EN

ICANN Transcription
GNSO Temp Spec gTLD RD EPDP – Phase 2A
Thursday, 10 June 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/IALpCQ
The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
Page: http://gnso.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 the 10th of June 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, joining late today will be [Amy Bivens] from ICANN staff. But we do have listed apologies from James Bladel of the RrSG, Matthew Crossman of the RySG, Alan Woods of the RySG, and Matthew Shears of ICANN Board. They have formally assigned Owen Smigelski, Beth Bacon, Amr Elsadr as their alternates for this call and any remaining days of absence.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists for today's call meeting. Members and alternates replacing members, when using chat, please select All Panelists and Attendees in order for everyone to see chat. Attendees will not have chat access.

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.

Alternates not replacing members are required to rename their lines by adding three Z's to the beginning of your name, and at the end in parenthesis your affiliation "-Alternate" which means 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 other Zoom room functionalities such as raising hands, agreeing, or disagreeing.

As a reminder, the Alternate Assignment Form must be formalized by the way of the Google link. . The link is available in all meeting invites towards the bottom.

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, 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 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 good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. So, today's meeting, this is our first meeting of the plenary following the publication of the Initial Report last week, and the last meeting we will have prior to ICANN71 which kicks off formally next week.

So, our agenda for today is to do a quick review of where we are. That will include just a recap of the publication of the Initial Report just to flag the chair's statement that went to the GNSOO Council accompanying the Initial Report itself. That was also copied to the EPDP Team list. And then we'll talk about, really, two other sort of substantive procedural issues. And that's 1) looking ahead to ICANN71 next week. There's a session proposal where we will be providing an update to the community on the progress of a EPDP Phase 2A. And so, there's an overview of the proposed session, and the action for us is to identify members of the EPDP Team that would like to contribute to that community update. So, I think that's the key action that we have to tee up today so we're prepared for next week.

And then after that, we will speak about the possible intermediary work that we might be able to accomplish as a Team while the public comment period is open for the next 40 days and to identify things that we can do together as a Team, pending the response to the public comment to the Initial Report during public comments to prepare ourselves to be ready to go as soon as the public comment period closes.

And really, what we want to do is identify anything that we might be able to accomplish in the next 40-ish days that might not be dependent upon or that may help prepare us for public comment

feedback. So, we'll touch base on that briefly and then we'll go to wrap and confirm next Team meetings.

So, that is our agenda for today. We may or may not need the fully allotted time. I note in chat that there are some folks that may have to drop a little bit early, so let's try to be efficient. But let me pause there and see if anybody has any questions, any additions or edits suggested for the agenda today. Okay, not seeing any hands. So then, let's just go directly to the update on the publication of the Initial Report and the Chair Statement. As I said, I did send an e-mail on behalf of the EPDP 2A Leadership Team to the GNSO Council Leadership Team which was then shared with the Council as well as the EPDP Team, basically teeing up that the Initial Report had been published, that there were some specific questions identified during the publication of the Initial Report where we really hope to receive feedback and input from the broader community.

And in the communication, we incorporated some specifics to be able to help folks focus on the items that are sort of key in the Initial Report. The e-mail is in front of us on the screen in Zoom. It was also, as I said, copied to the full team list last week when I sent it.

So, let me just pause there and see if anybody has any initial reaction, any comments, questions, anything that they'd like to speak to related to the publication of the Initial Report, the Chair Statement, teeing the status up for the community, and anything else at this point. And thanks to Berry for including the link in the chat to the public comment proceeding and noting that the public

EN

comment period closes 19 July, a total of 45 days as requested by members of the team.

So, with that, I see a hand from Alan. Go right ahead, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Keith. Your report to Council, I thought—certainly in respect to Recommendation 1—was quite apt. And you end up with, "Is it unfair or an inaccurate at this stage to say that such consensus does not exist today? No, it is not." So, you're agreeing that consensus does not exist. And that makes it really clear to Council, but it doesn't make it really clear to all the other people who are just reading the report and not reading the message to Council. And the fact that we have a recommendation saying "no change", whereas, in fact, there is no consensus to make a recommendation to change …

Now, I'm fully aware that the outcome is the same. In both cases, no change. But the message that is sent, I think, is very different. And I still greatly regret that the report says there is a recommendation not to change, which implies that comes from this working group, implying some level of consensus. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. I put my hand up, noting that the e-mail that I think you're referring to—and the language that I included that indicating that there's not consensus on the question of whether to change—that was actually my e-mail to the EPDP list responding to some of the feedback from team members and all of that. And basically, that was my response back to our team on the list. That

EN

was actually not the e-mail that was sent to the GNSO Council. So, I just wanted to make clear that distinction.

ALAN GREENBERG: My mistake. So, I'll have to go back to that e-mail. This is the one I happened to be focusing on, and I misread the foreword on it because of that. So, maybe it's not clear to Council. But nevertheless, the basic statement that it's not clear to the readers of the report, I think, is the salient point that I was trying to make. So, I may retract the fact that your report to Council was good.

KEITH DRAZEK: Right. Understood, Alan. Thanks very much for that. And you may still very well have some concerns that the note to Council was not as explicit, perhaps, as my e-mail to the team list. So, I completely understand that you may still have that concern. But I did want to just confirm, for the record, which e-mail we're referring to for the transcript. So, Alan, thanks for that.

I have Margie and then Jan. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. I just wanted to echo what Alan had said and just to, again, express the concerns that we raised on the list before the report was published, that it did not accurately reflect the input from the team. And I think it's really important to go back and fix it. Or it leaves the impression, again, that there is consensus, that there would be no change. And that's simply not the case.

EN

We also see, if you take a look at some of the press, Kevin Murphy and the Domain Incite article also described it the same way. And I just think it does injustice to the discussions we've had. And so, from the BC perspective, we're very concerned about this. We think the process should have been a little more clear. We should have been given an opportunity to voice our concerns and update the report. And it simply went faster than was previously indicated as a drop dead deadline for the publication of the report. So, I just want to flag that we are very, very, very concerned about this and feel that we have not been heard.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Margie. Jan, next

JAN JANSSEN: Keith, I can only second the feeling that was shared by Margie, and I would like to look at how we can approach this. The way that report went out and the way it's characterized, I think, left many of us with the feeling of being systematically ignored or discounted. And this is really something that needs to be fixed.

And to be constructive and thinking about way of how that can be achieved, maybe there should be an explanatory note added to the report that went out for public comment to explain the "can't live with" issues that were raised in time and that were then sometimes subsequently addressed or ignored, but that were never discussed on their substance. So, these are, I think, critical issues to be addressed so that the community is very well aware of the status of where this working group is at.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Jan. Would anybody else like to get in queue? So, I think on this point, I think the report, as I said in my e-mail back to the list, the report makes quite clear that there's no consensus at this time, at this stage, for changes to the consensus policy recommendations or for new recommendations at this point; for new consensus policy recommendations that would require change.

So, I think the report itself is very clear, and I understand the concerns that are being raised in that context. But as I said in my e-mail back to the list last week, I think that this was the status, this was the state. And I think that it was important for us, as I noted again, to get this report out to keep us on time because, frankly, if we were to have slipped the date or missed the date, we would have been in the position of having to submit a project change request that may or may not have … And I think there is real question as to whether the GNSO Council would have provided us any extension as needed.

And this was the decision that was made to move this forward. I think the report itself is very, very clear in terms of the fact that there is not currently consensus at this stage, and that there's an opportunity, based on public comment feedback as well as further deliberations of this group, for that to change. Right? There is the opportunity, still, for recommended changes or recommendations with changes, but we're simply not there at this point.

So, that's my response, but I think the e-mail that I sent back to the list last week in response to some of these inbound e-mails

EN

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Keith. I'm happy to live alongside. I'm reluctant to belabor this point, but for the record, I think we respectfully disagree that the point was clear. In fact, the recommendation saying "no changes are recommended at this stage is" is untrue as worded that way. "No changes are recommended" is not true. Changes are recommended by the IPC. Changes are recommended by the BC. And go on through the litany of groups that are recommending changes here. So, respectfully disagree that this is clear and represents what the group has been saying. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Brian. Look, I think the key question is here is, what do we mean by "recommendations"? Right? Sure, there are individual groups or multiple groups recommending something, but the team itself as a recommendation for consideration by the community— it's not an EPDP Team recommendation, and I think that's what the report clearly says.

So, I understand that a recommendation from a group, an individual, or multiple groups are recommendations in of themselves. But it is not a consensus policy recommendation, and it is not the position of the EPDP Team in full for community consideration at this point. So, I think, look, the Initial Report clearly is not as far along in the consensus development process

as some previous initial reports may have been from other groups. And certainly, not all other groups.

I mean, there are other examples of PDP working groups where the Initial Report did not constitute consensus recommendations, but there are some that have in the past. And in this particular instance, I think it's pretty clear that we didn't do a consensus call. There is not currently consensus of the group, of the full EPDP Team, to make recommendations for changes to EPDP Phase 1 Recommendations or to create new consensus policy recommendations and requirements on these issues.

So, I fully note the concerns that have been raised here, but I think at this point what we're talking about is the fact that there's no consensus of this EPDP Working Group, this team, around a single or multiple recommendation where everybody agrees. And I think that's clearly what the report says. And it's important, obviously, for those considering it to read the entire report, and to read it in full, and to understand what the proceeding sections and the following sections say, rather than simply relying on a particular characterization outside the report itself.

So with that, I've got a queue. I've got Alan, Chris Lewis-Evans, and Margie. And then, we should probably move on. But if others would like to get into queue, please do so now. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Keith, thank you. Keith, what you just said exactly captures what those of us who have been speaking against what was published are saying. There is no consensus. Now, some of also have a

problem with the overall timing and the way things were rushed with very little time given for consultation either among the team members or with our constituencies. So, yes, put that in the background for the moment.

If what the report had said, instead of saying "Preliminary Recommendation 1," it had simply, in that place, said, "There is no consensus to make a recommendation on change," the report would have gotten out in the same timeframe without this concern. Our concern is not that the end result is any different. The concern is that there's something called a "Recommendation" with a capital R that says, "This is a planned recommendation to not make any changes." And there is nothing near consensus on that—exactly as you just said.

But the fact that it is labeled Recommendation #1: Do not make any changes" changes that overall thing. So, it's not a matter of when you had to get the report out and whether you could get it deferred. It's a matter of the wording of that paragraph and the fact that there's something called "Recommendation 1." Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Alan. Chris, you're next. Then Margie.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Thanks, Keith. And I don't want to belabor the point too much, so I think Alan has made pretty much the same point I was going to make. I think the whole process with the timing has been quite difficult. I think it's safe to say, especially with some of the 24-hour turnarounds and, as was mentioned earlier, I think how this looks

EN

the outside reader. I'm just concerned that we'll get more comments about the recommendation that isn't really a recommendation rather than any sort of substantive input.

So, I think I like Alan's point around, really, is the language of which I think is really well worded. It just needed to be an introduction to the recommendations, not actually placed as a recommendation itself. And with that, that's me. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Chris. And Margie, you're next.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. The other point, I think, that needs to be raised is that this doesn't even qualify as an initial report from the perspective of the Operating Procedures. It simply doesn't carry the kind of recommendations that should be considered as an initial report. So, I don't see how we get from an initial report to a final report. I think this is one of those scenarios that has happened in the past where you have to do a draft initial report again for public comment before you get to final because this is more of a survey, if you will, given that we did not have recommendations that had consensus in them. And so, I'd like some staff to look at this issue and provide feedback to the group on whether or not we are able to even move to a final report at this juncture, after the public comment period is closed.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Margie. And I will take the action to follow up with staff who are clearly on the call with us today—but take the action to do just that because I think it is important for us to be on the same page as it relates to the GNSO PDP Working Group Operating Procedures and the Manual and everything in terms of expectations. So, I'll certainly take that action to make sure that we get feedback and an assessment from staff that we can then discuss further as needed. So, thanks. Thanks for bringing that up.

I have to say … Milton, I see your hand, but I just want to interject briefly. I think, as we all consider the timelines, the time crunch, the urgency about getting this public comment period started, trying to keep the trains running on time as it relates to this EPDP Working Group, one of the critical factors throughout this process over the last five plus months now is the lack of timely response and input and contributions and homework completion of the team. One of the reasons we ended up in the crunch that we did was because we were late in actually receiving input on a regular and consistent basis.

And there was very, very little interaction and engagement among various groups and various team members outside of the silos, outside of the individual groups where groups were working together to bring something that was a little bit more fully formed or vetted, or at least socialized with other groups together to the plenary sessions. So, I just need to note that for the record; that one of the reasons we were challenged in this way is because there was not timely and regular completion of homework, and

that certainly impacted the overall timeline of the development of the Initial Report.

So, thank you for hearing me out there. Milton, you're next.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. Just listening to the comments and the complaints, it seems to me that they could all be essentially addressed with a minor change in wording of "Preliminary Recommendation 1." Namely, instead of saying "no changes are recommended" it would just say "no consensus could be found on recommending any changes."

I mean, to me, that addresses all of the complaints that we've heard. I think the outcome, the result, is pretty much the same. And, you know, some of us did try to stretch things to find some consensus, but failed. So, I really think that this kind of delay calls for new reports, calls for redrafting. This is kind of pointless. It's true. There was no consensus, and no consensus, as a matter of procedure, means no change. So, that's it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Milton, for the constructive engagement, as always. I have hands from Laureen and Jan. And then there's also some activity going on in chat that I need to catch up on. So, Laureen and then Jan.

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks. First of all, I really agree with Milton's very constructive and pithy, elegant suggestion. So, I wanted to go on the record for that.

Just about, I think, the challenges we all experienced. I think it's very much a variety of factors, and I know that everyone wants to weigh in about the challenges and that it's very easy to lay blame in different quarters. But I do think part of this dynamic was very much to fan the flames by the very stringent timelines. And I understand that those timelines were set from the start, but I think, given the reality of people's workload and the complexity of some of these issues and the need to confer across timelines, that the deadlines created a very challenging scenario.

So, I do take your point, Keith, that sometimes deadlines weren't met throughout the process and that jammed us up at the end. And I think that's true. But my other observation is the amount of new material at the end and significant changes to the report really created an impossible situation for the team, as a whole, to give the end product the review and consideration that I think we all felt it deserved.

So, I'm fairly convinced that what you're hearing is just that frustration from folks who really wanted a chance to look this over with more time and opportunity to confer with colleagues and come up with something that was even better. And that, in no way, is disrespecting all the work that has been done by the team members and you and the fabulous staff who I think were scurrying more than anyone to get this out. So, I just want to make that observation that when we're under a very expedited

process—and this was like super-expedited in the first place—that this is going to happen.

And what I would say is that if there's a way to bake in some cushion at the end or some more restrictions as to the amount of entirely new material that we have to have on our plates in a very short time, I just think that should be avoided at all costs. And I just wanted to share those observations because I think that created this scenario we're now in where you're hearing some [discontent].

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Laureen. And, look, I think it's an important observation and input here. And this is something that I think we as the team and the GNSO Council will need to take on board as it reviews implementation of PDP 3.0 improvements and reforms. And also, the job of the Council is to manage the Policy Development Processes—multiple. This is just one, in considering community workload in terms of the phasing of different work.

This this group was chartered back in October, if I'm not mistaken, or at least approved back in October. The group sort of kicked off in December, if I'm not mistaken—I'm sure staff will correct me if I get any of this wrong. That's certainly welcome—with the expectation that work would be done early. But I think your point's a good one about timing, expectations, and making sure we have the needed flexibility to get things right. But that has to be balanced by the expectations as set out from the very, very beginning, and the fact that this group is expedited. It was given, essentially, a three-month period to report back to Council.

EN

I went on record saying I thought that there was still an opportunity for the group to find consensus at least on guidance. That bought us an extra couple of months to get to the end of May. And we then did have some extra time to bring it into the current state as far as the publication of the Initial Report. So, look, I think that, yes, challenges. There are always challenges in terms of time frames within our ICANN community in terms of PDPs. But I think this one was pretty clear from the outset and, frankly, we all could have perhaps done a better job of getting the work started earlier/contributed to earlier that might have alleviated some of that pressure.

But I'm acknowledging the concern that you've raised and the need for us and the GNSO Council to make sure that we're reviewing, assessing, and taking on board any experience as it relates to future implementation of PDP3.0 improvements.

So, sorry to go on there a bit, but I just wanted to provide a little more context. But certainly noting, Laureen, the point that you made.

I have Jan in queue. Jan, thanks for your patience.

JAN JANSSEN: No problem at all, Keith. And actually, many of what I want to say has been very eloquently put there by Laureen. So, I fully second what she's saying. And I think, going forward, we when we really need to take lessons because the suggestion that that was made by Milton shows how easily does issue could have been resolved had last week's call not been cancelled. And, quite frankly, I think

EN

a 24-hour delay of publishing a report—nobody would have died as a result of that. And that would have avoided that we were spending already 31 minutes on this topic.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Jan. And I see a hand earlier in chat from Berry. Berry, if you'd like to speak at this point, go right ahead. And then we probably need to wrap this up and move on because I know folks have to leave the call a bit early today. So, thank you.

BERRY COBB: Yes. Thank you, Keith. I just want to speak about the timeline, the project management approach to this, and recognize that the duration and timing are challenging. But I want the group to understand and really all of the GNSO and all of the ICANN community, but this is not the only policy topic being discussed and we can't think about timelines in abstract or independent of everything else going on.

There are topics that the Council is struggling with on how to find the bandwidth to address things. We're talking about restart a PPSAI and TNT. Those take staff and community resources. We're talking about the Scoping Team on accuracy which is another important topic. We're talking about what to do about the broader topic of DNS abuse. We're talking about topics related to implementation of reviews that are important to various parts of communities. We've got RPMs Phase 2 for a review of the UDRP that's in the pipeline.

EN

So, here has to be constraints around the timeline and the amount of time any one particular topic can be deliberated on and expect some sort of outcome, or we'll never be able to get to all of the other topics that are on the plate now or in the pipeline. There has to be constraints and controls, and that really ties back to Keith's message about the instructions that were provided by the Council. This was initiated in October. There was a clear instruction for groups to start developing proposals. And we didn't get any initial traction until towards the end of February.

We were already constrained by the three months from the Council's instruction, but recognizing that we got the late start, the Leadership Team managed to extend it to totally five or until the end of May. So, I do implored teams to really think about the grander scheme of everything else going on when talking about how aggressive this particular timeline is or not. This was not a new policy topic. It was discussed in Phase 1. It couldn't be fit into Phase 2 because it didn't have a direct connection to the SSAD. But we are devoting time to this topic as well as starting to deploy resources around the topic of accuracy. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Berry. And I think that's really important context for everybody, not specifically to this group alone, but just generally speaking in terms of the Council's approach and the need for all of us to be more efficient as we move forward in terms of all of our Policy Development Processes.

But I do want to note the point about whether an extra 24 hours could have resolved this perhaps single-word amendment or

adjustment or one clause, as Milton has suggested. Yes, maybe. Maybe not. Because I've seen different views expressed in the chat already here today. But I certainly recognize that if we'd had all the time in the world, we'd probably still be working on it. But that perhaps we could have been a little bit more diligent in terms of that last phase.

But I really do think that the Initial Report is clear, and that the language in the Initial Report very clearly lays out sort of where we are. But we will take an action item. I'll take an action item to engage with staff after the call on Milton's suggestion that was supported by many in terms of the possible rephrasing of that one particular section.

But I have to admit, I don't understand the dynamics of updating an Initial Report once it's posted and what the implications are there, but we'll take an action item to review that. So, thank you for that.

And then, Sarah, I think I saw your hand go up. Would you like to speak at this point?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, Keith. I was going to ask a question, but I feel like we've said a lot on this topic and you're trying to move on through our agenda. So, I don't mind just leaving it at this point. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Sarah. If you'd like to get back in the queue, by all means. But, yeah, let's go ahead and move on. So thanks, everybody, for the input. Obviously, constraints are constraints, and we these are challenges that we've had to deal with and we'll take a take a look to see if there's anything more that can be done.

So, let's move then to Item #3 in our agenda which is a review of the ICANN71 session proposal. We have on the screen in front of us the table that was pulled together by staff with the support of the Leadership Team on our proposed approach for giving the broader ICANN community an update next week during the ICANN71 session.

It is currently scheduled for Wednesday, June 16th at 14:30 UTC. So, so it's scheduled for an hour. And we have an opportunity as a team, as the group, to provide an update to the community, specifically related to the Initial Report to help frame where we are and to essentially explain to the community what we're looking for as it relates to feedback. And so, what we would like to do rather than this simply being a chairs update or a Leadership Team update, is that we'd like to invite members of the EPDP Team to contribute as well.

So, on the screen in front of you, you'll see the table has, I think, six or seven different lines. If we scroll down there's an introduction by me as the chair. There are five preliminary recommendations or segments, and we're looking for a EPDP Team members to volunteer to help support or cover those five items, or at least some are most of those five items if we can get enough contributors. And then there's a wrap up at the end.

EN

So, I did see on the list today that there were a few names put forward. Brian, I think you nominated a couple of folks—Laureen, and Jan. If anybody else would like to speak up at this point, raise your hand at this point to volunteer. Or we can take that on in the time right after this meeting, but time is short because the session is next Wednesday and we want to make sure that we've got this locked in this week. And, yeah, so we need to get volunteers today so we can nail this down.

So with that, maybe I can turn … I'm not sure if Caitlin or Berry have anything that they'd like to add at this point from a staff perspective. But I think, and as you can see on the screen, the introductory speakers are expected to represent the EPDP Team and the status, not necessarily their respective groups, particularly, where there might be differences of opinion in the update. It's supposed to be sort of a neutral presentation of where we are rather than an advocacy opportunity. I'm sure everybody understands the dynamics there.

So, anyway, let me just pause there and see if anybody would like to get in queue. And I see a hand from Marika. Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Keith. I just wanted to mention that, based on all your feedback today, your staff team can start preparing a set of slides that can help guide the presentation which, of course, would reflect what's represented in the Initial Report. And that would hopefully facilitate the presentations and lighten the work of it for those that are willing to volunteer to present during the session.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Marika. Okay, would anybody else like to get in queue? Do I have any volunteers or confirmation from those nominated that they're interested and available? Like I said, we don't have to have this finalized today. Sorry, we don't have to have this finalized on this call, but I would like to have this wrapped up by the end of the day today, ideally, so we can get things prepared and make sure that we're synced up prior to next Wednesday.

Laureen, I see your hand. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I had responded to the list, I think, but I'm happy to be taking on one of these questions. I thought either question four or five. Given the GAC's participation in those questions, development would be best suited. But I'm happy to stay flexible. So, just confirming my willingness.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great. Thanks very much, Laureen. Much appreciated. And that means we have four spots left. Amr, go right ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Keith. The registry stakeholder group doesn't have a name to put forward at this time, but we would like to indicate that we would like to have one of our members presenting one of the recommendations. And if it's okay, we will get back to you all with a name as soon as possible.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sounds good, Amr. Thanks very much. And certainly, happy to take that as a placeholder and then TBD on the details, both in terms of which slot and which individual. Noted.

Is there anybody else that would like to put their hand up at this point, either individually or on behalf of your group? And if not, what we can do is just put a pin in this one. But please, please, please, everybody, respond on the list or to me or whatever.

Sorry, Melton, it's next Wednesday the 16th. So, yeah, if we could try to nail this down today, that would be really helpful. And thanks, everybody, for your understanding on that one in terms of it being a relatively quick turn. But ICANN71 is next week.

Okay. Anybody else like to get in queue at this point? All right. I don't see any other hands, so let's go ahead and move on then. And I do understand that folks may have to drop at the top of the hour, so maybe we can try to move this to an early conclusion today.

Next step is to discuss any intermediary or intermediate work through the public comment period. So, I guess the question for the group—and this is an open question is—what work can we do as the EPDP Team during the next 40 or so days of the public comment period to either advance our work separate from public comment or to help prepare ourselves for what we anticipate may come from the public comment period?

Clearly, the public comments will be what they are and we will take them on as they are submitted and consider them. Staff will,

of course, do the analysis and summary of the comments. But I'm just wondering what the group thinks in terms of what we may be able to achieve together in the next 40 days in terms of helping to advance the work. Are there things that we've identified during the last five plus months that we could reasonably discuss that would not subvert or ignore the public comment period, but where we could actually make some substantive progress to help move things forward? So, let me stop there.

Alan, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll be rather blunt. I don't think there's a lot we can do without rehashing the same arguments that we've made before. Berry went on at some length about the other things that are going on within the GNSO and within ICANN. And to be equally blunt, there's a lot of other things going on in our lives and all. Well, I think we could use the time off more effectively than we could use it to rehash things and to highlight the point that we're not coming to agreement of this point. Let's wait for the public comment. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. And I think that's a perfectly fair statement in terms of other obligations. A break might be more helpful than continue discussion at this point on things that we've talked about previously. But I do wonder whether there's some benefit to having continued engagement on operational questions. If we're talking about what the dynamics would be of a particular

recommendation and what the complexities or challenges might be and looking for ways to work through those or to address those. But I'm just sort of speaking at a very, very high and general level here.

So, let me put it this way. If anybody, any team member or group, has a suggestion for work that we might be able to address or tackle during the next month plus, please suggest it to the list. Put it on the e-mail list and let's talk it through and see if that's something that would be worthwhile putting on an agenda for an upcoming meeting.

Our next meeting is currently scheduled for Thursday July 15th. So, that's a tentative date. We could try to schedule something earlier. We could try to adjust that if needed, but that's sort of what we're thinking at this point. So, anyway, I guess that's an open question. We don't have to have an answer today.

I appreciate the feedback, Alan, that perhaps a break for this group might be better than continued conversation at this point. But I do want to make sure that the folks realize that there is an opportunity here for us to continue discussion if there's a general agreement to do so on some very specific items. I think the expectation is that we may or may not hear or receive anything brand new during the public comment period. It could very well be a restatement or a reintroduction of issues that we've discussed in the past.

I'm hoping that we'll have something new that will help guide the group or help create some different perspectives that might give us a path forward on consensus. But at this point, I think there's

an opportunity for us to continue our meeting if there's a benefit to be seen and to be gained. But, if not, then the group can agree to basically pause its until we get the public comment period closed. It's really up to us, I think, is my point. So, if anybody would like to suggest or recommend specific work items that we could deal with in the next several weeks or month, then please do so.

Seeing some support in chat for taking a break during the comment period, so unless we hear otherwise, that's what we'll do. But the opportunity is there if folks would like to put something forward. Sorry if I went on there for an extra couple of minutes, but I think that's where we are.

The next item is to consider the possibility of a mediated discussion. I'll probably turn to Marika or Caitlin or Berry here, but there's an opportunity for us to engage with Melissa from ICANN staff from ICANN Org, a professional mediator, to see if there's some benefit to be had in having conversations and engagement of the various groups and of the various team members to try to see if there's a path forward or a way to bridge any gaps that we've identified, even going into the public comment period. So, I don't know if I could turn to staff on that one to sort of tee it up. Marika, go ahead. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure. Thanks, Keith. So, from the staff side, we've been thinking a bit indeed what can be done usefully in parallel to that the public comment period. And I think what we've kind of observed and what maybe has been missing compared to Phase 2 and Phase 1 is the ability to have more one-to-one interactions—the coffee

corner conversation, stepping away, trying to resolve some of the issues which, of course, in a virtual environment has been more challenging. And we've mainly done work in the plenary setting.

So, we thought that it might be worth trying to see if we can try out here an approach whereby we take advantage of someone we have on staff that I think many of you have already encountered in some of the work you've done. Melissa Allgood who's a qualified mediator and has run a number of conversations, as well, in an ICANN context to potentially see if it will be helpful for her to have some one-to-one conversations with the different groups to kind of work through some of the issues and concerns that then could potentially result in some further groupings of different groups coming together. Again, really working through some of the concerns and issues that have been raised but where we have not had that opportunity to have conversations in a more informal setting.

Of course, this wouldn't be in the same kind of intensity or meeting level as the normal group meeting, so we hope, of course, that everyone still can have their deserved break. But at the same time, we hope that this may create—that if a dynamic going into review of public comments where some groups have already had the opportunity to have some further conversations on some of the proposals that are on the table, some of the concerns that have been expressed, and potential alternative approaches or adjustments that could be made that would address some of the concerns expressed.

So, that's at least some of the thinking that we've done from our side and where we might be able to kind of experiment with that

EN

and kind of compensating for the fact that we're not able to do that face to face at this point in time. So, that's a suggestion we wanted to put forward and see if that will be something the group would be open to trying out and seeing how that would go.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Marika. So, if anybody has any thoughts or reaction to that, by all means get in queue. If you don't have an initial reaction now, that's fine, but consider it. But I think the key point here is that we have an opportunity to use some existing resources at ICANN Org in Melissa who has expertise in mediation where it may be an opportunity for a fresh perspective, a fresh view, and somebody with skills that can step in and help us try to find a path forward or identify opportunities or areas for coming together.

So, that's that is an offer. It is an option. And it's one that we could implement, I think, pretty quickly. Melissa has been observing our calls and has been keeping up with the work, so I think it would be possibly a really helpful thing for us to do. And in the interest or in the sense of sort of not leaving any stones unturned, perhaps this is something the group should consider.

Marika, is that a new hand or an old hand? I'm sorry. Okay, I think it's an old hand. Thank you.

So, anyway, please take that for consideration right now. We are certainly considering a brief sort of respite for the group. The next team meeting isn't scheduled until the 15th of July, and then a following session scheduled on the 22nd of July. So, look, we have

EN

some opportunities here for to come back together. Let's take an action off the phone, on e-mail, on the list to come back if anybody has any suggestions for re engaging.

But I think the general sense I'm hearing right now is that a break would be very much welcome. But I want to make sure that folks see that there's an opportunity to engage together and to engage with some expert help in Melissa if that would be helpful.

So with that, let me turn to the queue and see if anybody would like to get in queue, have any other comments. And then we will move to close the call today. So, I'm looking for hands. I'm not seeing any yet. Any other business? Going once, going twice.

So I will, again, as I said, take an action item as we wrap up the call today to circle back with staff and the Leadership Team concerning the discussion at the top of the call, Milton's proposal. And we'll circle back to the group following that discussion.

So, any other business before we close the call? I want to make sure that staff has an opportunity to weigh in at this point. So, Caitlin, Berry, Marika, if you've got anything else to add at this point, now's your chance.

Berry says, "All good." I think Marika spoke not too long ago. Okay, I don't see any other hands, so I think with that, folks, we can wrap up today's call. I really do appreciate everybody's time, effort, contributions to the work so far. I look forward to seeing folks next week at ICANN71, virtually. But, please, we have an action item to nail down five members of the team to speak during the community update next week. We've got two—one from

Laureen, another from the Registries Stakeholder Group. And so, we're looking for three more. So, folks, please reach out via e-mail. Let's try to nail that down today.

And with that, we'll go ahead and close the call. So, thanks, everybody. Much appreciated, and good luck with ICANN71 next week.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I'll disconnect recordings and close out the Zoom room. Please stay well. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]