EN

ICANN Transcription

RDRS Standing Committee

Monday, 22 April 2024 at 17:30 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/RQCNEg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call taking place on Monday, April 22, 2024. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or unmute your mic now. If assistance is needed updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information is posted on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for recording purposes. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you, and back over to Sebastien.

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.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Devan, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. So I look at the agenda and we will add a third AOB. I will ask Steve Crocker to share an email that was sent by the CSG over the weekend that I received. I'll share the email at the same time during the call. Anyway, I'll let Steve do that. So I see Thomas's hand up. Go ahead, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Just briefly, I also have a quick AOB. It's just going to be a short announcement.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And you want to also have an AOB? Okay, cool. Then noted, we'll have four AOBs altogether. Is there any other proposed change to the agenda? Any comments? Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Sebastien. I wondered whether we could revisit the document we discussed on our last call, which was a discussion of potential changes to the RDRS. Remember, we had requester side and registrar side, and I was hoping to revisit to see whether we've made any updates to that. The RDRS, what would we even call it?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It was the impressions document.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right, precisely. I'd love for us to revisit that online and see what's been added since the last call or updated. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So I wanted to put that to a comment to Steve's AOB. I intended to do that, so we can do that. I'd like to focus on the metrics and the data because this is the week for it, but we can visit all that. I'm sure that we'll have plenty of time. Okay, with this and seeing no further hands, I guess we can move to point two of our agenda, which is the RDRS usage reports. Is there anybody that has questions? Lisa, I assume, do you want to walk us through the latest on this document or how do you guys want to handle this?

LISA CARTER: Hi, Sebastien. Yeah, I just wanted to present it as far as overall and kind of maybe talk about what we updated. This particular one, this is the report where we decided we were going to publish the CSV of the summary of data chart. And so we've done that with this report. And then we also posted CSVs for the previously posted reports as well. So you guys should see CSVs for everything so far that's been posted. But in general, just kind of wanted to know if you guys had questions or any feedback. I had not planned to walk through each section of the report unless there's something you guys specifically want to talk about.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see Marc Anderson's hand.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Lisa. Just your real quick sort of if you could refresh my memory, is there any difference in format between the March

and the April reports? I find myself forgetting month over month what changed and if we have any agreed on changes from March to April. So I just want to check with you and see if there's anything different formatting wise.

LISA CARTER: Sure. We usually list the changes in the report, I think it's on page three. The only thing listed there for the report that was posted on the 15th was the addition of the CSV. And then we actually did highlight a little more clearly on the page that lists the participating registrars, the number of DUMs, and percentage of DUMs covered by the participating registrars. So those were the only two things in this particular report. None of the other metrics were updated from last report to this time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Last month, I reported that the metric nine, you added up the numbers, it didn't match the total number of requests that were reported in some months. And I don't think we got an answer back as to what had happened and why did the numbers sometimes not match. I haven't checked this month, to be honest, whether they match or not.

LISA CARTER: Hi, Alan. I actually did send you a reply to your question on each point in the mailing list. Maybe a week and a half ago, two weeks ago. But just kind of in summary, it indicated basically that those numbers aren't supposed to match because the report itself is a histogram. You cannot add those things together to make a sum that totals, makes everything match up specifically, was the information that I posted in that reply to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That doesn't actually sound right, but I'll look at the reply and get back to you on that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Thanks. Gabe showed us a way of displaying the data that I thought was extremely helpful. I've lost track of the name of that type of graph, but Gabe, I'm sure you can supply it. One of its features is that it accounted for, I think—a Sankey, he says, intrinsically accounted for everything that made all the totals add up. I like that a lot. I wish we made that a regular practice.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, I think that the topic was discussed indeed last week and prompted the idea of sharing a CSV. I think that there was reasons why staff didn't adopt it directly, licensing and others. But we were [inaudible] probably invited, and probably Gabe to start

with to try to plug the data, and that's why we're supplying it also in CSV into the system. So maybe we should pivot to Gabe and verify with you if indeed the data that is supplied in the CSV will be useful for you to integrate that. Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: yes, I do appreciate the data being provided via CSV because it eliminates the risk of transcription errors in allowing folks like myself to do these alternate visualization methods. I don't know what the reasoning is that ICANN staff feels that this is something that they can't do, whereas folks like me can. I sort of might have been told some of the reasons, but I've lost track of that.

I will note that if the notion was, though, that some of the data, as was just described, isn't intended to add up, I don't view that as being an obstacle per se. If you, for example, look at the denials that might recur for requests, the reasons for denial are non-exclusive, which means if you were to sum up all of the various denial reasons that were given, they might actually exceed the number of denials that occurred. But that's okay, as long as you understand that the visualization that I've provided doesn't actually fail to work just because that's happening. It just makes it more apparent where that's happening. And it still shows, in my mind, a very useful high-level summary that shows the relative proportions of the initial requests going all the way through the final adjudication. I'm still a big fan of it, but I note that everyone has reasonable opinions and that reasonable minds can disagree. But I have provided in the standing committee mailing list before links to some free tools that, not being a lawyer, so I can't comment on

legality, but at least as I read it, they were intended for public use, for non-commercial use. So I'll stop there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabe. Lisa, I seem to remember from a discussion last week, or last time we spoke, two weeks ago, that there was an issue, but indeed I don't remember exactly what was the issue. Do you remember what was the... Can you share on that?

LISA CARTER: So my memory is failing me a little bit, too. I believe that the challenge was sort of, again, the level of effort. I'm not sure the system that we have in place can actually accommodate what the Sankey is providing, but I can double-check that with the team and get back to you. I think that was one of the reasons, like you mentioned, that we provided the CSV, because of sort of the challenge in being able to present that data in the way that the Sankey report presents it within our own systems.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, can we try in the next two weeks maybe to integrate that? And I haven't looked at it, but maybe I should, and see where the effort is needed. Actually, I'll volunteer to have a first look at it, and then depending on how I fare, I might come back to you with questions, and if it looks more straightforward than that. If I'm able to do it myself, then maybe Lisa, we should have a chat and see how you guys can pick it up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry to interrupt, Sebastien, I just want to point your attention directly to an email that came from me to the Standing Committee thread, where I think the title might have said Sankey in it. So if you were to search the Standing Committee mailing list for that particular email, you'll see some, I hope, helpful instructions and links to explain exactly what it was.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. I'll keep on looking, but I'll reach out if I have any issues with it.

LISA CARTER: We'll take that back, Sebastien. We'll take that back and discuss. We don't have the software either.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I can have a look through it. Don't worry. No issue. Any other comments? Any other comments on the data itself, on the way it's presented, on anything linked to it? Going once, twice. Well, then there's none. Thank you very much. So I note that we will look at the Sankey graph and for that, beyond that, we can keep doing what we are doing for the coming months. Can we go back to the agenda? Oh, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, Sebastien. This really belongs in the notion of how we're going to plan out our calendar. But at the six-month point, considering it came up at the end of November, we get to the end

of May, we'll have six months in. That might be an appropriate time to schedule a call that looks at the six-month check in on where things are trending and what the cumulative stats are showing. So at that particular call, if we're able to organize it that way, we'd say, where are we trending in terms of understanding whether this RDRS experiment, this pilot is going to produce the kind of information we were hoping it would and whether we can observe any trends from it. So I'd just like to propose that as something for the group to think about before the end of May. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Steve, with the only caveat that six months will be May because there was no November to speak of. And so I had envisioned something like that for Kigali itself. Because that's when we will have the reports.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That'll be fine. And then in Kigali would be just fine. And it's possible that that could be picked up in the AOB from the commercial stakeholders group that Steve Crocker will discuss. We could end up doing some of that in that session. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. I want to give a plus one to that idea. And I'm happy to hear, Sebastien, you already had that in mind. I feel like our discussions today have been more small picture items, the format contents of the report and not really big picture items, which is recommendations for future policy and the SSAD recommendations. So I like Steve's suggestion. I think six months is probably a good amount of time for us to take a reflection point and have a little bit of a big picture conversation. So I just wanted to give Steve a plus one there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER: Yes, thanks, Sebastien. Lisa, for the record, just to follow up on what Marc and Steve mentioned, it's in the agenda to talk about as an AOB, but I'll just mention that there is a prep week session scheduled for the 29th of May at 16:30 UTC. That will be an RDRS update of about the six-month mark. So that will actually happen leading into ICANN 80. And I will give those types of stats in the presentation where we are six months in, kind of what outreach has happened, what enhancements we've made to the system, metrics, etc. So that will happen at the prep week session.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And yet, Sebastien, if I may, Lisa, that's a general audience prep week. It isn't the standing committee who's evaluating the more subtle and long-range big picture items that Marc and I have

brought up. So I appreciate that you're doing that, but it isn't a substitute for this group looking at the big picture. We need that as well.

LISA CARTER: Absolutely.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I think we're all agreed. Well noted, Steve. And thank you, Lisa, for that. Let's go quickly through point number three of our agenda and then we'll dive into the AOBs because it seems like there's much to discuss there. So finalizing the metric report changes. We did discuss two weeks ago one or two items that were going to change, but I don't remember anything specific to the report other than providing the CSVs, which you started doing. Was there anything else that we're waiting for? I don't see any reaction from Lisa, so I assume not.

There was the discussion that was open a few weeks ago by the, I guess it was the NCUC that brought it, by Farzaneh who joined our call regarding the adding the country, the jurisdiction of law enforcement requests. But I believe that conversation is still ongoing between them and the PSWG and we'll be waiting for them or for Gabe to inform on where they landed with that before we're doing it. I think, Simon, you did mention two weeks ago the fact that work could be already done or should be looked at in order to make that field mandatory and possibly pre-populate it with the requester's stated country from the user profile. I'm not sure if you're able to give us a bit of an update on this, but

EN

otherwise, at least from what I had on my radar, I think that the metrics were pretty much now stable.

SIMON RAVEH: Sorry, can you repeat that question for me? I apologize.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Do you remember, two weeks ago, we discussed the possibility of integrating a last metric, which was the provenance, the country provenance or the jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency requests. And we left it at PSWG for law enforcement discussing that with the party that was requesting it with the non-commercials. But in the meantime, that we would look at the feasibility. And you stated two weeks ago that it was easy, there was a field, there was country, that wasn't populated because it wasn't mandatory and that we could change it into a mandatory field and possibly populate it with the user profile country with the possibility of changing it if it didn't correspond, but pre-populate it to make sure that we had as much data as possible pre-filled.

SIMON RAVEH: So I agree with everything, but we haven't started the work because I think I'm waiting for confirmation.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: But you can confirm that it was feasible and you're just waiting for us to greenlight this.

SIMON RAVEH: In general, yes. We're talking about the requester country, right?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The requester country and then the report would be probably more focused on law enforcement, but in general, the requester country. Lisa, in the meantime, you raise your hand. Go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, I was just going to add on to what you were discussing with Simon. We talked about enhancements last week sort of to the interface and that was where we discussed having the fields required. Sarah wanted to add that to the list, I think, as well. And we talked about the law enforcement country being maybe taken care of by making the address field required. That is right now kind of going through the process of being set up and vetted for the JIRA tickets that would need to happen in order to go ahead and implement that. And last week, we actually talked about those items that the standing committee thought would be priority, the next priority of enhancement. So that is on the list, just FYI.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, I lost the last bit of what you said, but I think it's my connection that wasn't great. I assume everybody else heard you. Gabe, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi, this is Gabriel. I just wanted to chime in and say that I am looking forward to the next meeting when we can discuss some

additional feedback from that forum. And I note that at least one of the suggestions we had was actually to remove one of the questions so we might be able to free up some screen real estate on the forum if needed here. I think I was not privy to the call last week and apologies again for not being there, but I'm very much looking forward to continuing these conversations. And Lisa, for your awareness, just to help prepare for that, I'm really looking toward getting feedback from you in terms of which of the requester pieces of feedback are going to represent the lowest level of effort to get done. And then I note some of the pieces of feedback we had too even weren't intended for direct feedback, but rather just to note desired features for any future successor systems. So I think we'll have some more productive conversation on this next week, hopefully.

LISA CARTER: I had a quick question about I wasn't aware of any discussion of removing questions, so I kind of wanted to ask a little more detail about that. And then just to remind people that the level of effort for the prioritized list of enhancements that the registrars requested is in the impressions document. So a level of effort is listed there. And I think you were missing from the call last week, Gabe, but we also wanted to get level of effort on the items that you put in the requester section. We just need to have you list the priority so that we can have the team do the exercise of level of effort for those enhancements as well, if you can prioritize that for us.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, I think it's a little bit of a chicken and egg situation where I don't want to put a higher priority to something that is a high level of effort, if you know what I mean. But we can work together maybe for that. I'll do a first pass, but note that it is perhaps iterative then, where I want the one to inform the other. Specifically, though, with regards to one question that I know we thought was actually unneeded and perhaps even counterproductive was the question pertaining to provision of compulsory legal process, that is to say court orders, subpoenas, and that sort of attaching document. After discussion with my colleagues and counterparts in the Public Safety Working Group, our collective impression is that law enforcement agencies will not be using the RDRS to convey compulsory legal process from courts or governmental authorities to the beneficiary registrars. And that in all situations that we can at least envision at this time, having gone through the process of obtaining that legal process, you've already done the work of identifying the registrar and their physical addresses and whether or not they're within your jurisdictions and all of that. And so at that point, the value add of the RDRS is no longer really beneficial. The RDRS is more of a tool if you want to forward a request and you don't want to do that work. Further, there were complications arising from concern about operational security of introducing third parties to these sometimes sensitive documents. And so the general understanding is that that question isn't needed, and that was the piece of feedback there.

LISA CARTER:	Good to know. I hadn't heard that, so I'd be interested to hear what the other Standing Committee members think of all of that as well.
SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Sure. Can we just park this for a second because I wanted to go through the AOBs and we'll leave a maximum time to do that as Steve DelBianco suggested at the beginning of the call. So with that, I'll draw a line under finalizing the metric and then we can look at the list, see if there is anything that is missing.

So AOB number one, we propose to cancel the 6th May call. Essentially, the contracted parties are meeting in Paris for two days around that. And so there'll be a lot of absentees, yours truly included. And so we were thinking about canceling it. We will look at the agenda for the following meeting. So we're not going to do a meeting directly the week after. We're going to keep our cadence so that we don't mess up everybody's calendar. But because that meeting would be specifically one to discuss features, we'll make the next meeting after one that is feature oriented, at the very least the hybrid. We always seem to have more to discuss features than on data, at least at this stage. And so I'd like to make sure that we don't lose a meeting for it. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:	Yeah, no problem on my part for canceling 6th May. The next one after that comes out to be 20th May, which is hard on the heels of going to Kigali. And so as part of this discussion, what's our plan

about having any meetings in Kigali? And sort of just look ahead that whole period and map out how we're going to use the time and what we're expecting to do. Because when we meet on May 20th, most of us, I would guess, will have our minds well embroiled in the travel issues and scheduling issues going into Kigali.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. So I should prepare for that question, obviously. You're catching me a bit unprepared. I don't know exactly. I want to have a meeting, at least a meeting there. There is the one that you're going to discuss now about the CSG. I don't know if Sarah's on the call. I haven't seen her. But I believe that the registrars are also preparing something to review that. So it's a good time to look at it. I don't have any answers. But maybe this is, oh, I see Roger said this correct.

So I don't have dates for any of these things. Obviously, I need to figure this out and maybe something for Lisa and I to look at it together offline and come back to the group. But this is an excellent segue. So I've shared about 20 minutes ago with everybody the email that I received from Mason on Saturday for me. Do you want to discuss that, Steve Crocker, and walk us through it?

STEVE CROCKER: Sure. So it starts with a very simple thing, which was there was a lot of interest in the session that CSG hosted last time. And the suggestion is to do it again. The focus last time and presumably

this next time is on gathering the experience from the requesters. Now, there's a lot of other kinds of questions that one could ask, which we'll come back to in just a second.

One of the feedbacks from last time was apparently some of the people in the registrar community felt that it wasn't helpful from their point of view or it put them in a bad light. A comment that I recall Sarah making that I took in a quite different way was a reaction of, oh, that's interesting. Maybe it should have been sponsored by us, by the small team here. And I took that to be in a positive sense of, gee, that's like a good idea. Why didn't we think of that?

So part of what was in the message, if I recall what was sent to you, Sebastien, from Mason, was the suggestion that perhaps this group could participate, co-sponsor it or participate or something along those lines. I'm a little sensitive about trying to pack too many distinct agendas into the same session. So on the one hand, I think it would be great to have participation from the registrar, participation from this group, et cetera. On the other hand, if we try to transform what that session does from a gathering of data from the requesters into something else of what the registrars want or trying to be defensive about the way the system is designed or whatever, then I think we lose the opportunity to get the maximum substance there. And that there's other times and places to gather those other kinds of things.

So if the registrars are planning something, I think that's fantastic. I would simply say in addition that I can understand the negative reaction from some of the registrars in the sense that they may feel defensive. Let me tease apart two kinds of things. Some of

the comments from the requesters can be interpreted as, gee, the system is difficult for us to use in various ways or here's what we'd want. One particular item that would fall into that basket is, why does it take 35 clicks to submit a request? That is not aimed at the registrars at all. That is a comment that's focused on the design and the deployment of the system.

And then on the other hand, comments like, why do we get inconsistent responses from one registrar turning down everything and another registrar answering everything for the same kinds of comments. That's one which is understandably something that the registrars might feel somewhat defensive about.

The other point of view that I want to suggest here is that just as the requesters have various thoughts about what would make their life easier and the whole system more effective, I think the registrars have a list of very legitimate kinds of things that they could and are already asking for to say, ah, we now have experience using the system from the registrar side and here's our list of experiences and improvements that we'd want to make. So I think keeping those points of view cleanly identified and it'd be helpful all around and then we can have orderly meetings and discussions and so forth about all this without feeling like anybody's put in an awkward position. That's a sort of longer introduction than I think you were expecting, I'm sure. I'm all in favor of having another session. I don't know how much more experience we're going together than we had before. You always get a sort of a rush in the first event of that kind, but it can't hurt to have another go at it. I didn't initiate it, actually. The CSG folks initiated it and so I'm, as I say, I'm strongly in favor and I'm quite

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thanks, Steve. No, I know you didn't initiate. You were CC'd on the email. That's why I put you on the spot. Steve DelBianco and then I'll ask Roger maybe to raise his hand and talk about what the registrars were thinking of.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Actually, Sebastien, that's what I wanted to ask because I remember that session that Steve Crocker kicked off with all the appropriate context of let's gather our experiences and avoid being pejorative. I actually think that's what we did, but nonetheless, I think the registrars felt put upon and I saw, like, I think I saw Sarah and Ashley sitting in the back of that small room. What I would propose is Ashley, Sarah, Reg, sit at the table with us so that when we say something, you can characterize it, say, you know, there's a finer point on that or there are shades of gray. And it would take an effort of all of us not to be defensive or aggressive. But we've got to talk this through in a way that when a requester makes the observation of getting inconsistent answers from different registrars, there's an opportunity to come back and say, really, could you characterize that further? Do you have any feedback on that data? Do you realize there is no policy requirement here? Was it regarding privacy and proxy services?

We can ask a lot of questions in a way that really susses out whether that's a new concern. Is it a policy level concern? Is it a

systems concern, which we kind of move aside? So, you know, Steve, I'll discuss this with other CSG leaders. But if Sarah, Ashley, Reg, and perhaps a registrar and others want to join us, I would love for them to be able to react in real time in a way to keep it constructive. I hope that's agreeable. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Steve. Roger, I'll just give it to you to comment the way you [inaudible]. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks. And actually, thanks, Steve and Steve, because I think they hit on all my points, actually, of what the registrars were hoping for. And to Crocker's point, I don't think anybody took offense to, you know, why is one happening here or there? You know, what's the expectations? One of the big focus, I think, for the registrars in Kigali will be exactly that is talking through specific examples of, okay, here's the request. And this is what was missing. You know, if we had this data, then we could have pushed this further along than what we, you know, just denying it after looking at it. So I think a lot of the registrar meeting at 80 will be along those lines of just taking specific examples and walking through them and saying, okay, if we had this, you know, if we got a response to it, however, you know, just to make it better really is a big focus.

But, you know, the reason why is obviously coming out of Puerto Rico, we did see a huge advantage of the CSG holding that meeting and just wanted to flip that and provide the registrar side

of it. So I think that that's going to be the main focus for Kigali. So hopefully that answers it. If not, just let me know. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. And to complete, Roger, so it would be, from my understanding, it would be looking at specific cases, obviously anonymized. We're not here either to name and shame the other way around. We look at cases and say looking at our test, this is what would have passed and this is what didn't. Thomas, I see your hand up and you added a link in the chat for those who are not following that directly. Go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, I thought I should hit two birds with one stone and make my comment on the discussion that we're just having and my AOB. Which is both interrelated. Now, as far as the CSG session in San Juan is concerned, I've been in the room and I took the mic and said that I thought that the discussion didn't go the way it should. Because, you know, I thought that all in all, it painted a pretty dark picture on how the RDRS works. So it was not encouraging participation. What we saw afterwards is registrars saying that they want to opt out. And I think we don't want to lose registrars, we want to win registrars.

And I'm not making this comment with respect to Steve's intervention. I think that was all fair, right? I think it was the overall way the session was set up. You know, for example, that INTA is encouraging feedback via an email address, RDRS stories. You know, so it sounds like we're looking for, you know, nice stories to

tell. So it doesn't sound too factual, you know. And there may be perfect reasons why a disclosure is denied in one case and approved in another case. You know, it may well be that the trademark owner has a trademark in one jurisdiction and it doesn't have one in another jurisdiction. But it just stated the facts that, you know, a disclosure was not possible. So what I'm trying to say is that we should be extremely careful to endorse, as the working group, a meeting on ICANN's official agenda that is not totally inviting after the first session didn't go as it should.

We had a GNSO wrap-up session with a pretty high-handed analysis of what happened. And so I think that the session was set up with the best intentions. But it went wrong, according to some people's views. And I think we need to try to give this a positive spin, a constructive spin that we want to work together on this. Certainly, if there are inconsistencies in decision-making and approaches and requesting, that needs to be analyzed and hopefully harmonized. So if we could work on this jointly, that would be great.

And I have offered that we would try to do our best at ECO, this association that I'm working with. And the link that you saw in the chat is a link to a session that we're going to, a webinar that we're going to do on the 30th, together with ICANN. That is not an in-depth type thing, but it's more like a general overview of how you can report, how the RDIS works. This webinar is kindly going to speak there. And we're going to have Prudence talk about the requester side of things. And we're going to have Odeline and Chris Mondini from ICANN to talk about that stuff. So that's the easy listening sort of requester thing. And then we're currently

having discussions with Laureen and a couple of other folks, Brian Beckham, Jason—Mason Cole and others to maybe set up a workshop where we can bring together those who are writing requests, with those who are processing requests to hopefully find out where the issues lie and how we can bring the participants together. And in that same vein, I think if it is constructive, if it's not perceived to be cornering registrars, then I think it can all work out well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, and thank you for using this venue to pitch your ECO work. Paul McGrady, I see your hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, and Thomas, thank you, and others who've already made comments on this. I mean, great. CSG asking us to co-sponsor it, I actually think that we should—the council should consider having this group have these regularly, this particular small team, and so we could get out ahead of, or standing committee, whatever we're called this week, so that we could get out ahead of it in terms of branding. And instead of reacting to CSG invites or registrar invites, we could be leading in this space. But the ship has sailed for Kigali already, so glad to be invited. But I do think that in order to keep from happening what happened last time, or at least hopefully having a chance of that, and also keeping our good names good, we as part of our agreement with the CSG to join in what they're doing, I think somebody from this standing committee should moderate that session. And try to keep it on track and keep everybody's temperatures low, redirect people

if they're getting too critical, if they're calling people out by name, you know, the kinds of stuff that can happen.

And so I think we should move forward, but I think we should try to get out ahead of it this time, instead of just reacting to it. And Steve, always a big thank you to you for staying in the mix of all this. I know it's a giant hot potato. So thank you very much for being willing to interact with all the various points of view on this. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you, Paul. And I raised my hand so I'm going to recognize myself. So on the invitation and Paul's last comment that we should get ahead of it, I fully agree. In this particular case, I'm sorry, I didn't plan on the CSG organizing a new session, but I sort of had it in back of my head that it might happen. I knew of the registrars' effort. I wanted also the different communities to be able to do it. If we do it, if we sponsor it, then essentially we end with one hour discussion instead of what looks to be the case in Kigali, which is two separate hours to talk about it. So there's also the advantage of letting the community doing it.

But I agree with you, Paul, and I'm certainly happy to raise my hand if at the CSG session somebody wants me to help moderate or at least take part of the burden. I will be present at the session and I'll get back to Mason in a minute [inaudible] answer already.

Now this said, one of the things, and this is true for both sessions, one of the things that I asked before the session, before San Juan, is not to be presented with the recordings of the session of

the [inaudible] and for us to figure out what to do with it next. We took on board one of the criticisms that we heard about the size of the text field, it was fairly easy, and if Devan was able to put the impressions document, or Lisa, I don't know who has it the closest, on screen, there is still nothing about that session in our document. In the tools that we use to do our work here, there is nothing that's derived from that session. We've heard a lot of things, but either there was nothing concrete that came out of it that will help our work, or it wasn't captured. And I think that that's a problem.

So again, happy to go, happy to participate. I will be there present, I [wasn't in] San Juan, but then I do ask for that part of the legwork to be done, because again, it's not for this committee to then go back to the recordings and figure out what was and what was not pertaining to us. I would like for the representative of each of these communities to go and enter it in the document. Again, if we can have the document online, right now you'll see that the section of the requesters is basically Dave's input coming out of the PSWG discussions.

And then last but not least, I understand, I heard also, I heard much moaning from certain registrars that were named. Roger, he is my witness, because we happen to have the same employer that was named profusely and not always in the best color. It ruffled no feathers internally. It's part of the game of participation. I don't know exactly who the loudest and happiest registrars were, but my understanding was that some of them actually hadn't received a single request. And it was out of principle. So indeed, I agree with everybody. We should cool heads a bit and take a

breather. These weeks are usually pretty intense with little sleep and a lot of jet lag. So we'll be kind to each other. But it's not like we need to take all these as if people were slamming doors and everybody leaving. This pilot is still on track and everybody agreed once they were back home and settled down a bit that it should keep on track and we should keep on doing what we're doing best. With this said, Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: I want to ask for clarification of what you were saying about the report from that meeting is not in the record or in the tools that are available here. I'm a little confused because I don't understand what it is and what you wanted out of that. There was quite a bit of work. First of all, there was a transcript available. So that's just straightforward there and the recording. And then there was a reasonable serious effort to capture and summarize the main points, make that available for everybody who wanted to use it, including us in this committee if we wanted. What would you have wanted different or what would you like...

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, very clearly, I'm going to take on board figuring out what in these transcripts and these reports were important to you or not and then filling it in the requesters part of the document that is on screen. I would expect somebody from your side to go and do that and do what Lisa just asked, [I gave to do] at the beginning of the call, prioritize your request for the whole group to look at. This is the document that we're working from. And I'll ask the same thing of the registrars.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay, thank you. I'll make an observation that doesn't require further discussion at this point. There is a big disparity in the level of support that is available to the requesters versus the registrars. The registrars have a whole stakeholder group and the corresponding staff support that goes with that. The requesters have no organization and no staff support. So it makes it awkward to try to match all of that. We do the best we can. So as I said, no point to discuss here. I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Appreciate it. At least bullet points. Even if you want to go and refer to other documents so you don't have to spend hours copy pasting, I appreciate that. But at least bullet points so we know what we're talking about and we're able to prioritize. Okay. Now, Steve DelBianco, at the top of the hour, you asked to look at this document with all the good discussions that we've had. We've got now seven minutes to look at it. Was there anything in particular that you wanted to walk us through?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Sebastien. It's a mechanics question. Gabe, on behalf of the PSWG, put nine items in. Most of those, though, was that are relevant to the non-governmental requester community. We'd like to signal our agreement. For instance, BC, IPC might signal agreement to item 1, 3, 5, whatever they are. Should I put that in the table under ICANN constituency? Do you want to see a comment instead? And then if we have others to add, I assume I

can propose those as well. Just asking for expectations and mechanics.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, so expectations is to have at least each different discrete request be itemized under a number. Afterwards, and maybe I'll turn to Lisa because she's also using this document, what is the easiest for you either to have it as a comment or having the constituency to put CSG [inaudible] or whatever you want to mark it. I have no particular opinion. I think I've seen, for example, Sarah commenting Gabe's point when she was in agreement, maybe the comments is the easiest at this stage. Lisa, again, if you have other views, please intervene. But I'd say for now, just put it in comments. It'll have your name on it. We'll understand what you mean there. Yeah, exactly. Adding BC there. Okay.

LISA CARTER: I can second that. If you want to add a comment that you agree with something that's already in there, that would be great. If there's something new that you want to add, I would just follow the format that Gabe sort of has done in the requester section or even in the registrar section. As far as prioritizing, Sarah was kind enough to actually provide priorities, one, two, three, four, for each of the items that registrar saw as most important to maybe not as important. And then we had our ICANN team internally look at that and then provide level of effort on each. And then I provided commentary on that level of effort back in the document so everyone could see what that was and any other sort of feedback we had. So we can keep doing that same thing.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, and when it comes to priority, we might assign something to a very high priority because it's important. And then we learn that the level of effort is prohibitive. It would be better to have that discussion with you rather than what Gabe has done here is to say high priority, but maybe it's low because it's a big level of effort. You know what I'm saying?

LISA CARTER: Right, right. I mean, if we'd like to know what's of most importance to you guys as well, though.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. Because we can make judgments. Let's suppose we have something that's really important, but it's not as important as a bunch of other items. We might want to clarify that this is a high priority, but if it consumes resources that would address the other high priority items, this one could be deferred.

LISA CARTER: Right, and we did that same thing with the ones that Sarah prioritized. There was one she had as a lower priority previously and then saw the level of effort was low and made it a higher priority, so we can do the same. Absolutely.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can somebody scroll a bit to go through those different items? Again, I see Stephanie Perrin on the list. The item that was discussed two weeks ago. Is that yet on the table? It might be worth you guys adding it as an item 10, 11, whatever comes up following on the list.

With this said, we've got three minutes to go. I think I've discussed everything. Again, I'll look at the possibility of integrating the CSV into the same key graphs, and I'll coordinate with Lisa and staff to see who does what. Answering to Steve Crocker, I'll share on the list what is being planned for Kigali in terms of our sessions and the different sessions on the RDRS topic, and I'll share that as soon as I've got that figured this week.

With this, and seeing no further hands, at 8:28 PM here in Paris, I'll give myself another two minutes of my evening, and we'll see you guys not in two weeks this time because we decided to cancel, but immediately after as we reorganize our schedule. Thank you very much all, and have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]