clear from what the report is stating and what is in the report. Those people who want to go into the annals of time and listen to what we discussed about this, we considered their report. It should really be straightforward and simple as that, in my opinion.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. What we have here though is a difference of opinion between “considered” and “applied” and “applied” was the original text. So if we don’t agree to change “applied,” it’s going to remain. Sorry. Go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: Sorry, Keith. Just to say we have indicated that we’re okay with “considered.” So is there other people?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. But others are—

ALAN WOODS: Oh. Other people. Apologies.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. No. Exactly. But others would like to have “applied” and have some aspect of “applied” so we have a difference of opinion. Laureen, is that a new hand or an old hand?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just for clarity, if it’s between “considered” and “applied,” we prefer and think the original text is more accurate.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Okay. Thanks, Laureen. So I’m going to make the call on this one. We’re sticking with the original text. Thanks for everybody’s input on this one. So we will stick with “applied.” Okay. Merike, back over to you. Let’s move on.

MERIKE KAE0: Thanks, Keith. The last proposed edit here is the one that Mark SV sent to the list. I’m just scrolling up to find it. This was the changing of “disclosure” to “publication” here. I think Alan Woods, on the mailing list, already objected to this being a minor edit. So I think this is the last item that we’re discussing here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Merike. Yeah. So Mark SV submitted a suggestion. Alan responded. I see that Sarah is supporting Alan on this one. So it sounds like we’re not going to likely agree on this point of

changing “disclosure” to “publication” or vice versa. Merike, sorry. Remind me again where we are exactly in the document. Yeah.

MERIKE KAE0: Yeah. We’re here. So the proposal was, in this instance, to change “disclosure” to “publication—” [Mark’s edit].

KEITH DRAZEK: I’ll just open the queue on this one but it sounds like the proposed edit from Mark SV is not supported by Alan and Registries and see that others are showing that there’s some disagreement here. Go ahead, Mark SV.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. I did not recall that we had deliberately settled on “disclosure” here, which I what Alan said. So if I’m misremembering that, I apologize. The idea that publication is a subset of disclosure still doesn’t sit well with me. I’ve always felt that they are substantially different things. And the fact that we’re talking about it makes me think that readers will be confused about it, too. If you were to take that interpretation and apply it to Bird & Bird memos about publication that are also attached to this report, I think you’d find it quite confusing.

However, Alan says on the list that there are two places where this is clarified. I couldn’t find them. I apologize. So if we could look at those two places where this is clarified, it might resolve my concern. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Mark SV. Would anybody else like to get in queue? If anybody has a response to Mark's question in terms of the other references, that would be helpful. Stephanie, go right ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. There's a big difference between "disclosure" and "publication." Just because data is not protected by the GDPR does not mean you have a license to publish it. So we'd like to just stick to "disclosure." "Disclosure" is a word that's generally used in the plain Oxford definition and that's how it's being used here. So it's not particularly confusing, I would argue. "Publication," on the other hand, brings up the whole question of, "Have you checked for all the other reasons why you might not publish?" Thanks.

And of course, underlying my concern is that we would argue for not publishing data about non-commercial human rights groups, for instance, if it's going to expose them to violence. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Stephanie. Mark SV, back to you and then we will move on.

MARK SVANCAREK: Thanks. To Stephanie's point, the sentence does say ... It says "generally allows ... However, when processing, you should put safeguards in place." So I think Stephanie's concern about those other cases are actually addressed in the paragraph. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Mark, and thank, Stephanie. So look. I think on this one, there's a difference of opinion on the terminology so we will default to the original text of "disclosure" versus "publication." Let us them move on. So, Merike, is there anything else that we need to focus on in terms of proposed edits?

MERIKE KAE0: Yeah. I think we just need to come back to ... So not moving on but moving back to the one we just looked at. I think that's only remaining item, at least from our perspective, that's on the list.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Sounds good. I see a hand from Sarah. Sarah, did you want to speak to the previous issue or are we coming back to this one now?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I'd like to speak to the issue on the screen right now. I think it's a minor change that just makes the sentence more clear, I think, what I'd like to suggest. Where it says I row 107, "ICANN must coordinate the technical community," I think it should be "must coordinate with the technical community." That's what I think. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thank you, Sarah. I think that's a good suggestion, actually, and does help clarify as "must coordinate with." ICANN doesn't

have, necessarily, the lead coordination role, for example. But ICANN, I think, is expected to initiate or trigger the work with the technical community and to coordinate the effects with. I think that makes sense. Anybody object that to that? Stephanie, I think that's an old hand, if I'm not mistaken. And then I have hands from Jan and from Marc Anderson. So, Jan, over to you.

JAN JANSSEN:

Yeah. I wanted to comment on the edit that was proposed by Mark SV. I've heard we're talking about definitions. But disclosure, in the dictionary, it's the action of making new or secret information known. Really, I think that the concern that was raised by Stephanie is addressed, as Mark said, in the remainder of the sentence.

I really take issue because Mark said in his e-mail that this was probably an editing error, which I perceived as being the same. And that we now say, "Okay. We will move back to the sentence with the word 'disclosure,'" I really don't see how that rhymes with the consensus designation here. In my view, if we keep the word "disclosure" in this report—in this recommendation—I would rather say that this is something that has strong support but significant opposition, which is also an acceptable outcome for a PDP.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Jan. I understand that Mark SV said that he thought it was an editing error. I think the response that we got back from Alan Woods was that it was not an editing error and that the

language was actually discussed and intended in that regard. So we've moved back to the previous discussion.

So if we could move back to the text, please, on the screen. My assessment on this one is that the suggested edit from Mark SV, in his view ... I don't want to speak for Mark directly but my take was that he thought it might have been an editing error, when the response that we got from Alan on the list was that it was not an error—that it was not an editing question and therefore the original language referencing disclosure versus publication is the text that we have discussed and was basically agreed to by the group going into today. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Keith. I raised my hand on recommendation one. We're bouncing back and forth so I don't want to jump around unnecessarily. So can I confirm I should go with recommendation one?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Let's get back to recommendation one, which is still on the screen. And if we need to circle back to the other point, we can. But I think at this stage, we're going to stick with the original text of "disclosure" versus "publication" in the previous discussion. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks, Keith. So on the proposed edits to recommendation one, having had a chance to look at it, I think the

“coordinate with—” the addition of the “with---” and then later, the “in developing,” I think both of those are non-substantive grammatical improvements so I’m fine with that.

I think the “in the RDDS” at the end of the sentence subtly changes the meaning of the sentence. And we are not supportive of that change. There was previous discussion, when we had the footnote in there, about changing “RDAP” to “RDDS” in the footnote. I think that is a good clarification. I also note Manju, in chat, also added that she supports changing RDAP to RDDS in the footnote. So I think that would be a fine clarification. But I think the addition of “in the RDDS” at the end of that sentence is a problem as it subtly changes that meaning of that sentence.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Marc. So on this one, now, with the objection from Marc and the Registries to change the text in the body to include the term “in the RDDS,” we’re taking that off the table. So we now have to choices. One is to change in the footnote—so keep the footnote, leave either the reference to RDAP our change it to “RDDS.” So those are our two choices. The default would be the original text referencing RDAP.

So I’m going to ask if anybody objects to changing the text in the footnote from “RDAP” to “RDDS.” Sarah says she’s okay with “RDDS.” I didn’t hear any opposition to that in previous discussion. So unless I see a hand here real quick, we will keep the footnote, make the change from “RDAP” to “RDDS” and leave the text of the body as it was. I see a hand from Jan. Jan, go ahead.

JAN JANSSEN: Yeah. I think we are having the same discussion back that we had almost 20 minutes ago. I'm quite surprised with this here because I recall from this call that the general idea was, "Okay. This is exactly the same as the footnote. But having it in the text, it makes it more succinct and that being more succinct is preferable." I think those were the exact words that you used, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thank you, Jan. Yes. Of course. Being succinct and clear is always a goal and something that I hope we've all strived for, myself included. But I think what we're hearing from Marc and from the Registries is that adding the reference to RDDS at the end of the sentence in the body of the text changes the meaning of that sentence enough that it has concern and raised concern.

So because of where we are in terms of the finalization of this text—which was supposed to be minor edits and cleanup, not substantive or material changes—then we're going to need to default to the original text, keeping the footnote and making the minor change of "RDAP" changed to "RDDS." So I think that's where we need to end up on this one. We will also make the editorial changes of adding the word "with" and then "in developing" up above, which were non-substantive changes. But I think this is where we need to end up on this one. Jan, is that a new hand?

JAN JANSSEN: Yeah. it's a new hand. This is just a suggestion because there was also quite some concern of keeping this into the footnote. So I think rather than having it in the footnote, it works well as a sentence. Just add it as a sentence at the end of the recommendation. I think that would be a good decision.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Jan. So the proposal on the table is to use the footnote as it is on the screen. "Created, in this context, means that ICANN Org, with the assistance of the technical community, will develop a standard that defines how and where this field or fields can be used within EPP and the RDDS." The proposal on the table is to move the footnote into the body of the text of the final report. I will ask if anybody is opposed to that suggestion. Okay. Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: First, can we have a moment to discuss? My quick reaction, though, is it would be ... If we were to agree to this—and I need to talk with my colleagues first—it would go better after the first sentence and before the second sentence. So if we could see it as the second sentence and maybe have a moment to just caucus.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sure thing, Marc. Thanks. Go ahead and take a couple of minutes as needed. We will pause here and everybody take a couple of minutes break until Marc and the Registries come back to us. So get a cup of coffee if you need to. Thanks. And, Sarah, I see you in queue. We'll come to you when we come back. Thanks.

Folks, this is Keith. Just going to ask for maybe two minutes. Two minutes and we can try to restart. We've only got about 15 minutes left on our scheduled call. I know we're starting to lose folks along the way as well. So thank you.

All right. I note that Sarah has said that she'll have some proposed text for us here shortly. So we should plan on restarting here very shortly. Thanks.

Okay. So if we could gather back together, folks. I see that Sarah has suggested some text into chat. Sarah, if I could turn to you. Thank you for that. And if you'd like to walk us through that. And then, I see a hand from Chris as well. So, Sarah, over to you if you're ready.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you very much. I did share that suggested text with the CPH team and they seem to be okay with. So really, what I've done is left the first sentence the same. And then, the second sentence is combining the second and third sentence from the original version. So, "Created means that ICANN Org MUST coordinate—" and that's an all-caps MUST that comes out of line 110—and then, "with the technical community—for example, RDAP." And then, it's got the EPP and the RDDS from lines 109. So that is my proposal. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Sarah. I just want to check and see if we've captured what's in the chat and what Sarah just referenced in the text on the screen, just so everybody has the ability to see it. We

need to be careful here about making major or significant changes, with some folks having dropped off the call and all of that. But I see Mark SV says that he supports Sarah's edit. That's good. Chris, I see your hand. Go right ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah. I just proposed an edit. I think I combined one and the new pasted bit, whereas Sarah's done the new pasted bit and two. I'm happy with Sarah's, if IPC and BC are, and CPH, obviously. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Chris. I see that Hadia is saying plus-one to Sarah. So let me ask if anybody objects to Sarah's suggested edit on this one at this point and if anybody has any questions about it. Let me just pause here. Merike, is Sarah's suggested edit now captured in the edits on the screen in front of us? I just want to make sure that what we're looking at here on the screen is consistent with what her changes are.

MERIKE KAE0: I hope it is. And if not, I'm hoping that Sarah will point that out.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Sarah says she thinks it is. Okay. So I'm going to ask if anybody is opposed to the reordering and incorporation of the ... Because this does now take the footnote into the body of the text, essentially, through some rewording. So I just want to make sure

that everybody's comfortable with that. All right. I'm not seeing any objection at this point. I know we're doing some editing on the fly. Sarah, thank you very much for proposing the reordering and the reformulating. Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah. Sorry. I'm going to throw a spanner in it. I don't like the "created" in this context, at the start, because it then mutes the "MUST" further along is my only problem with this.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Chris, to you point, I think "created," when this was a footnote, it was a footnote referencing back to the "must be created" in the first sentence. So I guess the question is does it makes sense at this point to simply say, "ICANN Org MUST coordinate with the technical community," for example, and removed the lead-in "created?"

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yeah. That's my suggestion. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Yeah. Right. Alan says, "The joys of elevating a footnote." Indeed. So I guess that's a question for Sarah, who proposed this text. Is it okay? Does it make sense to remove, "Created, in this context, means that ..." as suggested by ...? Sarah says she thinks she's okay with that. And that helps us with being concise.

I'm just going to pause for a few seconds here to see if anybody has any follow-up on this one, based on Chris's suggestion.

Okay. All right. I don't see any objections to that. Mark SV says he's okay with Chris's suggestion as well. Okay. Look. On this one, we've made some editing on the fly. I don't think we materially changed anything in terms of substance. I will say, because of this editing on the fly and needing to make sure that folks have had a chance to review, and all of that, that if anybody strongly objects and presents a compelling case as to why this is a problem, then we would revert back to the original language for the final report. But I think this is a good step forward. I think we've made it more clear and it seems that we have consensus, at least those of us on the call currently, that this is a good change. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. For clarity, revert back to the original language or the original language and changing "RDAP" to "RDDS," which I think everyone agreed to. The rest of it was just trying to make it better.

KEITH DRAZEK: In the footnote—correct. Yeah. I think there was general agreement that "RDAP" would be replaced with "RDDS." The question here is how do we incorporate the footnote into the body of the text. I think Sarah's language and Chris's suggestion achieve that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. But I'm saying if we revert, you said to the original text. I think you meant the original text, modifying "RDAP" to "RDDS."

KEITH DRAZEK: It's a good clarification. Thank you, Alan. Yes. I think we had agreement that we would replace "RDAP" with "RDDS" in the footnote. So that's correct.

Okay. I think we are good there. So let us then move on. Merike, is there anything else that we need to speak to in terms of edits—in terms of the final report, the text, anything else that we need to focus on or can I move to some wrap-up remarks?

MERIKE KAE0: I think from our perspective, that's it. I think we've made all the changes that we agreed are currently in this version. The only thing we need to insert is the chair's statement and the attendance records. But I think Alan has his hand up. I'm guessing that's maybe in relation to the suggestion that he was going to make on the chair statement. So I'll stop here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Yeah. Thanks, Merike. Alan, is that a new hand? Is that what you want to speak to?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No. I just wanted to point out that you had asked me to propose some wording and I did in the chat, somewhere way above.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. I noted that and I'll take a look at that and see if there's a way for me to find the right balance in making the reference that's been identified but also acknowledging that there was some concern about how we do that. But I'll find the right balance and make sure that we can highlight the point without getting down into the weeds too much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If you can do that, then that removes significant concern for the consensus level. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. And thanks for the constructive suggestion. Okay. Thanks, everybody. So I'm going to make some final wrap-up remarks here quickly because we're running out of time and I don't want to belabor it. I know we've lost some folks already.

I just want to say thank you to everybody for your work over the last eight or nine months on this. This essentially concludes the work of not just EPDP Phase 2A but it wraps up the originally-chartered work on the EPDP. So yes, there may be some additional policy work that could be needed down the road. But this is a milestone and I think an important milestone for all of us working on this effort but also for the community.

So I want to just thank everybody for the good, constructive work and contributions that you made to the Phase 2A effort. Many of

you have been involved with the EPDP for far longer than I. And I want to thank you all for all of the time and effort that you've put into this. It's been a challenging road at times but I feel good about the work that we did as a group to come to consensus on this final phase at this point.

So I just want to say thank you to all the members, the alternates, the support folks in the background and your various constituency groups who contributed to this effort. And most importantly, I really want to call out and thank our ICANN staff colleagues for the work that they have put into supporting not just 2A but the entire EPDP effort. I said this to them yesterday during our coordination call that none of this gets done without the excellent support and the work of the ICANN staff.

So I want to call out, obviously, specifically, Merike, Caitlin, Berry, and Terri for all of the excellent work that they've given us and the support that they've given us. And thanks to those who have said nice words about me in the chair role. But frankly, I only look good because of the excellent work that they do. I think that it's really just important to note and thank them because for those that don't see what happens in the background and the constant work that they do to keep us moving forward, none of this would happen. So I really just want to make that point.

And with that, I don't have anything else to say. I think this is the conclusion of our work. I'm glad and appreciative for all of the effort that you put into this. And I think we can feel good about this final phase of our work. We'll look ahead to more interesting and new stuff on the horizon as it relates to GNSO policy development and policy work in the ICANN space and the multistakeholder

community. Next up, data accuracy, among several other things that are in the queue for gTLD policy development.

But with that, I think we can wrap this one up. Thank you all very much for your efforts. Let's go ahead and wrap up the call. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much, everyone. I'm giggling at Merike's note in chat. In case somebody hasn't seen it yet, we're still looking for a chair for that effort. Anyways, I will stop the recordings. Thank you, everyone. Stay well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]