ICANN Transcription

RDRS Standing Committee

Monday, 17 June 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/TwCNEg

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

JULIE BISLAND: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 17th of June 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Thomas Rickert. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing no hands. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat only and have 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 state your name before speaking. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder

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.

process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. I will turn it over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Julie. Welcome, everybody. I saw a number of you in Kigali last week. For those that I missed, good to see you again. I don't like to make big speeches, but we did have in Kigali three sessions. Again, one focused on this group. And then two sessions managed by other groups, including the CSG on the Monday and the Registrar Stakeholder Group on the Tuesday. On my own very humble opinion, both great sessions with a lot of sharing and a lot of sharing of opinion, etc. Because we already spoke about the San Juan CSG session, I guess we're going to focus on the ALAC side. We're going to talk about all this.

I wanted to spend a bit of time and to be fully clear, normally I work on these agendas with Caitlin. But because of the traveling and everything, I believe Caitlin or somebody else from the team came up with this agenda that is absolutely great. But I didn't particularly help on building this. So we'll go as we go.

So these RDRS sessions, who wants or is there anybody or should I talk about the CSG session? Steve, I see your hand up. And go through the Registrar session.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I may have jumped the gun when you said, "Looking for somebody." I was going to ask a couple of questions and follow up on the Registrar Stakeholder Group session on Tuesday.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, as you have the mic, you're very welcome to give us some impressions on the CSG one. Otherwise, I can give a few. And we can wait for somebody maybe from the Registrar.

STEVE DELBIANCO: For the Registrar session—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. About the CSG—yes, that somebody is you, Sarah. Absolutely. In CSG, just briefly, we have another session that was in format similar to what we did in San Juan. There was attendance from a lot of people in the community. It's just because of the way we sat, I guess. I was the only one that was around the table, and then did have a few questions. I may have answered a few as the chair of this group and a few as GoDaddy registrar. I think that GoDaddy had sort of wanted to keep their comments for the next session on the next day. So I may have just gone on a few there.

But anyway, it was a good session. I hope also everybody felt the same. I think this is me maybe being too hopeful or very hopeful like that. But I think that the most important, even if we didn't open every door and resolve everything, I think the most important and what I heard in these two sessions, in particular the CSG and the registrant is a conversation. I think that people came out of it. Happy to have been able to see each other face to face and have these conversations and be able to better understanding where

the other was coming from, which, at least to me, gave a lot of hope.

Sarah, did you want to talk a bit about the Registrar session? And then maybe Steve will have his questions then.

SARAH WYLD: Sure. Hi. I hope everybody is well, and those of you who traveled are well recovered. At the Registrar session, really, my big takeaway is I should have given it a much different title and a better description in the session descriptions in the listing. Good to know for next time. We shared example requests, and then people discussed those requests within small groups. And then we reconvened. Sorry, there was much more to this session also, but specific to RDRS, we looked at real examples. And we have some takeaways of different insights that people came up with about the RDRS platform and how registrars process requests that I have not yet had a chance to actually think through.

The real surprise to me, the one surprising feedback for me was hearing some surprise among other people about the WHOIS privacy or privacy services not being in scope within RDRS. I was so glad that we cleared that up because I think that's an important misunderstanding among some of us. But beyond that, I think there were also other insights that will be raised in the next little while. I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. Now, Steve, for your question.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thanks, Sebastien. I'd start with the Standing Committee meeting that we had in the morning. I did appreciate that we looked at the distinctions between what data we're gathering? What is it showing? What do the screens need to do to improve the quality of the data? And then half of the discussion was on the future. Where do we go from here with the data we've discovered? Do we go back and iterate? Or do we just continue on this path? Because it's clear with seven months of data under our belt, if we all agreed, boy, it'd be fantastic to separate request store type from nature of the request. At this point, we have seven months of accumulated data. If we make any changes to what data we collect or add any fields, we won't have anything consistent going back seven months. So I'm curious to see what the group thinks about whether our enhancements might include variations or additions to the data that's gathered. And then during that Standing Committee discussion, of course, any notion of what is the legal basis? What about privacy/proxy? None of that was really in scope, but we covered it in the CSG session. I sat next to you, Sebastien, and appreciated everybody sort of opening up. We weren't talking about the app. More and more, we were talking about what is the basis. And it was one of the first times we actually talk to each other about which part of GDPR are we looking at? What part of NIS2 will influence it? Very productive discussion. I appreciated the registrars participating.
	Sebastien, you made a comment that I'll never forget. You said for 20-25 years, the consumer protection, brand protection community has become used to just transparent WHOIS, although

inaccuracies and privacy/proxy were growing. And because of that, you sort of conditioned to using it, and we need to break that conditioning. I'm just paraphrasing, Sebastien, but the real key is for us to get the disclosures, we have to do it a certain way.

And that brings us to the Registrar session, which I thoroughly enjoyed. I have two questions and follow-ups. I believe that knowing who was attending and sitting there, we could have focused more on the kinds of requests that come from the people around each table. I saw a healthy smattering of, I guess, clueless requesters who were just sort of, I guess, fishing or trolling for contact information, as opposed to trying to get disclosure requests that would be pursuant to an investigation. And I did love the discussion about whether it's appropriate to do a disclosure to a party that is gathering the information necessary to build a case. GoDaddy had a different view than a few of the other registrars. I realized that you're managing your own risks, you, registrars. You're managing your own risks, and you may have a different opinion about it. But there is total benefit to discussing whether we could deserve a disclosure in a very well-formed request that says we are trying to build a case to whether this particular registrant who we've caught several times on other instances deserves our ability to build a case against them. I think that about covers it, but I enjoyed it all. And I appreciated the engagement from all parties. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. I put myself in a queue to answer one or two points. But anyway, Gabriel, you can… Let's go in the queue. We'll let people talk. I have to answer that. Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I put a link to the Registrar session that I had to watch after the fact, Sarah. I appreciate the fact that you guys recorded that to make that available for us afterward. I was in the GAC session. So couldn't the live. Otherwise, I would have been there.

But I wanted to highlight in particular that if you follow that link, and if you go to the 51-minute mark, Owen Smigelski I think transferred the mic to a man who I don't know, but Marc, last name unknown, who spoke about in general the lack of plain language in the RDRS as it stands to talk to your normal Internet user. That's was the key takeaway I took from it. But he walks through how as a regular Internet user—thank you for that, Sebastien. I see Trachtenberg. I think that was it. But he did a fantastic job articulating something that I've been trying to articulate and failing at for some time now. But there is so much of the RDRS system as it stands, which is geared towards us, the ICANN long timers, we're really diving into very arcane terminology. But he made the point that most of the Internet users, they don't know the difference between a registrar and registry or even know the difference between a proxy service and the redacted for privacy that exists there. And the fact that the very first experience that when you've come to the RDRS has been hit with that giant wall of text, not all of which is parsable to a normal person. It really struck home to me that the key thing that would have to be improved from a user perspective in a successor system, SSAD or other, is just making sure it's parsable to your average person in a way that we're currently not with the RDRS. And I don't know how to incorporate that into the Feedback

document other than to say plain language. But it's something maybe that we need to keep in mind here. Again, listen to the way he articulated. He did a far better job than I am right now. But if 51 minutes in at that link I provided, and if you didn't hear it already, I think everyone should. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Good point, Gabriel. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, everyone. I was attending remotely. I was able to attend both the CSG and the Registrar session. I really wanted to give a shout out to both groups. I thought both of those sessions were really well done. The CSG session, as a member of this group, as a member of the Standing Committee, having to consider the lessons learned from the system and consider a future work or what comes next, I found beyond the discussions and the feedback very helpful.

I do want to highlight one thing that that sort of stuck with me. I don't know if it was an answer to the question or as part of a presentation, but one of the things I heard from the CSG session was that one of the requesters found that her disclosure rate was lower using the RDRS system than what she had experienced before the RDRS going directly to registrars. And that was concerning to me. I would hope that at the very least, we would have the same success rate. So that feedback to me, that implies to me that maybe we're not doing as good a job as we could be with the RDRS system. And then maybe that gets to Gabriel's

points about usability and clear language. But that one really stuck with me, and so I want to highlight it for us.

Then on the Registrar session, I thought that was a really novel session, having the breakouts and to have small group discussions, looking at actual anonymized requests. I thought that was great. It was not what I was expected, but I enjoyed it thoroughly. I thought it was very well done. A very good exercise. I hope maybe not just for RDRS but just the ICANN community in general, I hope they take note of that session and do more things like that. I thought the breakouts and the discussion were excellent. So thank you. Both groups, I thought they were both really well done, and I wanted to make sure I shared that feedback.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. Going back to a couple things that Steve DelBianco said a few minutes ago, question of whether the enhancements that we're looking at for RDRS should consider what data is gathered? I feel like I'm not articulating that well. When we think about, for example, tracking request type versus requester type, why would I make that change? Not so much for the data that would come out of it, but more for the benefit of the requester having a more usable process and being able to submit a more correct request. So I think for each change that was suggested, we should consider "Should we do it and for what

benefit?" Yes, because some of them, I think, would be more useful just to give the requester a better process, even if it doesn't so much matter for the reporting. So that's one thought. The other idea was I think he had said something about that there's benefit to discussing whether a certain request can turn into a disclosure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Building a case, right?

SARAH WYLD: Yes, the building a case thing. I'm not sure that that's a Standing Committee topic. I think that's more of a CSG and CPH conversational topic because it's about how we are interacting and how requests are happening, but it's not about how the RDRS itself works. That's my thought. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. So you've covered a number of things that I wanted to say also. So just because you called, Steve, indeed the GoDaddy point of view of saying, "We're not here to build a case," is not a topic for here. It's a topic for a separate conversation. I think that if we have the sessions again and again, again, this is not the Standing Committee sessions where I'm talking the cross-community or between the requesters and the registrars. We'll be able to fine tune these things. I don't want to take any leadership there. But we should encourage for those groups to meet and meet again at ICANN, because we're going to find some middle points. GoDaddy, very frankly, they work with guidelines that have been provided by internal legal by other groups in Europe, in

EN

particular, and taking examples there. I don't know that it's a finite and a complete thinking of what we should or what we shouldn't do. So let's have these conversations. But let's bring the different points of view. I'm certainly going to relay that internally to with the teams that work on it and see if that changes or if that matures the way of making those decisions. But I agree with Sarah, we shouldn't spend too much time on the committee. It's not for us to decide.

On the RDRS for aconites or for the broad public, of course, I think we're all strive an endeavor to make sure that we [inaudible] broadest public ever. Let's not keep out of our perspective, the fact that we're working on a pilot. There are so many things that we want to do on it to make it better and attract as many people and as many different users as possible to make sure that we understand what the market for this thing is for the next iteration. This is going to be an imperfect thing, and we know that. At some point, we will draw a line on the sand say this is exactly what we think we should have. And there we'll have all the bells and whistles and all the different levels of interaction with different people.

Marc, for example, and I think that you are relaying a bit that the person that said that she was getting less requests through in the new system and the other, I remember well it was Margie from Meta. She's not typically the person that I would qualify as not understanding our processes, she's very much into it. So her problem wasn't us having an interface that wasn't clear enough. Her problem was other, and I'm not quite sure I fully understood

where it was. But statistically, she seemed to have a different level of response.

One quick question for Marc and for Gabe. Because, again, this is not the Standing Committee, but I really want those sessions to happen again, because of the fact that we're very rich. How easy was it to follow remotely the tabletop? I think it was the best way to interact. Thank you, Sarah, for coming up with that model, because I think that it really worked locally. But I don't know how that translates to a broader audience, and I want to make sure that we're able to, that these groups are able to balance that.

The last, last point that I wanted to make about the request types and do we change the goalposts by naming it, are we talking about request or requesters, it just looked out of that session that there was a number, I don't know how large and maybe we need to ask ICANN to give us more facts on that, requesters that were ticked by the registrar. So the requester type was ticked by the registrar as erroneous. So people that were wrongly presenting themselves. I think and I understand from at least the ones that I saw that it had no impact on the response, so that the registrar sort of reengineer what it was who they were talking to, if it was a lawyer, if it was law enforcement, those different types, trying to understand if they met—I am so and so. My client, the person I'm speaking on behalf of, is so and so. But in any case, it wasn't going to make or break a response. So I just want to make sure that indeed, as you said, Steve, let's not lose certain amounts of data that we've collected on this, but then label it in the way that seems to work better. Either that or we ask registrars to requalify what the requests are, which, right now, we're only capturing the

EN

fact that the registrar marked this as not the right requester type or request type. But I feel it's a bit of a problem because it blinds us on a key metric here. Whatever we can do to make it better, I'd like to have that. With this, I give the mic to Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I think to easily stand out conclusions from where we are so far looking at the data are that requesters, because of the very substantial number of requests that are unsuccessful, I think we can say that when a requester sits down to make a request, they do not have a high degree of certainty that that request is going to be accepted. And without wanting to take sides on any of this, that's a symptom that the system is not the kind of system that ought to exist. That when people sit down to use the system, they should have a pretty high degree of understanding of how it works, what they're going to get, and so forth. If there's anything that we're going to learn by continuing to run the system is to watch that ratio how it changes over time.

The second standout statistic in my mind is the very small number of requests that are granted, and actually a very small number of requests that are sent in. That leads to a big fork in the road downstream. Is it the case that really nobody really needs the system or very few people in that? Or is it the case that this system is so strongly biased to make it hard that we are missing the forest for the trees as compared to the ease of getting data before? There are some subordinate questions about accuracy— big, big questions. I don't mean to be dismissive of them. But I wanted to cite those two things.

So then that leads me to the question of so where are we going with this? I suspect that if we scratch the surface here, that some fraction of us assume that what's going to come out of this is how to improve the system or how to build a better version of this that is more or less built on the same assumptions, and a different fraction of us believe that this is completely unrepresentative of what a system ought to look like.

Then the last thing I want to say is that I was excited to go to the Registrar section. I thought it would be pretty interesting. I came away sort of nonplussed because I expected that the Registrar portion of us, the registrars were going to say, "Based on our experience, here's how to make requests that work better. Here's the things that you ought to know," and teach it. That is not what I got out of it. What I got out of it is, "Please give us more and more data. We're not going to tell you what to do. Except that "Just give us more and more and more data so that we can pour over this and make better decisions on your behalf." So I was one of the few people, I said, who I raised my hand at the end and said, "No, I didn't think this was appropriate." I liked the idea of working up the case studies, the dozen, ahead of time, but we didn't get a chance to really discuss them. One or two of them got discussed on our table or a few of them, but there wasn't any aggregation. I thought each of us was going to be able to say something about each of the case studies. But in any case, I would say from where I was sitting, this missed the mark with respect to being helpful to requesters. And then of course, Marc Trachtenberg's impassioned speech about a wall of data, a wall of words, and how do you understand this, I think resonated with everybody in the room. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. Gabriel, I see your hand again.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Just very quickly answering your question about how it came across to remote participants. I only can answer for after the fact remote participation that when I dialed in, there was a cutaway when it went to the tabletop breakouts, and then it cut back. And then we could hear everyone give the synopsis of their table's discussions. So absolutely zero time passed on the recording between when those breakouts started and where they stopped. So for whatever that extent that's helpful. But definitely here in the table, a table review of the most interesting points of the conversation was still very useful and interesting. And that's even how I was aware of Marc's comments to begin with. And the only other thing I'll say on a completely different topic is I should also make this team aware of one of the key messaging points surrounding how we can do promotion and awareness of RDRS that I had brought up as part of the GAC discussion. But I'm going to wait until operators switch that topic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. Marc and then John, and maybe we draw a line because we've already spent half an hour on that first topic. But Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I also raised my hand to respond to your question. I was at the session live. As Lisa Carter noted in chat, there was a breakout group for those participating remotely. So I was a part of that. There were eight people, I think, eight-ish people in that breakout group. Participation was fine in that format. In fact, I was pleasantly surprised. It was it was very well done. And I felt like I was able to participate pretty seamlessly being remote. So, thumbs up for me.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that. Indeed, now that you say it, Gabriel, you would have heard the feedback on that, because there was a remote participation lead for that room who present. I think she was the first one to present on the recording. John, I see your hand.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Seb. I also raised my hand to say I did join remotely and got a lot out of that session. I did not participate in the breakout group. But then did listen to everything afterwards, and got that feedback, and also supported what Marc had to say, I thought that was useful.

The other issue I wanted to raise—and it might be a nice sort of pin and I know where you want to go with this—is that I do agree that it's outside the real remit and scope of this group to have a debate over how the substance of decisions being made, etc. But we also know that the purpose of the RDRS was to gauge demand so that we could determine the ultimate cost of operating the SSAD system, and that we all pretty quickly realized that

EN

having a good user experience is going to be what bridges the gap between the thousands or millions of lookups that used to go on and the hundreds that are going on now to kind of get that square, that circle, and figure out what the cost is going to be. So maybe a suggestion would be to your original point that the CPH and CSG really need to discuss the standards for disclosure that we send some sort of mini note to those two groups to more formalize that process. And then we'll kind of maybe take this down a notch on our discussions and we can focus on the rest of the agenda. But anyway, I [do] want to offer support for that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. I don't think that we should go back to the CSG directly, but it's certainly something that I can drop the letter back to the Council to say, "Hey, here's something that we flagged that we believe is outside of our scope, but maybe you should…" and for them to go and send that to CPH if they want. I think that would be more closer to what I would be comfortable with.

Then you had another point, but suddenly that's lit again. Well, no, it's about the same. I think that we can do indeed all that we can do for this interface. I want to be cognizant of the fact that we're only having a pilot, and if we keep on changing things all the time, we're going to lose people too. But I do want to have something more clarified. I think that indeed—and maybe I'll circulate a draft to this team of what I think we should respond to the Council. But we should invite them to maybe look in parallel at what the next level of policy might be on this and maybe offer the policy more guidelines. I don't think it's for this group to do, I think it's for them. But at the end of this pilot, we can let the Council decide whether

they want to do, and then start several years of policy. Or we can also flag that to them as an important thing so that we don't use too much time. I have no whatsoever of seeing policy being changed in the timeframe of this group but that could be done.

Gabe, I see a hand. I hope that's brief, because otherwise, we won't have time to discuss all the other stuff on this agenda. Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Sorry, Seb. Very, very briefly then. One of the other points beyond the plain text that Marc brought up was the absolute lack of awareness amongst most requesters or Internet users that the RDRS even exists, right? I put in the chat that I view demand, because we're talking about this being useful of the RDRS being useful of measuring demand, I view demand as a function of utility and awareness. And currently, I think that there is very, very, very low awareness amongst the total population of potential RDRS or SSAD users. So I'm not sure that we're doing a good job of measuring "demand" of what it would look like when the user base becomes more aware. And I think that there's a significant amount of better work that we can be doing to raise awareness fast in order to do a better job of measuring demand.

And in the GAC session, I called out in particular that we don't have a bridge between the past tools that all the old dogs have learned to use over decades, that is the WHOIS tools, whether you go through the lookup.icann.org, whether you go through central ops, whether you do a command line, jQuery or what have you, whatever your tool of choice is, the only commonality

EN

between those various tools is you get back WHOIS data that says registrant is this, registrar is this, registry is this. Now with the RDAP functions, you have a little bit more fields that you can play with, but that response is the only commonality, and that response still doesn't point to the RDRS.

That was something I highlighted. I would actually want to add to the feedback document. This is maybe something Lisa, I'm going to flag for your awareness. I might want to get some clarity in terms of whether or not there is any obstacle within the RDAP profile document. I've read it, I don't think there is, to having a clear point out to what the RDRS tools location is, just a clickable link, what have you, to the RDRS tool itself to ensure that anytime someone ever sees this has been redacted for privacy, that in the very same breath, they also see and you can go here to request it if you have lawful purpose, right? Because until you do that, we're not going to get the awareness we need to measure with that. That's it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: First of all, let's be very, very, very clear. The demand that we're measuring here should not be compared with what we had 10 years ago, let's say. It cannot be compared with an open WHOIS. It cannot be compared with millions of queries that we were getting that were automated. We're talking about a tool that is human to human. This is not a machine to machine, and the volumes are not going to... I'm much more interested in doing a comparison of volumes with what we had last year, the year before, with collectively all the registrars saying, "This is the sort of volume that..." And from what I understand, we're not that far.

From my understanding, internally, we received still the request that we were receiving through our means and the ones through RDRS, and we're basically on par. It's not like suddenly RDRS is a big hole and everything is happening out flat.

On your request, Gabe—and I saw Lisa's hand, I think she would have repeated that—I believe there is a link on the ICANN tool. The problem is to go and ask all the registries, and even that wouldn't be too complicated because there's only a handful of back ends that do that for them. But more importantly, all the registrars to include that link in their feedback. I have no policy, no contractual obligation to do it and whatever. I'd like to have that discussion internally and suggest that internally for us, because we have room in our WHOIS response and RDAP response to add these types of messages. We would be able to change it for everybody. I'd like to have a conversation internally for us, but I can't make every registrar do it. I can't make anybody else do it. This is only going to be on voluntary position. I know that in the framework of WHOIS and RDAP, there is room to add these things. I know that it's also fairly controlled by ICANN and by contract, but I believe that we could add a message there if that's your understanding in the footer of a WHOIS or of an RDAP. I believe there's no footer in the structure of the RDAP. But again, I have no tool to make everybody else do it. I can only show leadership by trying to get my own company to do it and then see how we go there. Thanks.

With this, should we go to the next point? I saw the usage metrics only today. I understand might be short, but maybe Lisa, did you

EN

want to walk us through it? Unless anybody wants to raise their hand because they have immediate questions about it.

LISA CARTER: I actually didn't know if you guys wanted to spend that time walking it through since it just went up, or you want more time to do this and we can talk about it next time. Go ahead. Sorry.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I didn't see anything that jumped on me. What I wanted to do, though, is to grab the data and the CSV and try to reproduce what would Gabe did for us last month with the much better multi-level Sankey, to see if we could do that easily. But otherwise, I didn't have any because I didn't have time to look at it. Steve DelBianco, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Seb. Lisa, wanted to raise a request on the table of requests by request type on page 11. We're seven months in. Looking across the time series of that data is going to be less relevant because the total number of requests is falling. It may be that a flat number of consumer protection is actually a greater percentage of the request that have come in. So my request is that underneath each of the integer numbers in the table, what if we had percentage of total?

For instance, the eight requests in December by Computer Security Incident Response Teams might represent 5%. No decimals needed in that table. It would mean that each row's two

EN

rows or perhaps it's a different table entirely. Because over time, that seven columns turns into 9, 10 or 12. That's just a suggestion that doesn't require the gathering of any data, but just the presentation of the data in a way that gives the relative weight. An alternative is to take that circular pie chart at the top and turn it into a stacked bar chart time series. But there are very many layers in that stacked bar, which would be very difficult to track visually as it goes across the page. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Thank you, Steve. We can take a look at doing that if that's something the Standing Committee all agrees to in general. We can definitely take that back and look at how we can display that with percentage of totals.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any feedback from the rest of Standing Committee members about whether the relative would be a useful addition? No objection.

SARAH WYLD: I'm sorry, this is Sarah. Is everybody else hearing silence? Is it just me?

LISA CARTER: I'm hearing silence too. I was just going to ask if this silence means everyone agrees they want to add it or—

SARAH WYLD:	Silence is consent. That's how it works.
GABRIEL ANDREWS:	I'm wondering if silence also means that Seb dropped. Seb, are you still able to hear and speak to us? I know you mentioned computer woes.
SARAH WYLD:	His screen is entirely dark. He might not be hearing or seeing us.
GABRIEL ANDREWS:	Who's vice president?
SARAH WYLD:	Lisa, you're in charge now.
LISA CARTER:	Just to reconfirm for the metric that's request-by-request type, there's an ask to add the percentage of total for each of the different request types by month.
GABRIEL ANDREWS:	That's right.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	By month and total as well. Throw it in the total column as well.

LISA CARTER: By month and total. Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I realized that the total is exactly the percentages which appear just above the table. They would match to those.

LISA CARTER: Yes, they are. The other metric, just so we put that on the table, is something that Gabe asked for at the last meeting at the very tail end, but I also wanted to make sure there's consensus on adding. And that was for metric 10. He wanted to add not just the percentages but also the number of totals by month and since launch. So if you want to go to metric 10—I don't know if you want to scroll to metric 10 for that for everyone.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: From memory, that was where the initial input domains went. There you go.

LISA CARTER: He asked for that with not just percentages and for the month, which is just the total you see here, but the quantity and percentage for month, quantity and percentage since launch. That's another metric we want to ensure that we have a general consensus on from the Standing Committee before we add that in also. Do you guys agree to that one?

EN

MARC ANDERSON: I'll just jump in since we lost our chair. I don't have any objections to what Steve's asking for. I personally wouldn't find that useful, but I think that's fine. I have no concerns with the ask on Gabriel's request. I think that would be useful. Actually, I had the same thought I would like to have the totals instead of just the percentages. So my support/non-objection to both.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I might jump in here and actually giving this some additional thought. Thank you for chiming in there, Marc. I want to clarify here too that when we say that the domain is not supported, I think based on past conversations, that had two buckets of domains. We're talking about basically the TLD is what's not supported. It was because either ccTLD or what I guess we'd call legacy TLDs, does anyone object to somehow making clear what percentage of those are ccTLDs versus legacy TLDs? I think it's probably almost all going to be ccTLDs but I don't want to make bad assumptions. Any thoughts on that?

LISA CARTER: Just to clarify, are you asking for this measure to show which TLD it is?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: No. Because I know there's this hesitancy and that would be way more granular, but distinguishing between the ccTLDs and the legacy TLDs. I don't object to showing what TLD it is, personally. I would love to see as much data as I can, but that would be very granular for what is a very high-level graphic here. I think even just

distinguishing between ccTLDs and legacy TLDs like .mil, dot whatever, would be beneficial here to understanding. This is particularly going towards the conversation that we're having on the side about whether or not there is demand for ccTLDs to warrant and justify providing instructions to any ccTLD that wanted to participate on a strictly voluntary basis. If we're seeing a lot of demand, it makes it more clear that that would actually be a constructive thing to do to serve the request or constituencies. Versus if this is all request for .mil, well, then that would be pointless. I think having some amount of visibility into what TLDs we're talking about by category would be beneficial. Hopefully, I didn't butcher that thought.

LISA CARTER: Do others agree or...?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, you weren't part of the conversation a year ago when we first tackled it. I just want to make clear that there were two reasons why we didn't include ccTLDs in the first instance. One, because they're not contracted party in ICANN for data management purposes, because we're handling data. We wanted to make sure that we're dealing with contracted party. Just to make it more simple, because specifically the contract designated registrars here, that's why we chose registrars. Initially, the SSAD also had registries, and that's why we chose that for the pilot, we would keep it to registrars.

EN

The other is a purely technical thing, which is, in the case of ccTLDs, there is no structure with registrars. There's no global registrar accreditation like the gTLDs. Obviously, you would know. But if you look at a ccTLD WHOIS, sometimes the registrar doesn't have a name. Sometimes registrars are only resellers of that SSAD registry.

So I have no problem looking into it, but I think it's a conversation that's going to take a while. And I'm not sure that it's a conversation that we're going to be able to have substantially in the next 18 months. I think that the system that we'll derive from this exercise should include ccTLDs. I fully agree with you. It might be a case that for gTLDs, we redirect this to the known registrars, and for ccTLDs, we redirect it to the ccTLD itself. Often by jurisdiction, that's the way they would operate anyway. I don't know. But that's why we removed it. Again, let's have these conversations with the ccTLDs. Let's encourage. Let's see what the interest is. But there were a few good reasons why we didn't include it in the first round. And I wanted to make sure because you weren't part of the conversation a year ago.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Can I clarify your comments? Noting that some of this is being discussed in the e-mail thread as well, it's specifically the technical limitations, which I think are not as instrumental perhaps as we might first assume. But that could be an e-mail conversation. But on this specific topic of at least delineating when the TLD is not supported, when it's initially input, I still take it to your point there that you're not objecting to making clear what percentage of those domain not supported actually is ccTLD versus legacies like .mil.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that's a good idea, and I suspect that it's 99% ccTLDs.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I suspect it too. I would just feel like an idiot if I assumed it wasn't true.

LISA CARTER: Just an FYI, we did a quick check on ccTLD and it's kind of a small number. It's not really large in comparison to the thousands of requests that have been submitted since launch. It's a pretty small number.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You mean the non-supported TLDs? It's a small number of ccTLDs?

LISA CARTER: Yes. Like 140 something.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I would love to see that broken down in metric 10 going forward then. Because I think I'm making some bad assumptions. But it seems that by the quantity and percentage and historical, that'd be fantastic.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Marc, I see you hand.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I don't object to what Gabriel's asking. But maybe just to clarify on the language, I don't believe that legacy TLD is the correct term. Generally, legacy TLD includes TLDs like .com, .net, and .org, and those are included. I think the distinction we're looking for is regulated versus non-regulated. Typically, regulated TLDs would be included versus non-regulated like .gov and .mil example Gabriel provided.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good point. Let's find the term. Because the intro is a sponsored TLD and they would work within. Whatever distinguishes those TLDs that are not participating. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER: That was my hand up to just note the statistic on the ccTLDs on not found being a low number in comparison to 10,000 lookups. It was only 100 something.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Interesting. Again, because my assumption was the contrary and apparently Gabriel, too. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I put my hand up to say I support what Gabe is asking for. I was rather surprised by Lisa's statistic, though. I'm wondering what are the others non-supported ones if they're not ccTLDs?

LISA CARTER: The others non-supported ccTLDs are the .mil, .edu, .gov, .int, .arpa.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we're really getting that many requests for those? That's surprising.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Again, let's look at the data. That's surprising to me too. I believe you, but it's surprising to me too. Okay. Again, we're missing most of the agenda here. Great discussions. Can we go back to the agenda then and look at the next items?

We did have a bit of time to discuss the system enhancements and I wanted to go on a line per line on this. But obviously, I'm not going to start seven minutes before the end of the call. What I would want to show is I saw a preview of the updated Impressions document to include the—exactly. Thank you very much. So going forward—and maybe, Lisa, you explain where we're at with this.

LISA CARTER: This is something that Caitlin and team put together, this different view of the Impressions document. I think they showed it to you

EN

without actually adding in everything from the old format. This basically is designed the way Sarah requested to add the additional data field. So there's a field for priority, there's a field also added for who's going to own that particular ask from the Standing Committee. There's the notes column for comments that can be added. There's also a column for ICANN to put a level of effort on it and then any notes regarding the level of effort. Then at the very far right is a status so we can see whether it's in progress, whether it's pending, whether it still needs to be reviewed by the Standing Committee, and then whether it's completed. This will give a little better view into where we are with each of those requests and whether or not they've been prioritized, etc.

The other ask would be that I know lots of things we've discussed are not in this document. For example, the request for metric 10 is not in here. I think we had the request that was for more character limits in the document that's not in here. I think the ask would be that for everything asked for, if we're going to track it properly, someone needs to own adding it to this document so that it can be listed in here with the priority, etc., and then we can track it as closed and checked off the list, etc.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. If I can suggest, I understand that it's going to put a lot of weight on Gabriel and Sarah who have been inputting in the old document, but to transfer indeed the information that was in the old document into the new one, I like it very much, too. I think it's a much better way to track it. It doesn't read great on Zoom because the size of the screen on Zoom is very small compared to the

normal laptop or desktop, but it looks a lot better. I would like to use that going forward. If you can make sure that all the items of importance from the Google Doc are passed into this spreadsheet, that would be fantastic. And use the opportunity indeed to put your name as a champion next to it. I'll have a look again before our next call and do a compare. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Big thanks to Feodora and the staff team for making this change. I find it much more conducive, which is great. Thank you so much. Slightly confused about whose job it is to put the info from the old sheet into the new sheet. Because from Sebastien I heard that we each should do our requests, and from Caitlin I see that Caitlin will do it. Please let me know. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Seb, this is Caitlin Tubergen. Support staff can copy the information from the old table into the new one.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Did everybody lose Sarah too, or was it just me?

SARAH WYLD: I just stopped talking.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Because I missed that. Anyway, Caitlin, if you can help with it. But then I still want people to come and own these things. So if Caitlin and staff added, thank you very much, but do go back and, please, before the next call in two weeks, make sure that the ownership is properly labeled. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: One suggestion for an additional column or some means of denoting, I think some of the feedback we received is very much geared towards the RDRS itself with making changes to the RDRS. Whereas some of the feedback we received is to denote qualitative features or functions of an eventual SSAD. Those are two distinct things. I'm not sure how to distinguish between them in this so far. But maybe if we had an additional column for what impact, if any, to an SSAD or a successor system, that would be fantastic to have a mechanism to make clear that we're not asking for some of the big issues to be solved within the next 18 months. But nonetheless, highlighting that they need to be considered for the successor.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Could it be a different level of priority? Like priority for RDRS and priority for SSAD or whatever we call it in the next iteration?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Maybe. It's interesting thought. I'm thinking on it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just adding more column at some point makes it unreadable. But anyway, let's have a thought. I like the idea. I definitely like the idea of recording that. Sarah, I see you hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Sorry, we're almost done the meeting time. I just have a question about our follow-up meeting. Next meeting would normally be scheduled on the 1st of July. Will we meet that day? I know many Americans take off the whole week for your Independence Day, which is Thursday. I will not be working as it is Canada Day. I just wanted to know if we are meeting on the 1st. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that we intended. But a good point. And maybe we share that on the list. Let's have a head count of who would show up if we did on the 1st. Otherwise, you would suggest then to have it set in later on the 8th, I guess. Again, my computer being in the state it is, I don't know if silence is because I can't hear you or if it's approval. You have one minute to go, Marc. I see you hand up. Gabriel, I'm assuming this is a previous.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. This is Marc. I want to respond to what Gabriel said. I like his suggestion. I think we need something like that. I don't want to presuppose an outcome with it. But I think we do need a way to track, for lack of a better term, I'll call learnings from the pilot that will ultimately inform we have a task to provide recommendations or advice back to the GNSO Council. I think with that in mind,

document like what Gabriel suggested, but maybe a little broader to capture any learnings that we've achieved as part of this pilot that will inform our recommendations or advice back to the GNSO council.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I definitely like the idea. Again, adding an infinite number of columns is not going to make the document that readable, but either, being a new tab for that or whatever we choose, let's have a think and discuss that on the list before next time.

Thank you, everybody. We're at time. Great discussions. I hope to catch you all very soon. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]