
JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the transfer policy review PDP working group call taking place on Tuesday, the 23rd of July 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Eric Rokabauer, RrSG, Ken Herman, NCSG, and Catherine Paletta, RrSG. Ken formally assigned Wisdom Donkor as his alternate for today's call and for remaining days of absence. As a reminder, the alternate assignment form link can be found in all meeting invite emails. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or speak up. Seeing no hands, all members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcription. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you. And over to our chair, Roger Carney. Please begin, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Julie. Welcome, everyone. I think this is our last substantive meeting, hopefully, before we get to our initial report to public comment. The goal for today is just to get through all the comments that were received. And it looks like we got a few edits that we need to make. I don't think anything that changes anything, but just makes everything clearer and cleaner, which was the big goal. So and then next week we'll plan to do that one final review so that everybody's comfortable before we take it to public comment with where it stands before we take it to public comment. I don't have

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.

anything else to cover here, but I will open up the floor to any of the stakeholder groups that want to come forward with any comments or questions or discussions they've had that they want to enlighten the working group with or ask any questions to the working group before we get started. So I'll open the floor up to any stakeholder groups. Okay, great. Then I think maybe I'll turn this over to Caitlin real quick just to take us in. Again, we did get some comments and from a few of the stakeholder groups. So I think we'll go ahead and go through those real quick. So, Caitlin, if you want to take us through this.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Roger. There were three cannot live with from the registrar stakeholder group. And in a cursory look at these, this is for consistency with what the group ultimately ended up recommending in groups one and two that were not properly transferred over to the updated transfer dispute resolution policy. So, for example, in the first line, which Christian is showing, you'll see that there's a reference to a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock following a change of registrant. Since the working group is recommending eliminating that requirement, it would be recommended to eliminate that from the draft updated TDRP as well. And I will pause to see if any of the registrar reps want to add to that, or if anyone has any concerns with making the TDRP consistent with what the group ultimately recommended for group 1B.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. It seems to make sense. And again, one of the reasons we were going through this is to make sure that we did touch

on everything. But does anyone from the RrSG want to speak to this? Or I think it's fairly straightforward. But any comments? Thanks, Rick. Any issues cleaning this up and removing this item here? Okay, I think we're good there. Thanks, Jody. Okay, I think we're good, and we can move to the next one, Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Roger. So in the same document, you'll see that Christian is highlighting that the TDRP references the current requirement in the transfer policy, which is a transfer restriction within 60 days of initial registration, as well as a transfer restriction within 60 days of a prior transfer. The working group in group 1A is recommending changing that time to 30 days for both domain name within 30 days of initial registration, domain name within 30 days of a prior transfer. So again, this is an attempt to make the TDRP consistent with the updated recommendations. But again, I will pause in case there's additional information or any objections.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Caitlin. Again, yeah, as Caitlin said, anything from additional from the RrSG or any comments about updating this, it seems to make sense and consistent with what we've been saying. So any issues from anyone? Okay, I think we're good with this one as well. Nothing from anyone. We can go to the next one, Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Roger. And we have another reference that has been superseded by recommendations from group 1A, and this is referencing a gaining FOA. And because the gaining FOA is being eliminated, or the group is recommending that that be eliminated, the registrar stakeholder group recommends eliminating this block of text as it is referencing something that the group is recommending removing. So again, it's for consistency. And with thanks to the registrar stakeholder group for reading this in detail and catching the updates from previous groups. But I will pause in case anyone objects to removing this from the draft updated TDRP. And I guess what I will say quickly is this is a reference to the group that ultimately implements the policy, so it's not... So the edits here are to help, but rather it's something... if the group is implement... it's not a policy requirement, rather. So it's just a guide for the group that ultimately implements of what the updated TDRP could look like.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Yep, thank you. And again, thanks for those that went through and found these things, because it will help out. As Caitlin said, this is a policy language, but it will still help out the IRT when they get to here and see this and don't have conflicting things to have to work through. So greatly appreciate it. It makes sense to me. I don't know if anyone has any issues removing this. Okay, good. I think we're good with that. And as Caitlin said, it helps clean it up a lot. So it'll make the IRTs work a little easier. So I think we're good with that. And move to the next one.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Roger. So we've now moved into the can live with but prefer this change. And we have some entries from the registry stakeholder group. You'll notice that we added a column to the right of the suggestions or the concerns, because in some cases, staff went ahead and added a proposed textual change based on the concern from the registry stakeholder group, but in some cases, the registry stakeholder group is actually proposing the language. And so we'll just go through those. But if there is a registry rep that would like to talk us through these, and I see Rick's hand is raised, so I am going to pass it over to Rick to help us go through these.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure, Caitlin. Thank you very much, Rick Wilhelm for the registries. The good news and the bad news is that I had a five hour plane flight alone with the document. And so this is sort of a fine tooth comb run through the document. Yeah, pros and cons there. So, okay, so the first one here, I won't sort of read this in detail, but when I was reading the thing, and sometimes when we say registrars, we mean registrars as a collective, and sometimes we mean the language really means the registrar in the singular. And so in this one, I sort of identify a couple of spots where we should, I think we should change it from registrars to registrar, move it to the singular. And then some spots, it should stay the way it is because it actually refers to the plural. So it's really going to take a read through the document, probably by staff. I think it's going to be pretty easy to judge where the singular and the plural should make space. But I think that it'll lead to greater specificity and precision in the document. And so I give a couple of examples there. And so I think that it'll just improve it if we do this. So I'll stop there and take comments

and thoughts. And I would assume that staff had a little bit of time to look at this and maybe they can comment on it. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great, thanks, Rick. I do really appreciate that you did get a chance to go through it, because that will help out tremendously. So and it does make sense that we need to be consistent here. And when we say registrars, we actually mean the plural of it. And we can identify those. And as you said, hopefully it's a fairly easy fix. So I don't know if anybody has any questions. It makes sense to me to jump through those since Rick found some issues with them and just take a look at each one of them and see if they need to be updated. Thanks, Caitlin. Okay, any issues with that? I think it makes sense. Yeah, exactly. Yeah. All of those should be looked at. So great. Okay, I think that's a good edit and a good update to that. Do we want to hit the next one? I know I think it was Rick's as well. So maybe he will talk to that.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Okay. So here I'm actually proposing changing the wording of rec 29. You can see there in the text in the block, I've got the as is and the proposed to be. In looking at this, it struck me in reading the recommendation that I think that the current wording somehow doesn't really capture the essence of what it is. It says right now it says timing for initiating contact. And it really is about timing for responding. And so I'm proposing changing the wording for rec 30, which is sorry. I said rec 20, sorry, proposing changing of rec 29 and rec 30 is really more about

the timing limits for initiating contact. So, I think that it would give a more precise definition for what rec 29 is really about.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. And maybe everyone can just take a read of that and see if that makes sense.

RICK WILHELM: This is about the messages sent to must generate a non-automated response. So it's about responding to the contact. But unfortunately, the thing says initiating with. rec 29 says initiating with. And so that's how I'm proposing the different wording in the block there. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Any concerns with any updating, basically initiating to respond, responding? Thanks, Sarah. Yeah, I mean, it seems reasonable to me as well. Okay. Let's go ahead and, you know, go with that. And no objections here. So let's go ahead and move forward with that. And we can go to the next one, Rick, if you're on that one as well.

RICK WILHELM: Sure. Yeah, I'm on kind of on all of these. So, on this one here, this is just a simple cut and paste thing where the rationale for one of the, for the block below was pasted into this one. And then you can see here on the far right, between the time I put this in and this morning, staff said, oh, yeah, you're right. And then they pasted some proposed text. I haven't had a chance to review this proposed text, but I'm going to bet that it's

bang on or, you know, 99% of the way there. So, and this was just a cut and paste glitch when the draft was produced. So, I'll let Caitlin chime in here. I'm guessing that she wants to come to the mic. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Excellent. Thanks, Rick. Yeah, and thanks for that catch. Caitlin, anything to add here?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Rick. And thanks, Roger. So, as Rick noted, there was a copy paste error. So, what staff did this morning was look back at the discussion or the deliberations around why the timeframe changed. And in short, this is modified slightly from the text, which was longer in the deliberations portion. But noting that one of the reasons the working group was looking at this was because some registrar representatives had complained that the four-hour timeframe was not tenable due to time zone conflicts. And also the significant concerns around the consequences if you miss that deadline. And also the working group had discussed that there's currently a 24-hour deadline for registrars to respond to DNS abuse complaints. And they thought this was analogous to that. So, to match that timeframe to the TEAC initial response made sense to the working group. So, that is the text that we copied and pasted with just a few slight modifications from the deliberations on why this changed. But certainly, if there's additional context or preferred wording, then by all means, we're happy to take additional edits from the working group. But wanted to note that, yeah, this

definitely was an error. And it should actually have deliberations and rationale from the appropriate recommendation here.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. Yeah, I agree, Rick. It looks good. But take a review of it. Everyone take a look at it and make sure it makes sense and you're comfortable with it. Just reading it a couple of times here, it seems to make sense. So, it seems to fit. Okay. Again, just take a read of it. And if anybody finds anything, we can drop it on the list or we can talk about it next week as well. So, okay, let's go ahead and move to the next one then. And Rick's on hook.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Okay. So, these next two will bring, scroll to rec 30. So, this is an interesting one. And these next two are a little bit different because I actually kind of raised a question. Now, the reason these are in the can live with thing, because I don't have a direct suggestion here. But in reading this rec 30, in the over 30 days scenario, the question I asked is, is the gaining registrar allowed to reject the losing registrar's emergency situation justification? Now, we debated on this for a long time. So, it pained me a little bit to type this into the box because I almost didn't know if I wanted to disturb the anthill, if you will. Not sure if that's the right metaphor. But in rec 30, we say that if the initial communication to the TEAC, this is at line 12, 1321. If the initial communication to the TEAC occurs more than 30 days after the alleged unauthorized loss of a domain, the losing registrar must provide a detailed explanation to the gaining registrar's TEAC. And so, I'm surprised that the collective we

didn't say, well, what if the justification is sort of like the dog ate my homework. And the gaining registrar's TEAC says, look, Roger, that's bogus. That's nonsense. I reject your emergency situation and move along. So, that's sort of the question here. Do we want to extend the quote flow chart to handle that case to allow or consider what would happen if the gaining registrar is allowed to reject the losing registrar's justification that is described in that last sentence? Or do we say, no, you've got to accept it? This does not involve the registry. I brought it up so that while this concrete is wet, so to speak, while we're still constructing, that we don't end up with a hole in our process. Because I would hate for us to codify something, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. I'll stop there. It's really kind of a question for the registrars. And we might not want to solve it today. We might want a parking lot it, Roger. That's for you to decide as chair. Or maybe we can figure it out very quickly. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick. And thanks for bringing it up. Yeah, it's an interesting thing. And I do recall when we talked about this, that there was a lot of, you know, if it's more than 30 days, how is that really an emergency? And again, I think a lot of the conversations is always it's always an emergency to one side and maybe not the other side. hanks. Sarah. Sarah, please go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi, this is Sarah. Thank you. I think Rich and I have our hands up to say basically the same thing, but I got here first. So in a TEAC situation, the

losing registrar believes there's a problem in the gaining registrar might or might not. So what happens? What happens either way? Right. So the losing registrar contacts the gaining TEAC and says there's a problem and then the gaining TEAC can either say, yes, there is a problem here, take back the domain, or no, there isn't or they don't respond at all. And then it goes to something else. So, here also, like, outside the 30 days, they could still say, yes, there is a problem or no, there isn't. I reject your emergency. It's not a problem. I reject your reality and substitute my own. So, I think that Rick has identified a gap, but I don't think we need to fix that gap now. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks. Rich, please go ahead.

RICH BROWN: I'm also filling in for Catherine, I don't know if that got marked or not. But regardless, my same point as Sarah. The TEAC is just a means of communication that has, you know, response requirements. The quote dispute is over when one of either party says we're done with the dispute. There is no requirement that again, the registrar return a domain. So, whether they find the complaint meritless or not doesn't matter. They can just say no, thanks for the email. Have a nice day. Yeah, that's it. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rich. Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS: Yeah, thanks. So, I think we are circling a little bit around the word emergency in the more of is it an emergency situation or not. And who is the arbiter there. If it is an emergency or not. And I think ultimately, being in an ICANN policy, I think at some point if you are starting to disagree with the gaining registrar who shuts down the emergency complaint, you eventually have to go to ICANN compliance. Well, that won't be a speedy emergency process, but then you get some clarity around what is an emergency or not. And then you get some accountability around what an emergency is or not. But I agree with Sarah, this isn't really on fire or something that we need to solve now. I think maybe even in the IRT, it is okay to address it then but you know I'm not really strong on the subject. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Theo. Rich, your hands up again, please go ahead.

RICH BROWN: Yeah, thanks again, Rich Brown for the record. I just want to kind of go into this. Because Jothan mentioned how much does this come up, this scenario described happens. The answer is almost every transfer dispute if a gaining registrar responds. Normally, to follow the process—and mind you my last week was involved in an entire TEAC failure process so if we want to go off board and talk about failures in the systems, we can. But regardless. Every transfer dispute. That's the frequency. As a losing registrar, you notify the gaining registrar, they either answer. And normally in their answer it's, give me a turf, which is not a policy form, it's just kind of an agreed upon kind of thing registrars

do, or fill out this indemnification agreement, stating that, you know, you'll take all responsibility if we return the domain, etc. There you go. Those are the responses you get. A lot of the times, a company can't stand to take such responsibility like an indemnification, especially if their customer, the R&H, you know, might be litigious. Even if they say they aren't, they might be a big company that regardless, they have to do something about it to keep their, you know, public awareness or whatever, you know, up. So, sometimes indemnification doesn't even cover.

Now as far as emergency goes, let's talk about last week I had to submit a TEAC, I submitted it, I waited four hours. I submitted my notice along with copies and everything to the registry. Registry did not respond for 24, maybe 48 hours, we actually had to go through back channels, they still never responded to any official emails, it was all done through back channels. Then part of during that wait, another transfer was submitted on one of the domains I was asking the registry to stop, but because they hadn't stopped the transfer, they told us, well, we have to file a dispute with wherever that goes. You see where this is going. This is an emergency. I have a customer who has lost their domain, and I'm following the process. I'm doing everything I can. I filed my emergency. I filed my, hey, nobody's helping me. And even because the policy states I had to file with ICANN, I even have an ICANN complaint open on the non response of the TEAC. Mind you, all of these things were not taken care of in any timely manner. Do we have any sort of out, do we have any way to deal with this? No. This is a hole in the process. I've been pointing it out for a long time. I'm just saying it again. Am I against the

policy that we have right now or anything? I like what we have. I think it can do more. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rich. Yeah, and I'm leaning here toward leaving this as is. I appreciate Rick identifying this. But as we've heard, this doesn't stop it. The same responsibilities and same outcomes can happen. So I think we let this go and move forward on it. If anybody has anything stringent against that, let me know. Otherwise, I think we leave it as it is and move forward. And thanks for Rick for pointing it out. But I think we're good here. Okay. Let's jump into the next one, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

All right. Very good. The next one, we might end up in the same bucket here. This one here refers to I think it's 1353. These updates must include specific actions taken by the gaining registrar to work towards resolution. As you can read there in the box, this basically says that it implies the updates are going to be taken by the gaining registrar that it's all going to be reverting and heading back. The name is going to be heading back from the gaining registrar toward the losing registrar. But what if it's the other way around? What if the gaining registrar is needing information from the losing registrar to clarify and that this isn't going to be headed backwards, but instead that it's going to stick, right? That the undo request is going to be rejected, something like that. So I don't know if we need to change this or not, but it implies that all of the communications is, and I'm not sure if you want to say from right to left or left to right, or depending on how you picture this sort of

thing, but it implies that it's only going one way. I don't know if that's on purpose or an accident. sort of thing, but it implies that it's only going one way. I don't know if that's on purpose or an accident. Again, you might more quickly end up saying, look, we want to categorize this one as the prior one and just leave it alone, but it feels kind of incomplete to me, but we might just leave it go. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick. And to be honest, when we walked through this, I never thought resolution, as you said, it seems like it goes one way, but to me, towards resolution is either the outcome the losing registrar wanted, or it's not. To me, resolution is just completion and working towards resolution doesn't mean that it's going to be, in my mind anyway, satisfactory to the losing, but it's still a resolution. But I'll open it up to the floor to comment and see if you think, Theo, please go ahead.

THEO GEURTS:

Yeah, you just sort of lined out my thinking there. There is a resolution that might be disputed in a court or somewhere. These things happen and yeah, well, it is indeed a two way street and the recommendation goes one way, but definitely, Roger, what you just said, there will be a resolution, maybe not satisfactory, but you know, it is what it is. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: All right. Thanks, Theo. Okay. Any other comments? I think we're good with leaving it as is. Okay. All right, let's go ahead and move to the next one, Rick.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, very good. I think we'll pick up the pace here. Okay. In this one here, I think that's line 1386. In rec 32, we mentioned in here the text that includes the 24-hour limit. And so what I'm suggesting here is that we delete some text so that we don't, if the limit changes that the rec 32, which deals with the method of communication with the TEAC doesn't contain information about rec 29. So if rec 29 changes, rec 32 doesn't get updated. This is just to avoid that dependency. This seems like a pretty simple and straightforward change. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Rick. Any comments on that? When we put in the starts the clock, I thought that made sense. And as Rick points out, really the 24 hour response time is the big concern here. Starts the clock for the timeframe specified in rec 29, I don't know, the wordings exactly around that, but something like that, just to remove the 24 hour. And again, I don't even know if that's that big a deal to remove it. I understand what Rick's point is here is if 29 changes, then it affects this one. If 29 changes, it probably went through a PDP to get it to change. Right, Jothan. And that's what I was thinking, dropping the 24 hour and making that sentence just reference rec 29.

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, the bracketed text, it's just pulling out that bracketed text.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, that seems to make sense.

RICK WILHELM: And then that last sentence. I think that these are editorial cleanup changes, so you don't have to change it.

ROGER CARNEY: Yep. Okay. Good. I think that's good. And again, if someone has problems, let us know, please, if they think that removing that is going to make it less clear or not as intended. But it seems like it's a good edit to me. Okay, I think we're good with that. So I think we can move forward on that edit. Rick, if you want to take us to the next one.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Rec 34, line 1452, a friendly amendment to add the word voluntary in here to help maintain clarity about what kind of full portfolio transfers we're talking about. Because within this policy, as we've been talking about, is just to just continually talking about whether these are voluntary or involuntary transfers. And so here, just add any word voluntary into 1452. Thanks.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Rick. Any comments? Any concerns about adding voluntary in to the title here? Okay. I think that we can... Thanks, Theo. I think we can

add that and we can move forward. If you want to take us to the next one, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. In 1575. So I just raised the question here. Does rec 38 on or about line 1575 need to mention rec 35 for clarity? So it looks like Caitlin pasted in a suggested edit to make it clear that this is a voluntary on into the right hand most comments. Because when I was reading rec 38, it looked like a reference to rec 35 might help. Caitlin seems to have yes anded and also said, quote, and the associated implementation guidance, which I think is a good upgrade. So I think that her suggested improvement and the location of where she put it in is the ways that she structured it looks good to me for what it's worth. So I like the suggested edit. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Rick. Yeah. And obviously, when you read these, you should be tying together. But I see no problems explicitly making sure that people see the connection. So I think that's a good positive edit and helps for clarity. So yes. And I agree. Caitlin's extra words there do help with that. So I think the suggested text looks good. And if no one has issues with that, I think it's a good edit for clarity. Okay. I think that's a good one. And we can move forward, Rick, on your next one.

RICK WILHELM:

Okay. I think we're down to the last couple before we get into the editorial pedantry. Okay. So 3288, this is a suggestion to add a couple of

things here to make it clear what the limit is in the discussion, how long you can wait, and to distinguish it from the limit that discussed above. And I think the previous wording left it unclear as to whose limit this was. You can see there's a suggested edit to add the bracketed text. Now I made these edits as delicately as possible to do them with brackets. When staff gets in there and actually does the editing on their own, they may choose slightly different editorial word choices. So I did, and it looks like I have a typo because it should say, initiate action. I just said actio. That's not some sort of a weird Harry Potter reference or something like that. Action on an emergency associated with a transfer. So that was sort of the gist of it to just make clear what limits we're talking about just to add some clarity there. So hopefully that's, I think that's helpful to me to improve the text like that.

ROGER CARNEY:

All right, thanks, Rick. Yeah, and with the additional action, I think that makes sense. And to me, it does read clear. And again, it's not changing policy here. So I think that that clarity is useful. Does anybody have any concerns or any additions or updates to that? I think what Rick provided here makes sense. Okay, I think we can update that to include those. I think it helps for clarity. So I think, Rick, you can take us into the last one you've got here.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Apparently, I pasted these out of order. Sorry, we're going to have to scroll up in the document. 3176. This is just adding some additional rationale. Based on my recollection with these things

involving the TEAC, there was relatively low volumes of these TEAC kind of operations. And that was one of the other reasons why, during the discussion, why we agreed that we wouldn't want some sort of a system or something like that regarding a centralized system. And so I just suggested that we add that in there. So I've suggested adding that bracketed text just to help capture a part of our rationale.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Rick. Yep, exactly. And you're right. And I do remember us discussing that, the volume issues, the amount of times. So I think that's appropriate. But anyone have any concerns about adding that? Okay, great. I think that we can add that in. And it does help provide a little more of our rationale there. So good. And I think that was all of the, besides the grammatical, which we won't need to cover. Staff will go through and make sure that those are correct. So unless staff has any questions on those, I'll say. Rick's flight home may give us one more good read through. Okay, great. I think that was great. And exactly what we want to do with these is get through these and make sure we're as clean as we can be before we head out to public comment. Okay, any other comments from the group? Okay, maybe I'll turn this back over to Caitlin for our next steps through.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Roger. So we have made it through all of the cannot live with and can live with but would prefer this change for all of the groups of recommendations. Support staff in the background has been making those edits to a separate initial report. And we will now add the

agreements from today's meeting into the report. Our plan is to highlight the changes that we have incorporated as a result of the last three weeks in an updated version of the initial report and circulate that to the working group. So that the working group has one more week to review the report. At this stage, it's more about making sure that the text reads cleanly and finding additional grammatical or textual edits that you would prefer. Only because, as we noted before, our plan, if all goes according or if all goes well, is to publish the initial report for public comment on August 1st. So since our next meeting will be July 30th, that doesn't give a lot of time to go through any major showstopper or cannot live with issues. What we would recommend instead is if your group does identify one of those issues, that that can be included in the group's public comment submission. That doesn't prevent you from pointing those out, but it's unlikely that the group will be able to adjust any huge substantive changes to recommendations in two days and get agreement and the buy-in or support from the various stakeholder groups or the respective stakeholder groups.

So our plan is to send out that report with all of the changes by the end of today, so that the group will have a week to look at that and make sure that the new changes are all agreeable to the group. What we do plan on doing to better highlight those is to remove all of the existing highlighting and just have only the updated changes highlighted in the report, unless the group has an objection to proceeding in that way. I don't see any hands raised. So we will be sending out the updated report today, along with the assignment, and we'll have another Google Doc where folks are able to capture any additional concerns. So thank you for all of the helpful edits and the thorough read-throughs of the

report. It's very much appreciated, and we'll go ahead and get that updated report circulated as soon as possible.

ROGER CARNEY:

Great. Thanks, Caitlin. And again, thanks to everybody, as Caitlin said in chat earlier. It's appreciated when people are able to get to the homework and capture, even if it's little things, it makes it that much cleaner and easier for people to read through. So it's great that we can take this time to do that. So with that said, if there's nothing from anyone, I think we can give everybody back about 40 minutes of the meeting time here to your day. Any comments from anybody? One more read-through, one more week of this, and hopefully we can publish this for public comment, and the group can take a couple months off from the weekly meetings and get with their stakeholder groups to make any comments that they want to make on the proposed recommendation. But I think we're in a good spot, and one more week and we can officially say we've got our initial report done. Okay. With that, I think I'll give everybody back time, and we'll talk to everyone next week. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]