TERRI AGNEW:	For the recording, this is Teri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 28th of April, 2025.
	For today's call, we have the listed apologies, Steve DelBianco, Gabriel Andrews, Steve Crocker, and Thomas Rickert.
	Statements of Interests must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any update to share? If so, please raise your hand and unmute now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view the chat only and have listen only for the audio.
	All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. All chat sessions are being archived. And as a reminder, participation in ICANN, including the session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment. One final call, please adjust your chat and select "Everyone" versus "Host and Panelist". With that, I'll turn it back over to chair, Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.
SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Thank you, Terri. Good early evening to everybody. It is a beautiful spring evening in Germany, too. Today, we wanted to continue the discussion from last week on Chapter 4, but more importantly, maybe

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.

EN

going back a bit to the roots and the charter, particularly following an e-mail exchange that was initiated, I believe, by you, Sarah. I'm quickly looking at the list, but I see that Steve Crocker or Farzaneh are not online. But anyway, we'll still have that discussion. Basically, we wanted to go back a bit to that conversation through the charter and then sort of reviewing together.

I've seen that, Terri. Thank you very much. To review a bit what we're doing, to make sure that we're all on the same page, and if we go wrong, to correct course. I think Feodora prepared maybe a few slides. I'll pass it on to you, Feodora. And then you can pass it on to Caitlin.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Yes, we will start with some slides. Good morning, good afternoon, and evening, everyone. As Seb alluded, today, ICANN Org will give you an overview and a quick recap of the Standing Committee's assignment scope based on the charter. After I'm done, my colleague, Caitlin, will present which avenues the Standing Committee could take and what processes should be considered regarding the SC's recommendations to the GNSO Council. Now I would like to start to provide a recap on the scope for Assignment #3 and #4 as outlined in the RDRS Standing Committee Charter.

Let's begin with Assignment #3. The Standing Committee is tasked with identifying specific lessons learned that should be factored into the consideration of how to proceed with the SSAD recommendations. For this assignment, aka Chapter 3, which the SC has already seen and worked on, the Standing Committee closely reviewed operational

experiences from the RDRS pilot implementation and assessed how the RDRS system has performed against expectations and the SSAD/EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. These lessons learned could serve as a basis for Assignment #4 and brought recommendations to make it fair.

Now I will turn to Assignment #4. Here, the Standing Committee is also tasked with suggestions to the Council for proposed recommendations to the ICANN Board in relation to the consideration of the SSAD recommendations. These suggestions should be grounded in the experience and data gathered through the RDRS period. The Committee's recommendations could include, one, approval of EPDP Phase 2 SSAD recommendations in current or modified format, which would replace the SSAD proof of concept. Second, determination that adoption of EPDP Phase 2 SSAD recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN in termination of the SSAD proof of concept. Three, modification of the EPDP Phase 2 SSAD recommendations by GNSO Council informed by the SSAD proof of concept findings. And lastly, a variation and/or combination of the above scenarios.

As noted in the charter, the Standing Committee may share its findings and recommendations on an ongoing basis. Seb, the Standing Committee chair, has provided regular updates to Council on what the Standing Committee is working on, but it is expected that a comprehensive report addressing Assignment #3 and #4 will be compiled towards the end of the two-year pilot.

In closing, I want to emphasize that there are... It says also that the focus of the report should not be on technical enhancements, but more

EN

on strategic review, and that a recommendation could be to maintain the proof of concept online if it has been proven successful and relevant enough. As said, that the focus of the report should be on Assignment #3 and #4.

In conclusion, we can derive some assumption based on the charter questions, and this includes that the work that the Standing Committee is undertaking on Assignment #3 and #4 is critical as it directly supports the GNSO Council's ability to make informed and evidence-based recommendations about the next steps regarding the SSAD recommendations. Furthermore, the RDRS pilot was built to inform the GNSO Council on ICANN Board discussions on how to proceed with the SSAD recommendation.

The SC's evaluation of those lessons learned will help and provide practical data-driven insights gained through approximately one and a half years of experience with the RDRS pilot. It is, however, important to note that the committee's report is not a policy report, as we've discussed in various meetings. However, it will inform the GNSO Council's deliberation and inform the Council's dialogue with the ICANN Board. Therefore, based on charter questions, a detailed and comprehensive report focusing on Assignment #3 and #4 is encouraged. The report could provide the Council with the information it needs to make informed strategic decisions about how to proceed with the SSAD recommendations based on the data reviewed by the Standing Committee. It is, of course, at the Standing Committee's discretion to determine the most appropriate structure and depth of the report that will best assess the Council's understanding and decision-making.

EN

Before we take any questions, I will now hand over to my colleague, Caitlin, to guide you through the various scenarios that Assignment #4 proposes to consider. After that, Seb will lead the discussion and take your questions and comments. Caitlin, the floor is yours.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Feodora. During last week's meeting, there were some questions about what could potentially happen if recommendations aren't adopted or there are certain modifications to those recommendations. We thought it might be helpful to provide the background on the Bylaws and the GNSO procedures of what could happen, just so that as the group is working through Chapter 4 on its recommendations to the Council, it kind of has an idea of what could potentially happen in case it wants to tailor recommendations accordingly. I hope we can go to the next slide.

Similar to Feodora, I'm going to go through all of the potential scenarios first, just in case a question is answered in a later slide so that you have a full understanding of what could happen, and then we can certainly take questions and discuss. What you see on this slide is part of the Board approval process in the ICANN Bylaws, particularly Section 9 of Annex 1, which talks about the PDP process. Generally speaking, when you see the left side of the arrow, if recommendations are adopted and receive supermajority support from the GNSO, the Board adopts those recommendations, unless of course, in its fiduciary capacity, it determines that those recommendations are not in the best interest of the ICANN community. In the event that it determines that those

EN

recommendations are not in the best interest, the Board will issue a statement and provide that to the Council.

In recent years, that statement has come in the form of a scorecard. Some of you are very familiar with this because you've seen it before, but essentially, the Board will issue a scorecard that details the recommendations. Then for the recommendations that it doesn't believe it can adopt or it's choosing not to adopt, there'll be a detailed explanation as to why the Board is choosing not to adopt or it sees a problem with that particular recommendation. If we can go to the next slide.

Following the receipt of that scorecard, the Council usually enters into a discussion with the Board and can meet to affirm or modify those recommendations that were not adopted by the Board and ultimately come up with a supplemental recommendation. For those of you who either participated in Phase 1 of the EPDP that dealt with the SSAD Phase 1, dealt with a detailed review of the Temporary Specification. In that particular instance, there were two recommendations the Board did not adopt. One example would be Recommendation 15. As a reminder, that recommendation dealt with the treatment of the organization field in RDDS. The Board did not accept that recommendation. In its scorecard, it provided the concerns as to why and the Council met and ultimately provided a supplemental recommendation based on the Board's concerns. For some of the former EPDP team members, these discussions largely took place at ICANN meetings. There were EPDP team members at the table that were part of that conversation or observed that conversation and provided concerns.

At the left hand of that arrow, that's when the GNSO Council is in the process of drafting a supplemental recommendation based on those articulated concerns from the Board. Once those supplemental recommendations or recommendations are crystallized, the Council would vote on those, and then the supplemental recommendations would be sent to the Board for action. Again, the Board in its fiduciary capacity could choose to reject the supplemental recommendations or accept the supplemental recommendations. But ultimately, that is the process for supplemental recommendations. If we can go to the next slide.

Taking into account the supplemental recommendation process, we wanted to kind of put this into a real-life scenario, what's in front of this group at this time. We have some scenarios here based on the group's conversations to date. Some might not be very likely, but we wanted to include them just for the sake of completeness. For example, Feodora just went through the Standing Committee's assignment. The Standing Committee in reviewing the RDRS data up until now could recommend that the GNSO Council communicate to the Board that based on the experience with the RDRS, the Council believes the Board should proceed to adopt all 18 SSAD recommendations as is. If that were to happen, it would be the standard PDP process continuum, which means the Board adopts, and then the Board would have ICANN Org implement those recommendations as is. As I noted, based on the conversations to date, it doesn't seem like the RDRS Standing Committee is proceeding in this direction, but again, for completeness, wanted to share this.

The next potential scenario would be the opposite of scenario one. That would be that based on the RDRS Standing Committee's review of the data and experience with the RDRS, it recommends that the Council communicate to the Board during this dialogue that the Board should reject all 18 SSAD recommendations. Then if that were to happen, and the Board agreed—because again, the Board is independent. Even if the Council tells the Board to do something, they may or may not. At that point, the Board could not adopt those recommendations. The Board and Council could have a consultation, and then potential supplemental recommendations could emerge. Also, the Board could not adopt. And instead of, the Council working on supplemental recommendations, the Council could say, "Okay, the Board has not adopted, we're going to start a new EPDP on this and maybe add some of the other areas that we've identified that need further policy work." That's scenario two.

Scenario three is kind of a combination. That's the situation where the Standing Committee goes through the 18 SSAD recommendations. Perhaps there's certain recommendations that were largely incorporated or completely incorporated into the current RDRS. And the standing committee says, "Hey, Council, these recommendations are already in RDRS. They're not causing any problems." So the Board could potentially adopt these recommendations for whatever successor system follows. This doesn't need additional policy work.

However, some of the recommendations that are part of those 18 SSAD recommendations are not currently part of RDRS and we don't know that the Council should recommend that the Board adopt those recommendations. Further discussion might need to take place. If that were the scenario, the Board could potentially adopt certain

recommendations and the Board and Council could discuss those rejected recommendations, and then discuss potential supplemental recommendations for those areas that the Board did not adopt.

Then similarly for scenario 3B, the same thing could happen where the RDRS Standing Committee says, "These recommendations are fine. We don't need to spend additional policy work on these because we think they're working okay. These should be included in the successor system. These were not comfortable telling the Council that you should recommend the Board adopt these. These should probably be rejected." Then based on those rejected recommendations, instead of a supplemental recommendation exercise, the Council could determine or choose to charter a new EPDP to consider those rejected recommendations and potentially adding those other areas that the Standing Committee has identified as potentially needing additional policy work. Next slide.

Then in the interest of completeness, we wanted to also share another scenario that could happen. This is found in Section 16 of the GNSO Operating Procedures Annex 2. Annex 2 is the PDP manual. The interesting part of where these recommendations are in that PDP continuum is that the Board hasn't voted on these yet. Section 16 contemplates a scenario where the Council, having received guidance from the RDRS Standing Committee, could choose to amend or modify recommendations prior to sending them to the Board to vote. In that scenario, the Council could work maybe be a small team for example, on amending the recommendations. Then you'll see the next dot in that line contemplates that if that were to happen, that the EPDP team would be consulted. Those amended or modified recommendations

EN

would be sent to the EPDP Phase 2 team for its consideration and objection. Then, following that consultation, those amended recommendations would be posted for public comment for a minimum of 30 days. And then the Council could determine whether to submit amended recommendations to the Board to consider. Next slide.

This is the final scenario, unless we may have missed something. But that's that the Council chooses to modify recommendations before Board action. That's the main difference here, is that the Council chooses to modify recommendations. Again, that would be in consultation with that policy group, as well as a public comment period, and those amended recommendations would be submitted to the Board. It's a little bit different than a supplemental recommendation, but it is contemplated in the GNSO PDP manual.

With that, I know that was a lot of talking, I'm going to turn it back over to Seb to see if there's any thoughts or any questions about these scenarios that the group wanted to discuss before we continue.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much, Caitlin. I see immediately Sarah's hand up and I was going to pass the mic on to you anyway. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah from the Registrars. Just want to make a big thank you to Feodora and Caitlin for this review of what our charter requires, and what our goals and options are. I had definitely lost track of some of those details so I do really appreciate the time and effort to

EN

put that together and to take the time in this meeting. If it's time to then share what we think we should recommend in this light, I could do that or I can save that for later. I'm not sure when you want that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do. Please do.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. We should recommend, I would think, the second potential scenario that Caitlin presented. The RDRS should remain as a voluntary system for people to use if they want to voluntary with an API, and with some of the other contemplated changes, and I think the SSAD should not be built. Also, related to the topic of scenario three and maybe four, or just the concept, to the concept of adopting some but not all of the recommendations, I'm uncomfortable with the idea that implementing only some parts of this does not require additional policy work. Because I think that choosing which recommendations to implement and which ones to not implement would itself be a policy decision. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much, Sarah. I agree with that last statement. I might come back to you afterwards on that, but let's go to Alan first and I might have more questions. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Also, thank you for this work and identifying some of the things which I think we all forgot we're supposed to be

EN

doing. It looks like a daunting amount of work and something that we haven't even thought about at some level. It strikes me that it's going to be easy to recommend which parts of RDRS to continue, at least on the interim, and perhaps to incorporate in some other system. It also strikes me as highly unlikely that this group could come to closure on what to change or how to change it, or even if to change some of the other parts of the SSAD recommendations. Just as the SSAD EPDP had difficulty coming to closure, I think we would have similar difficulty. This isn't the policy process, but nevertheless, I don't know how we would do that. I'm not quite sure how we would give the GNSO guidance on what to do if, as opposed—Sarah said, just continue with what we're doing and don't do anything else. That's easy. If indeed there's a belief that we need to do something else, I'm not sure how we could give Council any guidance on that other than as implied by both Sarah and Sebastien, this is going to require a PDP. And how long that would take is daunting also. I'm not quite sure how we proceed because I don't tend to agree with Sarah that all we should do is keep a voluntary system. But I'm not quite sure how we're going to move forward other than that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. I see no other hand. I see that Farzaneh in the meantime joined us but probably missed the presentation that Feodora and Caitlin gave. To your proposed path forward, Sarah... I understand that this group is not going to do any policy and we all agreed to do that. My thoughts are not completely gelled so I'll give it to Paul and give myself another 30 seconds to think how am I going to question this. Go ahead, Paul.

EN

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Sorry to intervene late. I just got myself promoted. I've been sending out e-mails and stuff and everything else. Thank you to staff for seeing that and getting me. I think, for the first time since this little team was formed, I'm going to disagree with Sarah on something and it makes me super nervous because I think Sarah is the [inaudible]. I don't think that we have done the policy side of this work to come in and jump to the end where we say that SSAD should not be built. We always talk that we were going to do a separate track on the policy stuff. Sebastien started to say we've not done that yet. I think if we are going to do this part of our assignment, we actually need to do that work. I don't necessarily think that that should hold up getting this thing out for public comment. Maybe that's a great thing to do, all these things out for public comment. We're just two or three months away from giving the Council anything final anyways, right? So, why not do that?

I guess what the policy work is, it's not policy and developing the policy work, it is addressing Assignment #4, which is the suggestions to Council about what the Board might do in relationship to the SSAD recommendations, which will become policy if adopted. That's what we're talking about. I do think, Sarah, we're getting a little bit ahead of ourselves. That's all.

We may come to that conclusion like the SSAD. We may include the SSAD dead in the water, the RDRS voluntary system is the best that we can get out of the ingredients that are on the kitchen table here. If anybody wants more than a voluntary RDRS, then it's PDP kind of folks, right? That may be where we end up. I wouldn't be shocked at all if

EN

that's where we end up. I do think we need to walk through that process and sort of at a minimum take a look at all the SSAD recommendations and see if there is consensus around what to keep and what to throw out.

It's weird that the Council small team is doing that. But the Council has asked us to do it so we should ensure our awareness duties. But we've got three months to do that. If what we have here otherwise saying that question aside, if it goes out for public comment, then let's use the time over the summer to wrap all of that up. Sebastien, I know you are not super comfortable doing that. I mean, you can do it if you want. I guess you could try to get out of it, as I should say. You're more than capable of doing it, Sebastien, as a former GNSO Council chair. But if you hate the idea, let's volunteer McElwaine or somebody like that to walk us through it. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, I'm hesitant, but this is a great group and I trust that you're not going to throw me under the bus, at least not every session, so I'll be able to survive it. I'll just hand to Farzaneh, and then maybe we'll go with my questions. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you for these options. As I said in chat, if these options can be modified because you see, they're a little bit not flexible. I think we can't come to consensus based on this. If we can reword them and be diplomatic—my God, I cannot believe I said that. Because, well, I agree with Sarah that the optimal choice is number two. But we came up with

EN

a policy as a result of a process and we have to think about what our future action is so that we address the concerns of others and what we provide them. If it's possible, I think the group can think about option four, rewording and combining some of these recommendations.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It seems that we're, as I hear it, all in agreement that we should look at the SSAD recommendations, that we should analyze and figure out to the best of our knowledge what we should go with it. But the result of our work is more of a scoping exercise for a future team. Me partaking in it or not is beside the point. But a future team that will actually make policy recommendations. We're still on course of going back to Council, not with Policy Recommendations with a big R, but that we are willing to look at the recommendations that came from SSAD and to best of our knowledge, after year and a half of RDRS, give a judgment as to what should be kept and what should be worked on.

I think it's important, only from a project manager point of view, to give the Council an idea of scope of work there. We're not telling them go back and spend another five years starting from scratch. We're not saying it's going to be easy. But here is basically where we believe the work should concentrate and should go. With that, you can scope it and decide if it's going to be a small team. I'm sorry, Caitlin, but I wasn't taking notes. I forgot the multiple different paths than you were explaining. But is it a new PDP? Is it an EPDP? Is it a reworking on wording? One of the things that Caitlin didn't go too much into details, for example, that Paul will be my witness here, for the small team on the SubPro recommendations that he worked on for the better part of

two years is that conversation with the Board was happening also on a weekly basis. It's not like we were shooting and drafting text that we were just hoping we had Board understanding that this would float or this wouldn't way before it was sent back to the Board. We're completely in the dark. Again, I'm not suggesting this team would do it. It would be a subsequent team doing that work. Again, amongst the hybrids and upon the possibilities here. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Apologies for, I guess, reiterating a point. But just when you say to look at the recommendations and make a judgment as to what should be kept, I think, again, that just tells me that we're going to go through each recommendation and say implement it or do not implement it. I still am of the opinion that that is policy work because it's making a decision about a policy to implement or not implement. I think they're a package. I think they all go together. Maybe what we could do, that would be very similar, but not exactly the same would be to use that slide that I think we saw from the staff last meeting or the one before that looked at each recommendation—or it's in the report. Each rec and how it comes out in the RDRS, is it implemented or not. They were regular green. Then from that, we can tell them the ultimate, "This is what we as a group think should happen," but not do policy work. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It's we're doing the work, we're looking at it, we're giving an opinion, but it's not a capital P Policy, capital R Recommendation that we're issuing.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. I feel like there's a difference. Because what I'm suggesting is that we say, "In the RDRS, this is what we have observed. We saw that we've implemented this thing and it worked or we implemented this thing and it did not work or we didn't." Which is different than saying, "Now you should go ahead and implement something else that has this piece and this piece but not that piece and not that piece." That's the difference, I think.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Personally, I tend to agree with you. I think that's one step too far. But we should go, not cross the bridge, but go all the way to the bridge and give all the elements for Council to go and decide afterwards what they should do or not with it. We've got a few councilors here on the call so they can relay that very clearly. There's absolutely no problem. The Council will know exactly what we mean by whatever we're issuing.

Now, that opens another conversation and that was with regards to having time or not for public comments. I was on leave for the last two weeks. I may have missed... I did not go through every single e-mail yet, particularly not the Council e-mail so I haven't seen if there was any response from Council to the question I put to them two weeks ago or just before my leave. Was there any sort of answer there? If not, Paul,

EN

can you please clarify what you meant by that? But first, Feodora, because you had your hand up, and then Paul.

FEODORA HAMZA: I'll let Paul first and then I can take that.

PAUL MCGRADY: Well, I don't want to be factually wrong. Feodora, if you have a fact, we'd love to hear it. All I can do is convey to you what I'm hearing from the community. What I hear from the community is not a fact. It's just what I'm hearing. Feodora, I encourage you to go first.

FEODORA HAMZA: Well, the only fact that I have is that Council leadership asked the question to the wider community and we are expecting an answer for the May meeting. That's why you might have not seen an answer in your inbox yet, but should receive one after the next Council meeting. That's the fact I have at the moment.

PAUL MCGRADY: There you go. I will throw on top of Feodora's back my educated conjecture, which is I will be incredibly surprised if the community comes back and says, "No, we don't need a public comment period." That would shock me and I will buy everybody a drink in Prague if that happens. Everything that I'm hearing anecdotally is that people do want a chance to comment on this. There is no SSAD emergency. The thing's been sitting out there for years. The idea of having a public comment

where people can look at what we're suggesting and come back and give us feedback and then we finalize report to Council, that all feels very ICANN-ish. I guess what I'm saying is that it would be really surprising to me if we hear something other than that. I know it's extra work for us, but okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: For the record, minute 38 and 50 seconds that Paul offered us a drink. I can't remember if we're getting public comments on it.

PAUL MCGRADY: If we're going out to do a public comment, there will be... they won't be garbage either. We're going to find a wonderful bar in Prague before June, and I am prepared.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. It still leaves a relevant question. I tend to agree with you. I don't think that if we ask the community if they want to know the public comment, they're going to say no, for sure. The only difference was a question of timing. Is it a public comment on our clock or is it one on the Council's clock once we deliver. But it looks like our hopes and my personal hopes to have this signed, sealed, and delivered in June definitely before the summer break is not going to happen. If we keep going, we might as well include the comment and do a proper job, and have something that is full.

Okay. That answers a few questions. Now that we have everybody but Steve Crocker, I think, on the call that participated in the e-mail

exchange, does it clarify the questions that you had during the e-mail exchange? Are we agreed on where we want to go or was there still some point raised there that we missed? The question is obviously also open to those that didn't participate in the e-mail exchange but read it and had comments on it. Looking for hands. The overall question, Sarah, is does that answer the question of your e-mail exchange, the one you had last week? Farzaneh, I see a hand.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I'm sorry, I'm messing up your agenda. But I wanted to mention, if the community—NCSG usually is always linked towards more consultation. Probably we will say yes, there should be a public comment period. But I wanted to ask the group to be very clear with their constituency and their stakeholder group about the scope of our work and what we are doing here so that we don't receive public comments that we can just say, "Well, this would not within our scope. These are the issues that will be addressed elsewhere." It has happened many times, and I honestly sometimes... Let me stop the scope of work here. I think if we can be very clear about our scope and what we are doing so that we receive public comments that we can actually consider and integrate in our work, that would be great.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Because this was questioned in the mailing list last week, that's exactly the sort of confirmation I wanted to have, at least from the three of you that posed the question last week. Do we clarify that where—and it was a few slides up. If you can go back up, Feodora. The

scope as described in Feodora's presentation earlier actually clarify that scope that we will use for ourselves and then obviously for the public comment too. In the meantime, I see Alan's hand up. I'll listen to your comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to note that as was already mentioned, our scope is rather unusual. It borders on policy type work, not that they're asking us for policy, but they're asking us opinions on should we implement policy or not. That's rather unusual for this kind of group. I'm not sure there's anything out of our scope other than specifically saying implement X, Y, Z in detail. We are being asked to pass judgment on whether the policy that was recommended is something that we should go ahead with or not. That's dangerously close to policy as I think Sarah already said. But that's what our mandate is so we're going to have to be bold about this. Thank you. And I'm not quite sure almost any comment from the community is out of scope because of that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Wait a second. We've got 15 minutes to go on this call and we don't need to belabor it beyond that if we agreed to it. Can I turn to Feodora? I'm going to put you on the spot here because you're the one that in the end is the one that pens our thoughts back in Chapter 4 of our recommendations. Do you feel like you have the elements of the return that we discussed last week and that needed clarification? Do you feel like you have them? Or are there any other questions that are unclear to you?

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I think this was a very good discussion and we can definitely have some takeaways from this, I understand. Please correct me if I'm wrong, but we would do a similar table that we did for Chapter 3 where we list the recommendations from EPDP Phase 2, and where we compared them with RDRS. The Standing Committee would take a look and see which one worked well and which one could consider reworking or have a review.

I also understand that from the four scenarios that we discussed, most lean towards scenario four, like a variation or combination, but I am, let's say, missing the right wording for it so that's something we could discuss also next week. But as a key takeaway, I'm going to list what was discussed today and then probably present to the Standing Committee how Chapter 4 could look like and what could be included there, but having also in mind some of the potential recommendations that Caitlin presented during the last meeting that were discussed by the Standing Committee, and then we can go through them in the next meeting.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We're not going to wordsmith now all these things. I think it's well worth you guys sending those slides and the group looking at it because again there was a lot of material. It was very good but I think it's worth looking at every option and details, particularly if it turns out that we're going to have to invent some kind of a hybrid. One thing—and I'm looking at you, Sarah—is it next week that we're missing the call because of the CP Summit, or was it week after?

SARAH WYLD: Hi. Next week, May 5th, is the CP Summit. I think we're not having a call that week and we appreciate it very, very much. Then just so you know, on the 12th, Roger will be the Registrar rep.

PAUL MCGRADY: The Non-Contracted Parties are more than happy to have a call with everybody. We'll just wrap up the documents, send it into Council if you'd like. I mean, just try to be helpful.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Since I'm not traveling, I'll sign it off. It's all great. We agreed to take a break for a week. But thank you for your, as always and as ever, helpfulness.

Again, with this, look into your inbox. We'll send that, or Feodora will send that presentation. We have two weeks to figure out what we're going ahead with us. It would be good to continue exchanging on the mailing list to make sure that we're not all going with separate ideas. Buckle up, because obviously, this is not three weeks away from finishing, we're going to spend a bit more time and probably spend the summer together. By next call will be just on the eve of the next Council meeting, I guess. We won't have quite the answer, but we figured them out, the answers from the community on public comments and we'll know better what we're doing it. I don't think it's worth for the time is left to go into substance too much right now. But looking forward, one,

to the presentation, and then, to your thoughts about how to proceed with all this. Looking forward to it. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]