ICANN Transcription

GNSO EPDP Team Phase 2A

Thursday, 22 July 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/SwPpCQ

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls 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. Welcome to the EPDP P2A team call, talking place on the 22nd of July, 2021, at 14:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll 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 do have two parties who'll be joining a bit later: Brian King and Laureen Kapin. And we have listed apologies from James Bladel, Matthew Shears, and Becky Burr, as well as

---

Thomas Rickert. They have formally assigned Matt Serlin as their alternate for this call and any remaining days of absence.

All members and alternates will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members and alternates replacing members, when using chat, depending on if your Zoom has been updated or not, will either select Everyone or Panelists and Attendees is order for everyone to see your chat. Attendees will not have chat access, only view to the chat. Alternates not replacing a member are required to rename their names by adding three Z's at the beginning of your name and, in parentheses at the end, your affiliation-dash-alternate, which means you're 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 functionality, such as raising hands, agreeing, or disagreeing. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form must be formalized by way of the Google link. The link is available in all meeting invites.

Statements of interest of 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 ICANN

multi-stakeholder 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. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Keith Drazek. Welcome back to our EPDP Phase 2A plenary sessions and work of the EPDP 2A team.

For those listening, I just want to note that the EPDP 2A has just come out of the public comment period on the initial report that was published. The deadline or the closing of the public comment period was Monday, this week, the 19th of July. So we are now in the process of reengaging as the EPDP team to map out our workplan and essentially what we're looking at—the next six weeks of work—to try to bring the group to consensus so we can deliver ideally a final report to the GNSO Council around the end of August. That is our current thinking, current timeline, and current plan that is before us as approved by the GNSO Council.

So I just want to take a moment to thank everybody for all of the hard work that went into developing the initial report over the last five or six months, as well as the input that you and your groups have provided during the public comment period on the initial report.

We're going to spend some time today mapping out or reviewing where we stand and the plan for addressing and analyzing the

EN

comments from the initial report public comment period, and then we'll switch to a conversation following the meditated discussions that took place over the last several weeks with Melissa Allgood. So I want to thank everybody again for the time that you made to spend some time with Melissa in terms of trying to identify and map out possible paths forward for consensus.

I just want to note, before I hand it over in a moment to our staff colleagues for the introduction of the public comment review, that, from my perspective and my assessment of where we are based on a very preliminary review of the public comments submitted, we didn't receive a lot in the way of new information or new proposals for bringing the group to consensus on a range of issues. So I think that we still have quite a bit of work to do as a team—the community team working with leadership and staff—to try to identify our path to consensus.

So, as we reengage here following the public comment period, I want to ask each person, each group, to really think hard about what the path to consensus is and what it might be and what we need to do individually and as a group to compromise to get to a consensus position that can be supported by the full team.

So, with that, I'm going to hand it over at this point … Or we'll move to Agenda Item #3, which is the initial report public comment review. There's a high-level overview of comment received. There's a link there in the agenda that was also circulated prior to the call. So I'm going to hand it over to staff.

I see a hand from Berry. Berry, go right ahead. Thanks.

EN

BERRY COBB: That's who you're handing it to.

KEITH DRAZEK: Perfect. Thanks, Berry. Go right ahead.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Keith. For Agenda Item 3A, I'm just going to give you an overview of the process and the tools that we'll be using to review through the comments that were submitted.

First, I'd like to thank the group for allowing us to continue on with this particular public comment framework, which consists of a targeted feedback or input mechanism via use of the Google form that is categorized by each of the five recommendations or preliminary recommendations that were outlined in the initial report.

Staff, we understand that this isn't the most optimal solution, or not all groups prefer this format. But there's some good news with it in that this will be the last time that you'll be confronted with this exact structure. If you haven't heard, ICANN Org will soon be deploying a new public comment platform via the ITI initiative. This kind of style will be an option available, but it will also have the flexibility for kind of the same format that most groups may be used to in terms of just drafting an entire document and submitting it in whole. But there are options to continue to move forward with the targeted feedback that we're looking for for specific parts of a final report.

And just to reiterate, this structure goes a long way in allowing us to quickly turn around and group comments together. And you'll see that as we go through this. But for the most part, it really replicates what we did in Phase 1 and Phase 2 and now here in Phase 2A.

So, from the public comment page, of course you can click the View Comments link. You'll see the raw data of what was submitted. We understand that this is near impossible for other groups to review comments from other submissions. And that is one of the features that will be useful for the new platform. Even if a targeted format is used, there will be an easier mechanism by which other groups can review comments that were submitted on the fly.

But as we've put this together, essentially what has happened is, once the comment period closed, we'd taken an export of the Google sheet and moved it into an Excel spreadsheet.

Now, this format, which I know you're not going to be able to read on the screen, is essentially just a tool that I use to be able to extract the comments into our subsequent pools that we'll demo here in a minute. But this really serves a few different requirements here.

First and foremost, it allows me to organize and color-code the comments by the questions. It allows me to quickly go into each particular question by groups and cut, copy, and paste that into our subsequent pools. It helps to be able to filer out uncompleted or incomplete submissions so as to shorten the list of only the

most meaningful comments and then, of course, to be able to tabulate the total submissions we got.

So in particular, we had nine community groups that had submitted comments. There were seven organizations, such as INTA, as an example (International Trademark Association), [ECO]—another organization—and a couple of registrars. So we had seven of those. We had one individual that submitted a comment for a total of 17 comments.

The last reason for putting this spreadsheet together, which is posted on the wiki, is really just a keep-us-honest mechanism. This isn't the formal raw data, but what it does allow for is, if necessary, you can go back to the actual Google sheet that has the raw data and compare it to this. But, ultimately, none of the content or anything has changed in here. It's really just an interim step to get to our true review comments.

So as noted on the agenda—and what I'm pasting into the chat here—this is our wiki page for where we're storing all of the public comments. The top area is a link to the spreadsheet that I just sent you. Again, it's still not a useful tool to be able to read the comments, but it's there as a reference if necessary. There's a link to the raw Google sheet that I just showed you as well. And then there's a row for each of the recommendations. The first is what we call our public comment review tool that I'll show you here in just a minute. Then there are also links to our discussion drafts that, as we've evolved this process, are an even more useful to be able to group the comments in a way for a much more expedient review of the comment submissions by the recommendations.

EN

So looking at the public comment review tool itself, most of you are probably familiar with this template, but essentially there are five documents, one for each recommendation. The preliminary recommendations are listed up at the top. Then there's a gray section for each one of the questions that were grouped with that particular preliminary recommendation. And then below it, in Column 2, you'll see the extracted response from the raw spreadsheets and the group, individual, or organization that submitted them.

Now, this template that we've been using in the GNSO for a while has probably exceeded its useful life because, with the way we used to review comments within working groups, we would literally go through each particular row, review the comment, and then, as a team, we would make a determination on whether there was a new idea presented and whether there was support or divergence for that particular comment and then ultimately document the action that was taken.

Since we introduced the discussion drafts, which I'll show you next—and what Marika will get into more detail—basically, this tool really only serves the purpose of being able to review the individual comments in an easy-to-consume manner. It's much easier to read the text by a particular submission. For example, here, this one for Recommendation 1 was submitted by the Registry Stakeholder Group, and this was their specific response to this particular question as related to Recommendation 1.

So, as noted, there are five—well, technically six—different documents, one for each recommendation, and then there was also kind of a sixth question, which was just additional comments

that may not have been covered under the other five preliminary recommendations.

And then the next part. So, for each recommendation, there is a link to the Google Doc, which is the discussion draft. You can use these as a quick link to get into the discussion draft or you can also navigate to the shared drive for the EPDP and you'll see all of the preliminary discussion drafts that are listed here.

Ultimately, before I turn it over to Marika, when you click into any one of the particular discussion drafts—I'll give you the link here for the first one—basically the intent with the particular document is just to summarize and group like comments together by the submissions and basically use this as a tool to facilitate further discussions.

So with that, I'll stop here and turn it over to Marika. She's going to give you more detail about how we intend to use the discussion draft and moving forward. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Berry. So as Berry noted—I think for some of you, this may look familiar—we took a head start by basically following the approach and the model that we also used for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 public comment period by translating the public comments received into a discussion table to facilitate review and conversations. Of course, we've taken this step because we think people appreciate the way and how it facilitated the review in Phase 1 and Phase 2. But of course, if there is a desire to go row

by row—that's definitely an approach—we could consider it as well, or any other way you prefer to review comments.

So as Berry said, the way we structure the public comment period has greatly facilitated developing this tool because having input per specific question allows a very easy grouping together of similar or related comments so that the group can consider those.

So as an example, you see here on the screen what we've done for the question that was asked in relation to Preliminary Recommendation 1, where I think the question was, is there any new information or input that the group should consider in assessing whether or not changes should be made to the recommendation that registrars and registry operators made but [they] are not obligated to differentiate between legal and natural persons?

So as I said, we've gone through all the comments that were provided and kind of summarized these in this table. You see here there's a disclaimer as well. This doesn't take away the onus that is on you and the responsibility that the group has to review the comments in full. This is really just a tool to facilitate the conversations. Of course, there are any essential elements that you think we've missed, as I said, we have summarized or reduced some of the comments that were provided, do let us know as well. We'll really try to take in the essence from the different submissions to, again, facilitate consideration by the group.

So what the ask would be, if you all agree that the best way to proceed and review the comments, of all the groups to go through

this table and use the column that you see on the far right-hand side and basically provide your input there based on the summary as well as your review, of course, of the full comments, whether any further discussions is required based on the input that has been provided. If the response is yes, we really would like you to indicate what is specifically in the comment that you think needs to be further considered that will help forward the group in its deliberations on this specific topic and recommendation in the initial report.

Keith already noted there are a number of comments that are, I think, more restating positions that groups have already expressed as well during deliberations. Of course, if there is something new in there that you think will help move forward the conversation, please call those out, even if you can [inaudible] specific on if or how that could change what we currently have in the initial report. I think that will be helpful. The more specificity the group has to look at, the better.

Then the idea would be that, based on where groups indicate that further discussion is required, that would be then the focus of the upcoming calls that we'll have by going through those and discussing if or how that changes the perspectives of the group and if or how the initial report should be updated to reflect the input that was provided in the subsequent conversation by the group.

I think that's it. As said, we have one of these for each of the recommendations. It may make sense to start your review by going through them from top to bottom. Of course, it depends a bit on how many items are flagged as, yes, items requiring further

discussion and conversation in how we build up the agendas for the upcoming meetings. So ideally you start going through them and try to cover as much ground as you can in the upcoming week. As said, based on that, we'll start building the agenda and hopefully are able to make relatively good progress in going through this review and being able to complete this part of the group's obligation.

And that's all I had.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Marika and Berry. I very much appreciate all of the work that has gone into this preparation on basically a pretty short turn coming out of the public comment period.

If we could please go back to the agenda momentarily. But I'm going to open the queue here in a moment for any questions or follow-up or further input from the EPDP team. So if anybody would like to get in queue to ask any questions or to provide feedback based on what we've just discussed and what we heard from Berry and Marika, please go ahead and get in queue.

But, again, I think, just to reiterate, we have an initial report that was published. We have a public comment period that just closed. We have 17 comments that were submitted, which I think is a very manageable number compared to other public comment periods that we've seen recently in the GNSO processes. So I think that, in terms of the volume, it's very manageable.

The question now for all of us moving forward is … Taking these public comments, looking for any new bit of information or new

suggestions, new recommendations for being able to bring the group to consensus, is really the challenge before us right now. As I noted, I think that there's—and as, I think, Marika just said—quite a bit in the public comments that we've received; and again, I'm just speaking at a very high level based on preliminary review and speaking personally—it appears that there has been quite a bit of restatement and reaffirmation of previously stated positions, which is perfectly okay, but it does continue to present a challenge for us in terms of bringing the group to consensus on recommendations.

And so I really want everybody to please, please, please think of this in the context of, what is the path towards consensus for this group? Is there a path towards consensus for this group at this stage of our work? And let's get creative to try to find and make recommendations or ask clarifying questions of one another to be able to identify that path if it exists.

So let me pause there. I want to see if anybody has any questions, feedback, or thoughts that they'd like to raise at this point based on looking ahead.

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. And I see that there's a little bit of activity in chat. I see Milton said, ""Is there a path to consensus" is better phrasing than "What is the path to consensus?"" Milton, I think that's a fair point. At this stage of our process and where we are, the question of whether there is a path to consensus or not is a perfectly legitimate question. But I hope that we will take the time coming out of the public comment period to review the comments and to overturn every rock to identify what the path might be rather than jumping to the "if" or not. So thanks.

EN

Anybody have any questions or comments? I'm not seeing any hands at this point. I really would welcome any input, any feedback, any questions for staff at this point in terms of process or procedure/next steps.

And I'm not seeing any hands. So let's then move back to the agenda. So—

MARIKA KONINGS: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, go ahead, Marika. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Keith. Sorry for interrupting. Just before we close off on this agenda item, I'm just wondering what groups think is a reasonable homework assignment in preparation for next week's meeting. Would it reasonable to ask you to at least cover the Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2 comments and discussion table and provide your input there? Is that feasible, manageable? Can we even add 3 to it? I think we just want to make sure everybody here is on the same page and clear as well on what needs to be completed before we go into discussions for next week's meeting.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Marika. So let's pose that as a question now for folks to think about and let's circle back to that question before

we wrap up the call today because I want to get to the discussion about our mediated conversations and next steps in terms of continuing conversations following the engagement with Melissa that various groups had as well as thinking about some possible breakout sessions and conversations. I think we need to look at homework in the context of those follow-on conversations as well.

But, please, everybody, do think about what a reasonable and manageable homework assignment would be between now and this time next week in light of the fact that we have approximately (give or take) six weeks left for the group to conclude its work on the final report.

So if we could then turn back to the agenda for a moment. We're going to move to #4. I'm, in a moment, going to turn this over to Melissa to give her overview and next steps following the mediated conversations.

But I just want to … Melissa, I apologize in advance if I steal any of your thunder here, but I think one of the things that we took away from the conversations that Melissa organized and coordinated—I'll just note that leadership and staff were able to observe most but not all of the conversations, and we really were there in observation mode—is that we have all missed—this was consistent, I think, across all the groups that we spoke to—the face-to-face interaction and the work that actually gets done during face-to-face interactions, whether it's at a regular ICANN meeting or a separate face-to-face dedicated discussion of a working group. The experience that we've had during the plenary sessions and over the last five or six months has really been challenged by the remote and the virtual nature of our work. We

EN

have not had the opportunity or the ability to have hallway conversations, informal discussions, conversations that might shed some light or illuminate a path towards consensus on a particular issue to really be able to get into some of the nuanced discussions across our groups and among our various groups to try to work through very nuanced issues in some cases.

And so we've identified that that has been, I think, an obstacle and a challenge, where had we been in a face-to-face environment, we might have been able to make better progress earlier or more substantive progress to dealing with some of the key issues and asking and clarifying some key questions that might remain and ultimately being able to ensure that we're not talking past one another and that we're all talking about the same thing when we're talking about in the plenary session.

So without going on too long, I do want to hand it over to Melissa here to tee up her assessment and her takeaways and her view from the conversations that took place and then possibly to map out a path forward here where we might be able to facilitate some more informal conversations of the various groups and individuals to try to move things forward in a relatively short timeline.

So with that, Melissa, thank you so much for the time that you spent with the team and with the group. I think the conversations were very helpful—in some cases, maybe therapeutic—but, overall, I thought that the conversations would very constructive and helpful. And I'm going to hand it to you at this point. So thanks so much, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thanks, Keith. Before I dive into some of those substantive themes that we heard, I do really sincerely want to thank each of you for your time and your effort and your engagement with me. There was a lot of candor and a lot of honesty that was shared in these sessions. And I appreciate you all being so willing to engage with me as a stranger to many of you on those fronts.

So we took the substance of these conversations, these themes that we heard. And leadership, supported by staff, really evaluated what we saw at a high level. And some of the big themes that I felt emerged were that many of you—I would almost go as far as to say all of you—have open questions or a lack of understanding of another group, amongst/in between groups. There are, as Keith just said, a lot of areas where we're speaking past each other. Multiple times, people engaged with me and said, "I don't understand why Group 1 says X." So we really thought that it would be worthwhile to present to you a way to start to engage to answer some of those questions to bring greater clarity understanding at least of one another's point of view and the rationale underneath those points of view.

One of the other themes that emerged that was very encouraging is that there's a genuine desire amongst you to better understand one another and to really dive into each other's points of view, certainly a recognition—and I want to belabor it because quite spoke to it quite eloquently—of the challenges of not being able to meet face-to-face, and how essential that really has been to your understanding and subsequent consensus-building process.

And then, finally, I really did hear a consistent willingness to try to find creative solutions and a value in the multi-stakeholder model.

So all of those themes existed across every single conversation and I think are fundamentally a great jumping-off point to try to move conversations forward.

So, moving forward, what we were proposing are informal conversations. You all received a document from Marika called Next Steps: Mediated Conversations that details everything that I want to present to you today. But I certainly just wanted to put it in front of you and give you the opportunity to ask questions about it. But these informal conversations are intended to be small-group, tightly focused dialogues that will not be recorded, and we're trying to make them akin to what might happen, like Keith said, around the coffee table or in the back of the conference room, just with a few groups of people trying to get creative and to understand one another. The sole objective of this point is increasing mutual understanding and using that mutual understanding to facilitate the plenary sessions. This is not an attempt to circumvent anything in the plenary, and no decisions would be made in these types of conversations.

So the structure that I've proposed for these, again, small-group, tightly focused conversations is that each participating stakeholder group/constituency/appointing organization would send one representative to talk. Now, it's not to say that others couldn't observe, but we're trying to really narrowly focus the voice at the table so we really can engage in substantive dialogues. And each one of those representatives would have two minutes to answer a very particular question from their own appointing organization/SG/C point of view but to also share their perspective on what some of the other groups that are sitting at the table, so to

EN

speak, in a little group feel about that issue because what I saw a lot of is a misunderstanding or an incomplete, perhaps, understanding of other groups' points of views—this whole lack of understanding[/]open-question concept.

So what we would do is that each individual would have those two minutes in order, just going around a table, point by point, to share their points of view and the points of view that they understand of the other people at the table. When we get back to the first representative who spoke, then we begin the clarifying conversation. That's the opportunity for that individual to answer to what other people might have said about that SG/C/appointing organization's point of view. And we can start to clarify those misfires. It would also be an opportunity for that representative to again ask clarifying questions of others.

The goal of all of this, though, would be for you to speak to one another. Certainly, I would be present for facilitation support and whatnot, but it's intended to be different than the way these plenary sessions are structured. And it really is to try to engage in dialogue that increases understanding and provides more clarity.

Now, in terms of the substance, many questions were presented in all of our conversations. What we did in trying to plan this out for you guys is identify some top-level questions that we thought might initially benefit from these focused discussions. And, again, these were in the table that's now on the screen that's part of the e-mail that you received. We've identified groups that we thought might want to participate in these narrowly focused questions. But by all means, that is not exclusive. Please reach out off-list if your group would like to participate in any of these questions. This is

just where we landed based on our observations of your conversations and those stakeholder group constituency discussions.

Ultimately, the goal here is really to keep the conversations tightly focused—I know I'm saying that over and over again, but I really, really mean it—and to keep them as small as practical, certainly not seeking to exclude anyone. But again, this is the concept of virtually pulling a few people together and getting greater understanding on a given topic.

Now, in terms of timing, as Keith alluded to with the homework conversation, if there is interest in engaging in this moving forward, we would like to do it in pretty short order. So it would be something that we largely try to schedule next week, which is my understanding. Hopefully, that could then inform some of your conversations about public comment, building on some greater understanding.

So, with that, Keith, I'll hand it back to you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Melissa. Great overview. Great summary. Again, just to reiterate, what we're hoping to do is to try to replicate the more informal conversations that would take place on a break at the back of the plenary room during a face-to-face meeting or hallway conversations or really the more informal nuts-and-bolts hammering out of various tough and nuanced issues that take place much more easily in a face-to-face environment.

Again, to restate what I think I said earlier, I think what we've seen over the course of the last five or six months are some fairly hardened positions that are restated over and over by various groups during the plenary sessions. And I think we've seen that continue during the public comment feedback.

So what we're hoping to do here is to break out of that cycle, give ourselves one more chance or one more change to work in a cross-group, cross-constituency, more collaborative, informal manner to try to identify, again, if there's a path to consensus and what that path might be based on an improved understanding of where there's continued conflict or disagreement but really to make sure that we're overturning all the tones possible to make sure that, if there are misunderstandings or not a complete understanding or outstanding questions as to the views of the various groups, we can handle that in a more offline, informal way and then bring back the results of those conversations to the plenary and hope that that will help the plenary move forward as a full team to move towards a final report and ideally some recommendations for the GNSO Council to consider.

So, with that, let me stop and ask if anybody has any questions, comments, feedback, or general thoughts for Melissa, for me, for the team, as we consider this in next steps. Any initial reactions would be welcome at this point.

Stephanie, thank you so much. Go ahead.

EN

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you. And I apologize if my dog barks. He just barked and may do it again.

I just want to raise a point that possibly we did not raise enough in our discussions with Melissa. I apologize if we didn't because I showed up late. In my opinion, we are now down to the brass tacks of what our legal positions are in terms of the interpretation of data protection law on a couple of key issues. I don't think we're going to reach consensus because these issues are inevitably going to end up in court, and none of us particularly want to look like idiots by pretending that we are willing to espouse a view that we don't think is legally sound. You've heard me often enough on the subject of the differentiation between legal persons in jurisdictions who are not familiar with that term or with respect to non-commercial entities that don't take the same attitude to registering the domain names that a media powerhouse might.

So I'm not going to move off that. I expect to be proven right, and I think its unrealistic to ask us to move from our positions. Similarly, my colleagues in the Intellectual Property Constituency, just to take an example, are not likely to move on the arguments that they're going to take to court.

So let's not … I hate to say "Let's not waste our time." I don't mean to suggest that we're not all acting in good faith. We are. But let's be blunt about it. Let's be transparent about it and say, "Look, we're not moving on this. Period." Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Stephanie. Well, thank you for that and thank you for being so frank and so blunt. I think that is a fundamental question for this group. And that's one that each group and each team member needs to take on board: is there room for movement? Is there room for compromise at this stage of this process on the key issues that were presented to us in the charter and the scope provided by the GNSO Council? And if the answer is no, then you're right: it's probably better that folks say that and put that on the table rather than wasting time over the next six weeks to try to bring the group together on consensus on a final report.

But I hope that we would be able to at least go through the analysis of the public comments and be able to engage in the more informal conversations and discussions that we've just described and proposed to be able to ensure that we've uncovered or overturned all the stones, to make sure that we've done our work and we can say with confidence that we did the best that we could under the circumstances and under the current ecosystem environment and external dynamics to develop the policy or recommendation or best practices or guidance— whatever it may be—to help inform this discussion.

So I hear what you're saying, and if others feel that there is no path forward and you're locked into that position at this point, then by all means feel free to say so. But I'd like to think that we could continue this work over the next couple of weeks, go through the analysis of public comments, have the informal conversations. And then, perhaps in a couple of weeks, we'll have a better understanding of where each group is.

But I really do—again, speaking personally here—think we've been limited by the lack of face-to-face engagement. That was identified as a key takeaway by almost all the groups that we had during the informal conversations with Melissa. And I want to see if there's an opportunity for us to break through on some of these areas by having those conversations.

So let me just take Stephanie's intervention as an opportunity to ask if anyone, any groups, have any, again, initial feedback to this proposal in terms of moving forward. Is anybody fundamentally opposed to having these more informal breakout sessions on key topics, more informal conversations, that will hopefully inform the plenary further moving forward? And if anybody else wants to speak to anything at this stage, go ahead and put up your hand in the queue. We've got an open queue at this point.

Okay. Brian, I see your hand. Go ahead. Thanks.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Keith. Thanks also for putting this together. Thanks for meeting with us. We are encouraged by the potential for mediation. Personally, I'm a big fan of mediation [practice] and I'm looking forward to working with colleagues on this. [inaudible]. Let's give it a shot. I think, as we expressed to Melissa, I think there are some opportunities for us to collaborate and to come to consensus on some things. [inaudible]. So I just wanted to support the concept. And thanks to [inaudible] and staff for helping get us here. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Brian. Volker, you're next.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Thank you. I personally think that compromise should be possible in some form—maybe not on every point, but we didn't move into this effort thinking that nothing would be done here and we'd just be sitting off our time and waiting for this PDP to pass.

I think we've been very clear from the outset that the groups that have issues with the status quo should be the ones that are presenting the compromised positions that they would feel would be acceptable to the parties. But so far, we've not heard that. Or at least I feel we have not heard that. We have just heard that certain things would be nice to have but not how they could be legally implemented.

So I think the onus for the compromise is really on the side of those that want a change from the status quo. We are willing to compromise with providing further incentives and further ways of voluntary conduct and voluntary practices that would be then something that registrars and registries could implement. But if you want something that is going beyond that, then I think the onus is on you to tell us how it's possible or why we should accept it. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Volker. I appreciate that.

If anybody would like to get in queue, please do.

Just at a very high level, obviously compromise requires movement from multiple parties or both sides of an issue, but I think fundamentally the question here is, if there is to be a change to existing policy or the creation of new policy, there needs to be concrete proposals put on the table. That's, I think, one of the things that we struggled with early in this process, early in the EPDP 2A process: getting concrete proposals on the table that would generate that consensus or generate an opportunity for compromise. I think there were some that were put forward, but it was pretty limited, frankly. And I think that do still have that challenge.

But let me stop there. Anybody else would like to get in queue at this stage?

And I thought I saw a hand—yes. Alan Greenberg, go right ahead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On that last issue, Keith, my recollection is there were a number of proposals made, but the group—I guess via you, the Chair—decided that we would stop talking about them and go into guidance instead. So it's a chicken-and-egg thing. You have to have proposals, but you also have to be willing to talk about them and explore them. And my recollection is that we essentially abandoned that path and never really went back to it. I may be misremembering, but … Thank you.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. And I note that that issue of guidance versus new consensus policy or updated consensus policy requirements was something that was brought up during conversations with Melissa as well.

Look, on this point, my view on the question on guidance versus consensus policy requirements is—at least at this stage—that this group has not been able to even come to consensus on guidance at this point, on voluntary measures or guidance to registrars that choose to differentiate between legal versus natural.

And I'm struggling to see where there might have been consensus and compromise towards consensus on new consensus policy requirements. It just seems to me that, had there been that, it would have come to the fore, it would have been discussed by the group, and it would have been something that would have percolated to the surface, if you will. And the fact that we can't even agree, at this stage, or have not yet agreed on basic guidance really tells me that there's no appetite for a new consensus policy recommendation or changes to the existing consensus policy recommendations from Phase 1 or Phase 2.

So I hear what you're saying. There were a couple of proposals put on the table very early in the process, but at that time, it was, I think, pretty clear to me that there was not consensus at that stage. We spent several cycles and multiple meetings talking about them, and then we pivoted to talking about the question of guidance.

If anybody has a proposal to consider new consensus policy recommendations or changes to the EPDP Phase 1 or Phase 2

policies, then by all means put them on the table and demonstrate where you think that might have consensus or might be able to reach consensus because, so far, I haven't seen it. And I don't feel that the groups have worked together offline to be able to bring that to the plenary at this stage.

But let me stop there. Alan, is that a new hand or an old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a new hand.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I wasn't disagreeing with the ultimate conclusion [that] I don't think we will come to consensus on a new policy on legal/natural differentiation for a bunch of reasons, but I was disagreeing with your analysis that it was because of a lack of proposals. We did have some on the table. We spent a fair amount of time talking about the GAC one and then pretty well abandoned all of the concepts of looking at hard proposals in favor of the guidance.

So I'm not disagreeing, saying that, if we had gone forward, we would have continued with it, but it wasn't a lack of proposals, necessarily, that stopped us. So just for clarity. Thank you.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. I appreciate that. And you're right: there were a couple of proposals put forward. I know that there was one put forward by the GAC. There was another, I believe, put forward by the registrars. But I think, during those initial couple of months, it became pretty clear that there was a pretty significant divide among the group on those concrete proposals, and that was essentially why we ended up talking about the question of guidance.

But let me stop and hand it over to Brian.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Keith. I'm noting Marika's hand is up for Milton after this. I do think there are opportunities for consensus here. We flagged [inaudible] comment, in particular around the use of [appeal]. There's, I think, some extremes present. In between those extremes, there's a lot of colors on the spectrum where we could land as far as the [usage of field]. So that's a [field] we should unpack. I think there's a couple proposals there—sorry. I'll try to speak closer to the mic. But there are proposals there in that spectrum of ways that we can [inaudible]. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Brian. And thanks for bringing us back to the actual substance. And I do think that there's an opportunity—again, speaking personally—here around Topic #1 on our screen: the standardized data element. I see this as a possible and perhaps the most likely path forward to a substantive recommendation. And I really, really want us to explore that. I want us to explore all

of the points, but I think this question of the standardized data element is fundamentally one of the areas where—again, I'm speaking personally here—we should be able to come together. I'll just put that out there.

I see Marika's hand for Milton. Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Sorry about that. I really have spent the last five minutes looking for the Hand Raise function and I can't find it. So maybe I do need to update.

But anyway, I'm going to have to leave at 11:00. We have a faculty meeting. So I wanted to say, in terms of the movement towards consensus, my belief is that the breakdown occurred not so much around the issues we're debating now but around the SSAD, around the access mechanism. That's where we really, I think, pulled into a cul-de-sac because, from our point of view, most of the negotiations around the Phase 1 consensus policy were predicated on the assumption that there would be an access mechanism and that many of the concerns that the other faction had regarding access to registration data would have been helped or ameliorated by the way we handled the SSAD.

And when essentially certain stakeholder groups decided they hate the SSAD and would not accept it and began visibly lobbying against it, it really made it very difficult to agree on how we were going to handle the other issues because the SSAD was kind of a safety valve for many of the concerns that the—legitimate concerns—people who wanted access to the registration data

EN

had. But then, if we don't have an SSAD, essentially, you're pushed into a choice between moving back towards the direction of the original WHOIS or nothing at all; what we have; the current status quo.

So, to my mind, that is the real problem. And if we can agree on appropriate access mechanisms, then we can pretty much move ahead and can close this […] because I don't think there's going to be a lot of consensus on furthering opening up of the data elements[,] as you know. We tried a certain idea that didn't get consensus, and I just don't see much room there. But I do see room for movement on the SSAD. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Milton. So, again, I think your point about the SSAD and the interrelation or interconnectedness of these issues—the ones that we're talking about today, and specifically on legal and natural but also on the contactability question—I think are related, as you've noted to SSAD, can be related to SSAD.

And as I recall, there were conversations that took place during some of our plenary sessions (and I think may be supported in some of the comments that were submitted) on that there could be a larger appetite for differentiation and even looking at something like the standardized data element if it's built into or formulated in the context of SSAD rather than something that might be completely wide open.

But I'm quickly getting out over my skis here, so I just did want to note … Milton, thank you for that point. I think that the SSAD

context is important, and perhaps that's an area of focus or a discussion point that could be the subject of some of these more informal conversations that we've proposed. So I'd like to put a point there and say maybe that's a question that really warrants further discussion under Topic #1 at a minimum.

Hadia, I see your hand. You're next. Go ahead.

And, Hadia, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

Okay, we'll give Hadia a minute—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Keith. So I've raised my hand in order to add my voice to Brian's. I still think that there is a possibility for consensus in relation to the first topic and maybe the standardized element and data element.

And, also, I agree with the whole direction that, whenever we cannot really reach consensus, putting out a guidance would be an acceptable output. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Hadia. Just to clarify—I want to make sure I heard you correctly—did you say "an acceptable output" or "an unacceptable output"? I just want to make sure I got you correctly.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Acceptable.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you very much. Sorry. I think my audio cut out for just a split second there.

Okay, the queue is open. Would anybody else like to get in queue at this point?

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. If we could go back to the agenda. Thank you very much.

So I want to ask again, one more time, does anybody object or oppose the proposal that we've put forward—that staff, leadership, with Melissa's support, have put forward—in terms of the mediated conversations and the proposed next steps specifically about helping coordinate and facilitate some informal conversations offline on some specific topics. And, again, what we're going to do is to propose some very specific targeted questions or issues that have been captured here so that the conversations can be focused and efficient. And then the goal, of course, is to bring the output or at least bring some acknowledgement of those conversations back to the plenary for further discussion.

And I'm not seeing any objection at this point. I see a hand from Alan. Alan, go ahead. Alan Woods.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you. I suppose I just want to ask one question. Reading through the topics, I noted that one of the things that the registries were very clear about—we tried our best to articulate throughout

both the plenary session and indeed at the mediation session as well—was that we can talk about these things and the paths forward, but fundamentally we still have severe doubts as to whether or not some of the things we are attempting to make policy recommendations on are within the scope of the team.

We discussed obviously moving on beyond that and if it were in scope. And I see that in Topic #1. It talks about if this is setting aside the question of whether this is in scope. And I appreciate that we can talk about that, but, again, we have a fundamental gating issue there.

So perhaps I will ask the leadership … We're looking for clarity from this, and the only arbiter of the clarity that can give this to us is the GNSO Council. So that could be a very important leading question, especially for us in the registries: to say, if the GNSO Council is to give us clarity that what we are discussing is actually in scope of [what they've said to us], well, then it's a lot easier for us to go in and talk about these issues. But if it's not in scope, then no amount of meditation is going to bring us to that compromise because we shouldn't be talking about it in the first place.

So this is not my throwing the toys out of the pram or anything. It is a fundamental misgiving we have about this. And I think it is important that, if we're going down this path, that is something that we need to think about.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. And I think, on this particular point—and thank you for flagging that for the comments that the registries have submitted … Look, scope questions are always legitimate and are always worth reflecting upon. But if what we're talking about here is guidance and if what we're talking about is guidance for those registrars who choose to differentiate and whether a standardized data element could be helpful in advancing some of the work or some of the interest, then should we not then consider that?

If we were talking about a new consensus policy requirement or recommendation that was completely out of scope that would become binding upon contracted parties through the formal PDP process and all of that, I understand where you're coming from. But if what we're talking about here is guidance for those registrars that choose to differentiate, frankly, I'm willing at this stage to entertain these conversations and think that we should. If groups feel like we need to get guidance or clarification from the council on something, then let's have that conversation.

But I see a distinction here between something that would be a new consensus policy requirement through a formal PDP that would establish a new requirement on contracted parties versus something that is guidance where a contracted party, if they choose to differentiate, would do so in a certain way. I think we as a multi-stakeholder engagement, we as a stakeholder community, should feel that we have the ability or the opportunity to have that conversation about optional guidance.

I'll just stop there. But, Alan, I appreciate your comment, and the submission from the registries is certainly noted in that regard.

I have Alan Greenberg and then Alan Woods again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear—and the ICANN Org comment was pretty clear on this—if we are recommending that there be a standardized element—I'm not talking about whether it's required to be used—that requires a hard recommendation from us that the Board has to approve and pass on to ICANN Org to implement because the element doesn't exist unless it fits within the whole structure.

Now, whether that technically is a consensus policy because it doesn't actually imply a change in the contracts, I don't know. That's almost a nomenclature issue. But to be clear, if we want a new element created, it's not guidance. It is a hard recommendation. I don't understand any other way we could [e]ffect that. So just to be clear, we're not talking about whether it has to be used, but to bring it into existence will require a real recommendation that the GNSO Council approves and passes on to the Board for its approval, at least as I understand things. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan Greenberg. And I'll note that Marika has put into chat some text about what the council specifically asked. I'll just read it and then, Alan Woods, I'll come back to you.

Marika said, "Note that the council specifically asked, "What guidance, if any, can be provided to registrars and/or registries who differentiate between registrations of legal and natural

persons?"" And I think this Topic #1 about a standardized data element fits into that category.

I acknowledge what Alan Greenberg just said: that, if there is a requirement for the development of a new field that would then support the optional use of it or its optional use, then perhaps there's an important distinction there.

But, Alan Woods, let me turn back to you and then Alan Greenberg again.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you. [We're having a back-and-forth a lot]. Look, to be perfectly honest, I think I now need to clarify. We've never argued against the guidance. We've never said the guidance is out of scope. So to be perfectly honest, that was incorrect. We actually support the guidance, and our comments bear out that we just want the guidance to be practical in effect.

And Alan actually made my other point, I'm quite happy to say. This is the fundamental point about whether it's in scope or not. A hard recommendation is necessary for that. Therefore, we do need to look at the scope issue. And I'm not going to belabor that point again. Again, it is in our comments. We go through it in detail and we do urge people to consider that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan Woods. And back to you, Alan Greenberg. And then I'll make a comment and wrap up on this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I just wanted to reiterate a comment that was made earlier—not today, though—that Phase 1 spent an inordinate amount of time looking at fields there are in the RDDS and defining their existence, whether they had to be used or not. We came up with tech fields which registrars have no obligations to use. They don't even have to ask their customers about them. But the definition of the field was deemed to be policy in Phase 1, and I don't think we can change that concept going forward. So just for clarity. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alan. I appreciate it. And, look, I think this is a perfect example of the kind of conversation that we could and should have in a more breakout session, in an informal way, to help drill down on these nuanced questions to make sure that we're not talking past one another. I think this is case-in-point in my view about where we would all benefit from some additional in-depth discussion in a breakout, more informal session. And then that would hopefully, ideally, help inform the conversations of the broader plenary as we try to bring this to a final report stage with consensus.

So let me pause and see if anybody has any questions or comments. We have about 20 minutes left of our scheduled time. If we don't need all that time, we can certainly wrap up a bit early. But I want to make sure that everybody has had the opportunity to contribute.

Steve, go right ahead. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I'll just note that, if we're going to talk about standardizing fields, I want to take the point that Alan said and raise it a level. That kind of standardization is really Internet-wide. It's not limited to the gTLDs. It's not limited to the registrar and registry agreements and should go through the IETF process and be codified in IANA-maintained registries. That may sound complicated and hard or it may sound foreign in the sense of, "Oh, that's outside of our control," but it's not that hard and it is the right thing to do. And it is an inappropriate nearsightedness, in a sense, to think that that belongs entirely within the GNSO recommendation and standardization process.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Steve. I appreciate the input. I think that's an important point if we're talking about standardization: we need to understand the full picture.

Would anybody else like to get in queue at this point? I'll just note, circling back to the question of scope, if anybody has specific or concrete questions about scope, I'd ask that you write it up and send it to me, send it to the list, so it can help inform leadership and staff in terms of any possible conversations we might need to have with the council during our next update. I don't remember exactly the date of our next update, but I don't want to lose the point or miss the point that was raised about scope procedurally, but I want to make sure that, if there are specific concerns,

EN

they're captured, they're in writing, and we have an opportunity to keep it around so it's not handled off the cuff.

Berry, I see your hand. You're probably going to tell me when that next update is—the next council meeting, I presume.

BERRY COBB: Yes, Keith. The next council meeting is later today, and this topic is not on the council's agenda. So the next meeting for the council is scheduled for August 19th. So any scope discussions would probably need to [inaudible] [start a] list, probably, and we could alert council leadership if you want to take this further. Then the motions and documents deadline for the council meeting would be the 9th if we were to consider or if there was any movement where it would require a project change request on any scope adjustments if it was necessary.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Berry. I appreciate that. Berry's point about the project change request … If needed, there are document deadlines for council meetings. So if something like that were to be needed, then there is a timeframe within which we'd need to identify it. But I think, in order to even consider that, we'd have to have a pretty convincing argument and clear path towards consensus that would … if we need an extra week or two—something like that. But I think it really does require some pretty clear path forward.

Let me stop there. And let me see. I don't see any other hands in chat at this point—sorry, hands in queue. Would anybody else like

to get in queue? And, again, I'll open this up for reaction to the public comment review process proposal—in other words, the overview—and the next steps that were provided by staff in Agenda Item 3, any feedback on Agenda Item 4 in terms of a readout on the mediated conversation, and then proposed next steps about informal breakouts.

And then just to note that, for anybody who feels like they want to be part of one of these informal breakouts in the document that's on the screen before us, we need to know by tomorrow, probably, if someone wants to be added so we can start scheduling these more informal breakout conversations for next week. So just an action point there for everybody to review this, review the documentation, by COB tomorrow. Let's make sure to flag if you feel like you want to be part of those conversations.

I see I have Stephanie and then Alan Greenberg again. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. Forgive me if I'm making life more complicated than it needs to be, but Steve Crocker has more or less made my point about the fact that this is about legal interpretation. In my view, if we provide a standardized data element, that involves the criteria for that element. The criteria for deciding what goes in that standard data element are basically legal questions. Giving guidance is giving legal advice. That's my view on that matter. I'm happy to be corrected or have somebody explain why that's not the case.

Now, if we send it to the IETF—I totally agree with Steve that it should be set by the IETF if we are going to move it into widespread use—then those legal questions have to be debated at that level because its use by other entities on the Internet involves different legal interpretations. Tell me if I'm wrong here and making life complicated. Thanks. Remember, I'm not the lawyer.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Stephanie. And neither am I. So thanks for your question. We'll note that.

And I'll move to Alan Greenberg and then Steve Crocker.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a comment. I think Melissa said you're looking for one person from any of those groups to participate. So you not only need to know who should be added but you probably need to know which of the participants from a given group is going to be this spokesperson. Otherwise, you're going to have some difficulty scheduling.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. Great point on logistics. So you're absolutely right. So, again, ideally one person per group. Others can observe, but the hope is that we keep it to a manageable number of folks who are able to contribute in that informal dialogue and conversation. But your point is a good one, Alan. Thanks.

I have Steve's hand, and then Marika has her hand up as well. Go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I have enormous respect for Stephanie's take on all of this, but I think it's possible to subdivide this issue. The point about standardizing through the IETF … The IETF is not going to be the place where you're going to get consensus on legal issues. That's not going to be the place you're going to get citations in lawsuits. Hopefully, [inaudible] the IETF [inaudible] you make this distinction is the following. Rather, what is appropriate to do through the IETF is in defining the field and defining what the values are and.

Then, to the point that Stephanie is raising, which is a very good point, what happens if the value that somebody wants to fill in there is determined in one jurisdiction one way and, in a different jurisdiction, the other way? And the answer—at least my answer—would be that that could be included in what is filled in there, what jurisdiction, or what criteria was used. It's simply the question of, if you're going to have a value, how do you specify it? But you have to separate that from the legal processes and the judgements that are used behind that. It's mainly a question of whether or not the values there can be ported from one place to another and mean the same thing when they are. And if the fact that a determination of if somebody's a legal person in one jurisdiction and has some different determination in another, then that has to be included in the value, I would say, as opposed to simply a one-bit flag that says, "legal versus natural" and then trying to force that to be force-fit across the entire system. Thank you.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Steve. I'll turn to Marika in a moment, but I just want to note that that's a really interesting conversation that I think you have Stephanie have teed up and obviously probably deserves more time and focus. Perhaps that's also the subject for one of the more informal conversations.

But I want to focus specifically on the point you made about the transferability or the portability of the contents of a standardized data element. And I think that actually is an important question for these discussions: how is the standardized data element intended to be used? Is it portable? If a registrant, for example, wants to transfer its domain name from one registrar to another, even in the same jurisdiction but across jurisdictions, what does that mean? What is the value and what is the validity of the contents of that element? So I think it's a really interesting questions.

So let me stop there. Marika, you're next.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Keith. I want to come back to the previous point on next steps in relation to the mediated conversations, just to have clear for everyone what we're expecting to happen.

So I think we're expecting, by the end of this week, for groups to indicate if their group has not been listed in one of those conversations where you really think you should be present as participating. As Melissa noted, we made an assessment here based on some of the items that have been flagged or seemed of specific concern to certain groups. And on the basis of that, we've

identified those groups for these particular topics. But as said, this is not intended to be exclusionary. So if you think your group should be represented, share that with us off-list by the end of this week.

Based on that feedback, we'll start sending out Doodle polls to try and find the time, noting that we're trying to set these up in relatively short order, I think, for the Doodle poll. Anyone in your group can fill it out, but once we've identified a time, we will request you to, unless it's a really small group, identify one person to attend. Of course, if you already know up front which person you want to attend, don't have other fill out the Doodle poll, as we may pick a time that then wouldn't work for you. But I think that's how we hope to proceed.

And we'd like to start with this, as I think Melissa indicated, as soon as possible, although we're also realistic that we're probably not going to be able to do all of these in one single week. So it may spread out. And of course it's also dependent on the availability of those that are participating as well as Melissa. So I hope that clarifies things.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks very much, Marika. It does. And thanks for stepping in and helping to clarify next steps and logistics.

Okay. I'm going to ask if there's any other input, any other comments. Anybody would like to contribute? We have less than ten minutes left. If not, we will move to wrap things up.

Going once, going twice … Any Other Business. Then we'll move to the wrap-up. So our wrap-up is to confirm that the next EPDP team meeting, the plenary, is next Thursday at the same time: 14:00 UTC. But in the interim, we expect that we'll have some of these more informal breakout sessions scheduled and underway. And to Marika's point, we may not get all of them in next week, but we want to start them sooner rather than later because I think they will be helpful and instructive for the review of the public comments.

This takes us back to the question that was posed earlier about homework. I think the proposal was that we would get through two or three of the items.

Marika, maybe I could hand it back to you and to Berry for just a quick recap of what the proposed homework might be for going into next Thursday. Go ahead, Marika. Thanks.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Keith. My suggestion was that, for next week's meeting, groups would review and provide their input on the discussion tables for Recommendations 1 and 2. And we can share the links as part of the action items. I think both those are not too lengthy. And 3 and 4, I think, are longer because they have a number of sub-questions that were asked and that were part of those discussion tables.

So, again, we would like to propose to have 1 and 2, definitely, as homework, of course, [if] groups can already. If they want to

KEITH DRAZEK:	Thanks, Marika. If anybody has any reaction, thoughts, feedback, or alternate proposals, by all means put up your hand. Get in queue. But I think that that's a very reasonable approach for next Thursday. So to recap: looking at the first two items for completion by next Thursday's plenary session.

proceed and already go ahead, that's definitely encouraged. But we hope that's reasonable to do in the timeframe that we have.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Marika. If anybody has any reaction, thoughts, feedback, or alternate proposals, by all means put up your hand. Get in queue. But I think that that's a very reasonable approach for next Thursday. So to recap: looking at the first two items for completion by next Thursday's plenary session.

Okay, I don't see any other hands, and I think we are quickly approaching the end of our call. So if anybody has any other business, speak now or forever hold your peace, or at least until next week.

Then let's go ahead and wrap up things up. So thanks, everybody, again. Thank you, Melissa, for all of your work and your continued work with the EPDP team. Thanks to staff for all the work that you put into to developing the framework and the documentation and the early legwork that you did on the public comments' consolidation if not analysis. The analysis is really now up to the team and the community of members itself.

So thanks, everybody. We'll go ahead and wrap up the call now. And we'll look forward to talking again over the course of the next week and then during our next plenary next Thursday. Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]