

---

## ICANN Transcription

### RDRS Standing Committee

**Monday, 26 February 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/u4C5EQ>

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, 26 February, 2024. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or unmute your mic. If assistance is needed updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. Observers are welcome and will have access to chat only and listen only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. 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 set your name before speaking. And 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 Sebastian, please begin.

---

*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 hello, everybody. Good evening, good morning, good afternoon. So we have an agenda today as displayed. I think that we should and we will spend a bit of time talking about 0.2, about meeting cadence and how we see the next few months coming. And then obviously, I'd like to leave plenty of time for our staff colleagues to run us through the usage report that Eleeza sent earlier last week or even the week before the 16th, 10 days ago.

So without further ado, talking about meeting cadence. So I think that the discussion originated by a comment from Gabriel, who was asking on the list, if there was a possibility to have a high cadence than once a month, which got me thinking and got staff thinking also, and we put our heads together last week over this. And so there's a number of things that come out of this discussion. And I will give the mic just after maybe to you, Eleeza, to introduce your side.

First of all, in the initial discussions that I had back in the days with Göran, it was clear that whilst this pilot wasn't going to have a full time dedicated development task force to be in constant evolution, that we would have windows to prepare for enhancements as we see fit. And the first thing and the initial cadence that was sort of described this two years ago and before we knew it at all where we were going.

The initial cadence was to say maybe we have a first development, and then six months later, we come up with agreed additional features that get scheduled in the following six months, and so on and so forth so that we have a window of opportunity to add these enhancements, maybe once a year. So again, a

---

gathering of specs over six months and then development over the next year, so on and so forth. Understanding that as the development is happening, we can still think about what we think could be needed.

The other topic, and this is a topic that came after the first call that we had in January, the first report call, was that there were not so much enhancements, but a few quick fixes that could be done. Quick fixes like for example, enhancing the list of options when one is describing why they're requesting data, or when we're describing why the data can be supplied for example. And these are not things that need to be scheduled long term. These are much easier to fit in a quick scrum. But I'll let, again, Eleeza to describe that in more detail.

The third thing that we discussed also, and this comes out of a number of presentations that have been done in the last two months with the product, the possible bugs. And particularly, very annoying ones that happened very quickly in the process. Bugs in ill identifying the reason why a domain name can't be processed. There was a number of things that were, for example, raised by Olivier Crépin-Leblond, at some point, when ALAC did a presentation, he ran a test on a bunch of domains that he knew wouldn't go through, but that were wrongly labeled in their refusal, for example, and that we could find some way to [audio glitch].

Now, I also believe – and it'll be you, Eleeza, in just a second -- I also believe there's been a bit of a shift in the team, new faces, new people joining us. People that were with us in previous months, moving on to other things, let's not go on better into other topics and particularly, as you can imagine, ICANN is moving

---

---

people around quite a bit right now because of the new gTLD program. So there's been a number of changes, but I'll let Eleeza explain that. And then after that, Steve, I haven't forgotten you. I'll give you a minute or two to pitch your idea for ICANN in Puerto Rico. But go ahead, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Sure, thank you, Seb, and hello, everyone. Yes, Seb mentioned, we've had a few changes within our team. Previously, Yuko Yokoyama and Diana Middleton, who you've both interacted with, were leading this project work for us. They've both moved to better things, different things as Seb said, they've both taken roles in the next round preparations and planning. So I am very fortunate though to have an experienced colleague here with me today, Lisa Carter is on the call. She has been with ICANN for seven years, working on the gTLD accounts and services team. She is very familiar with the domain industry. I should say she comes from the domain industry prior to ICANN.

As an account manager, she managed, I don't even know how many hundreds of IANA's. So she's familiar with the registrar side of things as well as with NSP, the system upon which we built RDRS. So we're very grateful to have her here. She'll be the lead and kind of your liaison to consider these changes. So I'm going to let her speak in just a moment, but I just wanted to reinforce what Seb was saying in terms of cadence and considering changes. We've been taking in a lot of feedback we've seen all of the input that's come on the list. We've also been tracking the comments that you've been including in your impressions

---

document. In addition to attending and seeking to a number of different community groups.

Seb mentioned the EURALO meeting where Olivier had shared a number of kind of wonky error messages people were getting when they input for example domains under .com.inta [inaudible - 00:08:39] independently. And so those are things that we're treating more as bugs, so to speak, errors that we can build into our sprint cycles and make changes more quickly. The ones we want to dig into a bit more, and to ensure we have consensus from this group on before we go back and assess the level of effort for the changes are bigger things.

So, probably the biggest example that comes to mind is our previous discussions about an API, but other kind of major system changes would take a greater level of effort. And as Seb noted, most of our ENIT resources right now are devoted to preparing tools for the next round so we need to sort of think carefully about how we slot those in and what resources are available to make those changes. So if I can maybe ask Lisa to speak a little bit more about that and how we're proposing to move forward. And then perhaps we can open up for discussion. So Lisa, could you speak?

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Hi, everyone. I'm happy to be here. I've just joined the team on the 15<sup>th</sup>, so I'm still getting up to speed. But as far as cadence for changes to the system, Eleeza, Seb and I had a discussion about having a biweekly cadence where we alternate between meetings related to review and reporting like we are

---

today, and then the next biweekly meeting, which I think is slated for the 11th of March after the ICANN meeting would be a meeting related to changes in the system.

Also, for the system changes, we sort of wanted to look at all the feedback that everyone provided in terms of two categories to sort of make it easier. The first category being issues that would incorporate anything related to errors, things in the system that don't work as they were intended bugs, so to speak, that type of thing. And then the other category would be enhancements. So that's anything related to small enhancements like updates to language to make things more clear, more explanation to something that's higher level of effort, which would be like the API request.

The idea with that would be we would meet with you guys on a biweekly cadence for those changes. But we will also have an internal meeting to review the feedback you guys gave and have the ENIT team sort of put a level of effort on some of those requests. And then when we meet with you, we could have a discussion about prioritizing those and discuss when those could get slotted into sprints to be handled. So that's sort of how we've laid it out. Our sprints here are in two-week cadences. So ideally, we would get something out of those meetings with you that we could slate for a sprint close to that date so that we could start making changes and you guys could see some updates to the system. Any questions there?

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Quickly, Lisa, I think that Dee is also joining the team. Maybe if we can introduce her.

LISA CARTER: Oh, sure. Go ahead. Oh, you want me to do it? So Dee has been on the team actually longer than I have. She is now taking the role of project manager on the team. And I've been with the ICANN, I think, nine months maybe. I don't know, Dee, if you want to say hello, introduce yourself.

DEE WASHINGTON: Good morning, everyone. I've been with the team since July 5<sup>th</sup>, and it's been a pleasure so far; Eleeza and everyone has been great, and I'm learning a lot, and I went to ICANN78, which was a great experience. So looking forward to the outcomes from ICANN79. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And apparently, Dee is in my time zone. So that's going to make things a bit easier for me, wasn't it? No, did I misunderstand that bit?

LISA CARTER: That will be fair to borrow from the policy teams, I think is who you're thinking.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry about that. So just to recap, today and after this discussion, we will look at the usage report and have the team drive us through that and then questions on the usage report. And then in two weeks, think time, same day, but in two weeks, we will have a discussion more on going forward, enhancements of things that we want to see being developed and less on the data itself because obviously we'll be then waiting for the next report for next month. If that is all clear and I seem to have seen positive comments in the chat, I wanted to then give the mic to Steve Crocker, who wanted to talk about a meeting that he has open in Puerto Rico.

STEPHEN CROCKER: Thank you very much. Actually, I raised my hand immediately in response, Sebastian, to your opening remarks because I wanted to put on the record that your description of your discussion with Yorin about what the cadence would be to your project. Just as I say, to put on the record, that seems to me completely wrong. I'm very, very pleased with the rest of what has been discussed in the several minutes since then about the increased cadence and the picking up the pace, as it were.

A lot of information is available basically now based on the early use. There will be more, of course, but setting an expectation that this is going to run for two years has always struck me from the very beginning as way too long, I'll just put it that way. The thing that I mentioned earlier and is in the chat, been some discussion with several groups that has resulted in the Commercial Stakeholders Group hosting a meeting for requesters from across



---

all constituencies to come and share their experiences. So I want to emphasize a few small details about that.

As I said, this is across all constituencies. The second thing is this is for requesters who have had some experience or have tried to have some experience to share their experience, no restrictions on what they're allowed to say. So some of the things might strike some people. I don't know what they're going to say, but if they say things like, we wish it were like this, and the answer is that's out of scope, in that particular session, that kind of comment would be out of scope. That is, they could say anything they want.

The other side of that is no promises about what's going to be done with this. This is simply an information gathering and sharing experience. All the information will be open, public, and I'm expecting that there will be mechanisms for sharing that more broadly, for having ability for requesters to input whatever they want with whatever supporting material, and then there will likely be some discussion about how to use that and what to do with it. The focus is on information gathering across all constituencies, no limitation on what's being said, focused on requesters, because there is a natural home for the registrars, of course.

There is no natural home for all the requesters. It's been, just as the way things are structured, somewhat stove-piped, and so this is an attempt to reach across different constituencies. The CSG is hosting it, sponsoring it, but it's not a CSG-limited or focused activity. Room 103A at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, I believe, are the logistics, and there will be some publicity and formal notices and so forth. It's taking a little longer than I expected, but it's coming out. Thank you. I'm happy to answer any questions you want.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Before I give the hand to Sarah, and I saw you raising your hand very early, can I then ask, just to make sure that we don't lose information, suggestions, good, bad, or indifferent, but that we don't lose the data. That session that you're describing is not the Standing Committee, so if there is anything that is to be reported from that session, can I ask maybe that side of the discussion to sort of minute these and then bring them back to the Standing Committee?

So we have that input directly in the Standing Committee, and it's not for us or staff to go and figure out, out of that discussion what was important, what should be brought back, and et cetera. Can I then let the CSG bring that back to this party? I will obviously listen to the conversation, et cetera, but let's say that I'll ask you guys with bringing that back or the organizers with bringing it back to the Standing Committee, and what is discussed in the Standing Committee is what we move with.

STEPHEN CROCKER: My impromptu SLA for getting that information back to this committee is somewhere between 5 and 15 minutes. You'll get it, absolutely.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Cool. Thank you very much. With this said, Sarah, go ahead.

---

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. I think what I'm feeling is jealousy. I think that I wish that we as a Standing Committee had thought of this and had proposed that we should host this session. So definitely, there needs to be a venue for the feedback from the requester community. I'm concerned that it's going to split up the reactions, and I've noticed that in the impressions document that ICANN is hosting for us. Well, Google's hosting, but ICANN's managing. We've seen feedback from some, but not all of the different groups of requesters. So just whatever the feedback is, as Sebastien sort of just said, it has to get filtered back to this small team somehow. I'm looking forward to seeing what all that is. A little bit hesitant about splitting up that feedback or potentially losing information, but that's where we are. And hopefully I can change my schedule and make it to the session. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER: Yes, I just wanted to suggest maybe the CSG meeting notes could be put into the impressions document that we already have and tracked there in a central place. You can maybe label it as such that was from the CSG meeting if you think that would be helpful. Is that something we could do?

STEPHEN CROCKER: I believe that, I don't have my hands on all the details, but I believe that everything will be accessible, easily accessible, and copies of

---

it and pointers to it and so forth will be no problem at all. And the attendance is not limited to requesters. The speaking is limited to requesters and it's only an hour meeting. It's obviously an experiment. We'll see how it goes. It may be messy or it may be organized. We'll just sort of see how it plays.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I just want to set clear expectations again. That is for the standing committee to decide how we move after this. And whatever is said, heard, or even minuted in that meeting still needs to go through the standing committee to stand, so to speak.

STEPHEN CROCKER: Let me just confirm all that. I'm scheduled to say a few words at the opening of the meeting and I'll be more than happy to be explicit that this is not a decision process. This is not organized. And if you want to give me some words to speak that make it more formal with respect to the role of standing committee, I'm happy to do that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, I think we've got our points across. I think you understood. I'm not going to put words in your mouth. But that's all good. Now, finally, disclosure, I will be on this call, but I won't be in Puerto Rico. I'm not coming to this ICANN to join you, sadly enough. So good reaction there, Sarah. But I'll be listening and I'll definitely be joining remotely. Any other discussion, comments or topics to be discussed in this item two before we go to item

---

three? And I ask, Eleeza, is it going to be you going through the report or is that going to be you, Lisa?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'll do that today and then I'll let Lisa go over next meeting.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: If I could raise a hand here too, this is Gabriel.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you. I just want to express my appreciation for the staff and you, Seb, for being quick to adjust this notion of a more frequent cadence so we can talk about the feedback apart from just the reporting metrics coming out. I know I kind of kick started the conversation, but I'm by no means the only person I think would benefit from it, and I'm just very grateful that it seems like we'll be able to have that.

Further, want to note that apparently Lisa [inaudible – 22:46] in LA, I happen to live here too, utterly available to come by and meet for lunch sometime and more in detail go over any of the comments that I have inserted into that feedback chart. If it should ever be helpful, I think the desire here is just to make sure that if I'm communicating some of the feedback we get from our public safety and law enforcement representatives and requesters, just that it makes sense. I just hope that I'm doing a

---

decent job of communicating what we're hearing back to you. So thank you for that.

And final note is that I expect that everything that I say, regardless of venue is being captured in that document now and thank you, sir, for highlighting that document to me again because I think I've missed it the first time around but obviously been making good use of it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And thank you for raising the point in the first place. That was useful. So, Eleeza. It's all yours.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And thank you Gabe for the offer to meet, very much appreciated, and I put this in the chat earlier but realizing not everyone is in the chat, Lisa and I will both be in San Juan. I there is no formal meeting, we'll both endeavor to be at the CSG session, at least one of us will be there. And of course, are happy to meet with any of you in San Juan, so please just let us know.

In terms of the changes, I wanted to just say one more thing about the feedback that we've been receiving. Like I said, it's coming in from all angles which is great. And internally, we're capturing it to help us out our own kind of assessment of what's happening, but not just what's happening, but where the themes where things that perhaps topics we want to come back to you on in terms of proposed changes. But we also want to be mindful of how often we make changes particularly to the reporting right we want to ensure that this is a set of metrics that is useful that's comparable

---

over time so the more changes we make obviously that the more challenging that may become.

Lisa, Seb I spoke last week about changes to the actual reporting and we're hoping to have this kind of locked in the next month or two or we're not really adding a new metrics are changing how metrics are presented again to allow for that, that comparison purposes over the next about 18 months left really on this experiment, maybe a little bit more than that.

So in terms of the actual changes that we made in this month's report, which is only the second one, if we can scroll to page three they're all summarized there in the introduction. So we took on board a lot of the feedback that you provided to us at last month's meeting; so starting with the summary of data table, which is that first kind of long table with all the metrics, we kind of condensed it to make it a little bit easier to see the comparison between the current reporting period and the total for those metrics where that's relevant. We also changed the title of metric eight, as you can see here, and some of the methods for calculating metric nine were clarified we added some more language to explain how that works; I think that's the tricky weird histogram one.

Metric 10, we also changed to kind of dig a little bit deeper into the total domain lookup results by outcome category. And then on metric 13 we added a little additional clarification on what publicly available means. So we kind of highlighted those here, but you'll see that the actual changes in the report.

The other thing I wanted to highlight for discussion was a was a suggestion that Sarah made and I replied back in the chat about

---

the use of the confidentiality metric. Sarah had asked whether that's something we're tracking we are we just hadn't included it in the original metrics because that didn't come out of the conversation with a small team last year in the list of agreed upon metrics. We can certainly add it. We can add it and show over time, how many times that that checkbox has been used. I think those were all of the points I wanted to make on the metrics and I already see Sarah's hand, so I'll stop there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Sorry, I just wanted to say thank you. Those changes are very helpful and I think they make the report better and I appreciate it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good. Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Can you hear me?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, I can hear you now.



PAUL MCGRADY: Great. I'm hybridizing between the computer and the phone. Eleeza, thank you for those changes. I agree they're super helpful. One thing that bubbled up on the publicly available thing is whether or not I suggested of whether or not we could put that on the very front page. When people first go there, because I think that some folks are getting frustrated that they're going through the process.

And then they're being told all that you're all you're asking for is stuff that's already available because it's privacy proxy information, and that is that the tail end of all this, and we may be able to cut down some frustration if we could find a nice spot to put that on the landing page. So that people know that if they move forward, that they're going to get the same result. So I'm throwing that out there for what it's worth and already be there. I don't know. But thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If I may, thank you, Paul. I think that's a good suggestion. One of the challenges with and I'm assuming when you mean on the front page, it's when the lookup actually happens. Is that what you mean? So we can certainly take that feedback back. But I think the challenge is first of all, there's no standard way of identifying whether a registration is under a privacy or proxy service. So to automate that lookup, that was part of the challenge we had.

And I believe that was a discussion the small team had last year when we spoke about how we could treat registrations that are

---

under privacy or proxy and whether registrars, for example, could note that somehow in their responses. And we decided against that and we came up with this metric, if I'm remembering correctly; I wasn't in all of these discussions, but I see Seb nodding, so I hope I'm recollecting that correctly. So, I can certainly appreciate that frustration.

I would also note that when we have -- I can't remember if it's on that page or on an earlier page -- there is language, I believe it's on the home page. And I can go back and confirm this, that urges the requester to go to [lookup.icann.org](http://lookup.icann.org) and check what is available and use that to gauge whether or not they need to make the request. For example, it might be under privacy or proxy. So that's also built into sort of try to mitigate that. I hope that's helpful.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hey, this is Gabriel. Do you hear me?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, go ahead, Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Sorry, I just actually double muted myself. I actually had one point of feedback on that exact topic, Paul. When you first go into the RDRS system, there is a narrative text that pops up before you've enabled to input domains that does suggest for requesters to go off and use ICANN's lookup tool to make that determination. I have reticence about how much we can expect of requesters to

---

themselves be able to understand what does and doesn't constitute a proxy service when they use this tool.

And I think that we have to be careful about how much onus we're placing on the requester to be able to make that education at the front, whereas just a simple caution that, hey, if you make a request pertaining to the domain that has a proxy service in place, the registrar may respond with just that proxy service information, but we should also make room in how we treat this for those registrars that choose to actually divulge information about the beneficial end user behind the proxy service, because those registrars might exist in the future too.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabriel. Just for, and this is maybe as I remember it, but we did have that discussion indeed, Eleeza, last year. And I think, from what I remember, it wasn't completely black and white. So there is no true false flag on is this a privacy proxy or not. But at the same time, there are, if it's not an absolute positive way of defining one, let's say that there was a limited amount of players, or at least the majority of privacy proxy was in the hands of a few, if I remember well, that do appear or do pop up in a WHOIS or RDAP request.

Maybe something to be discussed in two weeks, but maybe something that we can capture in a better way in a more efficient way, capture in a better way, in a more helpful way. In description, if the information you return after a WHOIS lookup looks like this or that, then you're probably behind privacy proxy and you should be using this. Anyway, discussion for in two

---

weeks with the improvements rather than with the data now. Marc Anderson, you've been super patient. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastian. Marc Anderson. First, I want to echo what Sarah said. Thank you to ICANN Org for the updates for the second report. I found the new version much appreciated. In particular, I want to call out metric 10, I thought was problematic in the first months reporting, the new way or the changes you've done there address all of that. So I think that's much better, so thank you.

I do have a question on the use of the data request form. That's on metric number 6. The report itself says it's total PDF exports for non-participating registrars, so I have a clarification. Is it possible to download the PDF form or do a PDF export when you fill it out for participating registrars? And I think I heard from requesters that it is, but can somebody confirm that that is or is not the case?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. Good question. I cannot recall. I'd have to go back and check, but happy to answer that. Let me see if I can find out in the meantime.

MARC ANDERSON: No problem. Maybe I could just follow up with you offline. And I had a follow-up question on that, but it's not time-sensitive. We can follow up offline if you're on the list. But overall, thanks for the

---

changes this time around. I think it's much better and reads better.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. I'll give the mic back to you, Eleeza, and if you want to run those through the actual report.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, I can. I had assumed kind of everyone had read through it, but we can go through it one by one if that's helpful. So you guys can discuss it. I hadn't planned to go through the metrics individually.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So then maybe we could do it the other way around. Does anybody have any questions for Eleeza, anything that needs to be explained? I'm not going to reiterate the question for Marc. I hadn't heard particularly suspicions that that form was being used. Other than with non-participating registrars, but I was curious for that increase in uptake this month where that would be coming from, if there was any background on it. But I see Sarah's hand. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Hi, this is Sarah, thank you. So for the metric one and two that's on screen, this is great. In the longer term, it might be interesting to show opt-outs in the current period also, but I don't know how much any of us care about that. Metrics three and four, I have to

---

admit, I found it difficult because the dotted lines look like they're the same color.

So can we just scroll down a tiny bit? I think that there's a solid green line and then a dotted line right near it, which I think is also green. But for a while, I thought that both dotted lines were blue, so I was confused. So really not hugely important, but there's some feedback. I found the colors difficult to discern, thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you for the feedback, Sarah. And this is Eleeza, I'm looking and I'm pretty sure there are different colors, but I have my glasses on and I'm very close to my screen. So I will take that back and we'll see. We're a little bit limited in color changes due to the software we use to run these statistics, but it's a good point, thank you.

Seb, if I may, if there aren't any other comments, perhaps we could talk about the confidentiality metric that Sarah had suggested. I was interested to hear from the standing committee, whether that's something you all would like to see, and if we should add that in as a new metric. I imagine we'd probably add it to the end of the report, not to confuse the numbering of the rest of these, but I wanted to hear from others on that before we move forward with the change.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Plus one. It's an easy case. I see nobody running to stop you there. So if it could be added, I think it would be great.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great, then we will do that for the next month. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Any other comments on the report? If we could just maybe scroll quickly, slowly. So if anybody needs to remember things they saw and hope their memory is a bit, but you're right, Eleeza, anything that people should have looked at it. I see your hand up again.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I just heard from a colleague who checked the interface. You can export the PDF, even when it is a participating registrar. So that button appears next to the submit button when you use the submit request. So it gives the requester an opportunity, to have a copy of the request.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Marc, I see your hand immediately in response there.

MARC ANDERSON: Yes, thank you. Thank you for checking that out. I had heard anecdotally that requesters were using that feature as a way to capture their request. So they had a copy of it after they had filled out the data. With that, I notice in the report that we're only reporting out on the number of times that feature was used for non-participating registrars. Given that there seems to be some demand for this feature, even for participating registrars, I'm wondering if we want to update that metric to that table to include

---

---

the number of times it was downloaded for participating registrars. I'm thinking ahead as this is the tool that we're developing to -- This is a pilot that we're running to inform future policy work among other things. I think that's a data point that I would find useful in developing future policy work. So I would suggest that as a new feature request.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And then I see Sarah's hand making a point that I wanted to make too, go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah. I just wonder, is it possible that the metric is counting the number of times the form is used and there's an assumption that it's only being used for non-participating registrars? Possibly it's being used for both participating and non-participating and this metric is mashing both of those together possibly. And even in that case, I'm not -- so that could be a thing to look at. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Sarah, if I may, this is Eleeza. I will confirm this, but I am 90% certain we have distinguished between the domain lookup that results in a non-participating registrar and then the option to fill in. I think we were very careful to do that, but I will confirm since you asked the question. Thank you.



---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And indeed, to Marc's point, if it is indeed something that is used by requesters to document their own request, which I think is fantastic. And let's see what the traffic is on that to make sure that we capture that as a feature to keep for the future.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So sorry, Seb, is that a request for a new metric or would they be to add in more data to...?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So if we're getting the number of downloads for -- It's exactly the same as Marc. I hope I understood Marc's request that way. If we're capturing the number of downloads for non-participating registrars, can we also capture the number of downloads for participating registrars? Because if it turns out to be -- It wasn't intended to be some way to record what the request was, to take a snapshot of the request, but if it turns out to be a useful tool for requesters, let's keep it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Seb, so we can find out whether we're capturing that but you don't want that included in the metrics report. I just wanted to clarify that point.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Potentially, yes, if we're able to capture it. If it's something we can capture and report on.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So we'll get back to you on an answer on that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Any other comments? Questions about the reports?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I have a question. This is Gabriel for the record.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: All right, so one of the pieces of feedback that -- And I'm going to take credit or blame, it's probably the better word for this. But there was a particular type of visualization tool that I thought was relevant to address some of the questions I heard from other constituencies, wanting to know what proportion of requests make it through to where? For example, if you're a requester that self-identifies as the Intellectual Property Constituency, what proportion of those requests break down to what total outcomes? And I wanted to be able to replicate some of that on my own time if it wasn't something that ICANN staff had the bandwidth for.

And so I'm wondering to what extent can folks request anonymized data that goes into these pictures that we're seeing on the screen now, but the source data to that? Is that something that is going to be kept close hold? Is that something that could be shared in some capacity, even if some portions of it can be

---

shared and others can't? I'm just kind of curious if this has been discussed before and what the appetite for that was.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: This is Seb. Yes, it has been discussed before. I think that we agreed that at least within the standing committee, we felt comfortable sharing the aggregate data. And I think that that's all you need. You don't need any personal information or any specific requests there. Now I'll need to turn to Eleeza to see to what extent that can be done easily and how we can. But in terms of us sharing aggregate data, even if it's the minutia of aggregate, so what type of request or what type of response and et cetera, we all agreed that that should be something we can share, at least within this standing committee.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Much obliged for that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Oh, I see a hand immediately from Odeline. So there might be a legal issue here. Go ahead.

ODELINE MACDONALD: No, no legal issue, Sebastian. Odeline here. No legal issue, just confirming you pointed it. We agreed, we discussed this, I think at length before, and we agreed on sharing aggregated data within this group. But source data, we had some concerns because we want to make sure not only to protect personal data and et cetera,

---

but also to make sure that we don't allow the possibility to combine data and to reconstruct any requests.

So we want to keep the request confidential. We want to give that assurance to requesters that their requests are kept confidential. And we wanted to avoid this because we didn't know what data we're going to have, and we don't know what kind of play we can do with the source data. And so this is maybe a little bit of our very careful approach, but aggregated data, of course, we're happy to share some anonymity and data protection are the two reasons why we didn't want to share the whole source data.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's all perfect and concur. Absolutely no desire to see personally identified information, just the data about the categories of requests. So thank you for that.

I see Sarah's hand up. And Sarah, could I invite you maybe to also comment what you put in the chat? Because I'm not sure that Gabriel can see it if he's on the phone only.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, Sebastian. That's actually exactly why I raised my hand. Sorry, this is Sarah. So realizing that perhaps Gabe is not viewing the chat right now. Gabe, I'm really interested in this further analysis because further analysis of these data are something that I've also been considering. And so I think what I would do is encourage you to be very specific about exactly what information you would be asking for that's not already included in the reporting or what kind of a more detailed breakdown.

---

So for example, would you look for, like right now we can see how many requests for a given request type, and we can see the outcome of requests that are concluded. So perhaps what you would be interested in would be for each given request type, the breakdown of outcomes. Because right now I don't think we're able to reverse engineer that. But right now it seems to me that your request is intriguing, but perhaps not as specific as I would want it to be. So that would be my suggestion.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you. This is Gabriel again, for the record, but I do want to do what you're suggesting, is to be able to answer questions like that by request type as one example of what I would like to visualize. By request type, what percentage of those domains were made -- sorry, like to participating registrars to non-participating, what percentage were deemed to be, what's the term, to have a legitimate basis for disclosure versus weren't. And then of those that weren't deemed to have a legitimate basis for disclosure, what percentage of those actually resulted in data disclosures, which I'm not even sure that ICANN has visibility into. That might only be known by the data requestor themselves and the registrar.

So a little more homework on my end perhaps, but I wanted to get a better feel for what sort of data ICANN had that could be shared in order to start inform my own thinking about what kinds of models and graphic representations might really help answer some of those bigger picture questions. Because one of the key things that I think folks are interested in knowing as they're looking at the system is what is the relative volume of the request coming

---

in from who and what is the relative output? And I think that some of that big picture discussion is being lost. And I wanted to try to help to really make that clear to make sure I could. So that's the impetus behind it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Sarah, I see your hand.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you so much. And Gabriel, that's great, thank you. You said two things that I found really interesting, although they may be the same thing. So one thing you said is looking for understanding of what percentage of requests were deemed by the registrar to have a legitimate basis for disclosure, and then separately, what percentage of requests were disclosed or resulted in disclosure. And I would expect that those should be the same thing. So indeed, if they are not the same, that would be really useful to know. I think they have to be the same in the RDRS. There's no way for them to be different because if they have a legitimate basis for access, then the decision will be to disclose the data. And so the outcome as documented in RDS would be approved or disclosed or whatever we're calling it. So those should be the same is one thought.

And then my other thought is just that ultimately what we should all keep in mind, and we as the standing committee, we're basically the ambassadors for the RDRS. It's our duty to make sure that the rest of the community understands the purpose of the RDRS and also what's in scope and what's not in scope.

---

Those are important boundaries. So the disclosure itself is not the measure of success for the RDRS. Success means that the requests are evaluated fairly by the appropriate party who can make a decision. And so as the standing committee, when we're gathering this information from our community groups, we should make sure that that's clearly understood by everybody. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good point, Sarah, particularly as we're about to meet again and have that meeting that Steve mentioned. So a good point to note that. Thank you. With this, and seeing the clock running [audio glitch], maybe you can go ahead.

DEVAN REED: Sebastian, your connection's breaking up a little bit.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Apologies. I'm not home and I've had to move because I was running out of battery. Can you hear me now?

DEVAN REED: You sound clear right now, yes, perfect.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, I'm having to juggle the phone for the internet and a wall plug for the juice. So as I was saying, maybe in closing, we can go back to the agenda. There was an AOB, but no AOB item that

---

I recorded. So maybe just in closing, Steve, if you want to give us the time, place of the CSG meeting once more to make sure everybody attends or at least finds the recording.

And otherwise, I won't see you in Puerto Rico, but I will be there remotely following the discussion. And this group will meet again in two weeks. I believe somebody said the 11th. In any case, after the ICANN week, same time, same place on a Monday in two weeks to discuss this time features and how we move forward with continuous improvement on this project. If there are no further questions, I think we can adjourn.

STEPHEN CROCKER: I'll say it one more time. Thank you. Tuesday, Tuesday morning at nine o'clock local time in the CSG room, which is 103A. So that's everything that you need. That's a Tuesday, March 5th. It's in the schedule. One of the things that is a little unclear from just looking at the way it's printed in the schedule, it's posted as if it is a CSG meeting. It's being hosted by CSG, but it is definitely explicitly and unquestionably open to requesters from everywhere to speak, and for anybody to come and listen. And we'll try to get some more messages out to that effect.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for clarifying. Thank you very much. And if there are no further comments, thank you very much once again. And we will see each other, at least remotely for me on Tuesday and have an excellent ICANN week. Goodbye.



---

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Bye-bye, everyone.

DEVAN REED: Bye, everyone, have safe travels.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**