


RECOMMENDATION 17

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
---	---------	-------------	------------------------------

The EPDP Team requests that when the EPDP Team commences its deliberations on a standardized access framework, a representative of the RPMs PDP WG shall provide an update on the current status of deliberations so that the EPDP Team may determine if/how the WG's recommendations may affect consideration of the URS and UDRP in the context of the standardized access framework deliberations.



Support recommendation as written

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
1.	No comments provided in support of this recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Poole; Domain Name Registrant • Michele Neylon; Blacknight Internet Solutions Ltd • Volker Greimann; Key-Systems GmbH • Lars Steffen; eco – Association of the Internet Industry • Zoe Bonython; RrSG • Domain.com, LLC & affiliates • Wolf-Ulrich Knoben; ISPCP Constituency • Monica Sanders; i2Coalition • George Kirikos; Leap of Faith Financial Services Inc. • Wim Degezelle ; RySG • Brian King; IPC • Dean S. Marks; Coalition for Online Accountability • Tucows Domains Inc. • Lori Schulman Senior Director, Internet Policy; International Trademark Association (INTA) • Brian King; MarkMonitor, Inc., a Clarivate Analytics company • Jeremy Dallman, David Ladd – Microsoft Threat Intelligence Center; Amy Hogan-Burney, Richard Boscovich – Digital Crimes Unit; Makalika Naholowaa, Teresa Rodewald, Cam Gatta – Trademark; Mark Svancarek, Ben Wallace, Paul Mitchell – Internet Technology & Governance Policy; Cole Quinn – Domains and Registry; Joanne Charles – Privacy & Regulatory Affairs; Microsoft Corporation • Etienne Laurin • Ben Butler; SSAC • Evin Erdoğdu; ALAC • Farzaneh Badii; Internet Governance Project • Ivett Paulovics; MFSD Srl URS Provider 	<p>Support</p> <p>EPDP Response: The EPDP appreciates the support</p> <p>Action Taken: none</p> <p>[COMPLETED]</p>
2.	It only makes sense for both PDP WGs to feed their respective inputs into each other, instead of working in silos.	DR. JAIDEEP KUMAR MISHRA ; DIRECTOR MINISTRY OF ELECTRONICS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA	<p>Support</p> <p>EPDP Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
3.	<p>Given the timeline to which the EPDP Team is working, the EPDP Team may complete its work before the RPM PDP WG enters its Phase 2 discussions involving UDRP disclosures. URS discussions (already taking place) may provide the EPDP Team with insight into the deliberations, discussion and draft policy recommendations on URS (which will, in turn, shed light on UDRP).</p> <p>This recommendation merely facilitates coordination between the EPDP and the RPM PDP.</p>	Ayden Férdeline; NCSG	<p>Concerns Divergence Support New Idea</p> <p>EPDP Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
Support intent of recommendation with edits			
4.	<p>We submit that in lieu of or in addition to a representative of the RPM WG, a UDRP provider should be included as a representative in any update to the EPDP team to properly assess the potential impact of the EPDP work on UDRP case administration.</p>	Brian Beckham; Head, Internet Dispute Resolution Section, WIPO	<p>Concerns</p> <p>EPDP Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
5.	<p>The EPDP Team should now commence its deliberations on a standardized access framework, since the “gating questions” have been answered.</p> <p>Further, the EPDP team requests that a representative of the RPMs PDP WG shall provide an update on the current status of deliberations so that the EPDP Team may determine if/how the WG’s recommendations may affect consideration of the URS and UDRP in the context of the standardized access framework deliberations, and that a representative of URS and UDRP providers also provide input on the use of data in conducting resolutions.</p> <p>While the BC supports the concept of a representative of the RMPs PDP WG providing such an update, we reiterate here that the gating questions have been substantially answered and deliberations should commence on standardized access. We also recommend that a representative of a UDRP and URS dispute resolution provider be available to the team in order to give perspective on the use of data in conducting resolutions.</p>	Steve DelBianco; BC	<p>Concerns</p> <p>EPDP Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
6.	It may prove most productive if URS and UDRP Providers were also consulted to provide an update on proposed URS and UDRP changes.	Renee Fossen; Forum - URS and UDRP Provider	<p>Concerns</p> <p>EPDP Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment			
Delete recommendation			
7.	This is an action item but not a recommendation for policy.	Sara Bockey; GoDaddy	<p>Divergence</p> <p>EPDP Response:</p> <p>Action Taken:</p> <p>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
Not designated			
8.	No selection made and no additional comments submitted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Mark Massey; Domain Name Rights Coalition • Steve Gobin; Corporate domain name management • Sivasubramanian Muthusamy; Internet Society India Chennai • Sajda Ouachtouki; The Walt Disney Company • Tim Chen; DomainTools • Greg Aaron; iThreat Cyber Group • Neil Fried; The Motion Picture Association of America • Monique A. Goeschl; Verein für Anti-Piraterie der Film- und Videobranche (VAP) • David Martel • Ashley Heineman; NTIA • Greg Mounier on behalf of Europol AGIS; Europol Advisory Group on Internet Security • Ashley Roberts; Valideus • Stephanie Perrin • Fabien Betremieux; GAC 	<p>EPDP Response: none</p> <p>Action Taken: none</p> <p>[COMPLETED]</p>