

---

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December, 2024.

For today's call, we have listed apologies for Steve DelBianco and Sebastien Ducos.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or on mute in Zoom now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view the chat only and have listen-only audio. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call, and an email will be sent to the list stating so. Please remember to state your name before speaking. All chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With this, I'll turn it back over to John McElwaine. 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.*

---

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thank you, Terri, and welcome, everybody. This is John McElwaine for the record. I'm the Vice Chair of the RDRS Standing Committee. For those who maybe didn't hear it, just chatting before the call began, it's Sebastien birthday today. And he sent me an email right before this asking if I could step in for him and lead the call. He's got a family dinner and we all wish him a happy birthday. And from looking at the agenda, this should be pretty easy because it looks like all I have to do is hand this off to staff and kind of lead some discussions here.

So with that we can take care of the welcome and we can move to the pending action items. And I think Feodora is going to cover that for us.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Yes. Thank you, John. There's actually not much pending except for the Standing Committee members to provide input to the workbook by the end of this week and also for the final report and also, if they presented RDRS to any audience, to include their feedback also in the outreach tracker.

Other than that, we don't have any pending action item as such. One was closed recently, the one relating to the letter to the GNSO Council. Seb could have clarified that further, but he's not here. Maybe you can share what he decided on this. But other than that, that's it from the pending action items.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay. So, I see a hand up from Gabriel. So Gabriel, over to you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi. So noting that I have actions that were just described, most of the feedback that's come from the Public Safety Working Group has been incorporated in past comments, and I note staff have helpfully started to transfer some of that over to that Google Sheets document.

I just wanted to flag, for your awareness and for Sebastien's when he comes back, that I'm also going through a separate track of collecting prior GAC statements and comments that might pertain to the RDRS that have yet been incorporated into this sheet. It's a bit more homework on my end to go back and look through past GAC communiques and try to summarize that and then to bring it back to the GAC and say, "Hey look, this is the summary that I'm creating that I think speaks to what you've previously said," and then, "Do we have the concurrence to provide it back through this formal mechanism?" And so I expect that to occur. But I am not expecting that to occur within this week's deadline.

My prior comments that have been included for the PSWG can be done this week, but that separate issue of culling the key summaries of the GAC communiques in the past for this issue might probably take another week or two past the anticipated

---

deadline. And I just want to make sure that folks are aware of that and explain the reason for that. It's just more administrative overhead associated with that process.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for the heads up, Gabe. I appreciate that. Any other comments or questions on the pending action items?

Okay, just a reminder: get your comments in by Friday, December 6th, I believe it is. And that way we can make sure that's all included in our consideration for final report.

And not seeing—oh no, Farzaneh, over to you. Hands up.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Hi. Yes, thank you. So just clarifying question. Can other stakeholders comment on, like, requester a tab and the Public Safety Working Group's and also the Business Constituency's few comments they have made and feedback? I just had a few questions and so I just inserted comments on that. And I think that we might have to discuss them before incorporating them in the report. And so one of them is about a bulk submission of the form, which is a request by SSAC and the Business Constituency.

And I think for the PSWG, I had a clarifying question on an issue that I cannot remember. It's in the sheets. Anyway, we can discuss it during a meeting or before we write up the report.

---

And as to NCSG's comment, as we are here to defend and protect registrants' rights. Also, protecting registrants' rights can also protect end users. So we don't really use the form. I haven't heard cases from NCSG that they use the form but I have asked them for feedback. Our feedback is generally about how we can have a RDRS as transparent and accountable and privacy-respecting.

JOHN MCELWAIN:

Thank you for those comments, Farzaneh. And I think there is some discussion going on in the chat as to where the proper place is to put feedback into the Google form, the Google Doc, so that it can be in the right area for us to consider as a group which might be a good segue to talk a little bit about ... Well, I don't want to skip but we have a discussion later on on the timeline for the final report, and I think we can handle a few of the issues. [The] proper place [is] there. So I think we will get to the proper time period and places to put comments into the Google Doc there with the final report section of today's agenda.

So I'm pausing to see if there's any other comments or questions. Okay, so let's move on now to brief discussion on the standing committee session at ICANN 81. And I just wanted to make sure: are there any other issues coming out of that meeting that we need to discuss? Did we cover everything? And I'll just pause a little moment to get folks' opinions takes on that discussion we had in ICANN 81 in Istanbul?

---

All right. Everybody felt like we covered everything well. All right. Thomas, over to you.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yeah, thanks so much, John. I just think that we might need to discuss a little bit how the discussions in Istanbul went and that still the argument is made by some that the consequence of submitting requests to the RDRS must be disclosure and that every a disclosure is a failure of the system because I think that is dangerous in the sense that it's legally inaccurate and also it doesn't help in managing the expectations of the requestors. Just to be clear, I'm all in favor of making sure that we increase the chances of disclosure by educating about the legal circumstances, the facts required and all that. But the narrative that everything that doesn't lead to disclosure makes the system fail, I think, is pretty dangerous. And I wouldn't be really willing to invest my time if we don't get alignment at least within this group that sets the record straight. Thanks so much. Maybe that's not for now, but that's been one of the takeaways from the various discussions that have been held in Istanbul.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thank you, Thomas. So, I mean, I take your point and I'll just kind of put myself into the queue. And certainly I didn't hear anything quite so strident, shall we say; that there must be a consequence of submitting a request, must be a disclosure. I don't think

---

anybody expects that. But I don't think you also find any pushback from this standing committee on those topics. So that comment—Marc, I see your hand up. Over to you.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, John. I raised my hand for a different topic, but I'll maybe try and incorporate what Thomas said into my comment. In reflecting on how the discussion went at ICANN 81, first, in general, I thought it was a good discussion. I think it was a nice opportunity for us to have a frank discussion about what our thoughts, feelings and observations are.

But reflecting back, I looked at our committee assignments and I think we're really focused on assignments three and four at this point: what are the lessons learned that should be factored into proceeding with the SSAD recommendations, and what are our suggestions to council for basically next steps. And I'll just paste those into chat so people see them and they're front of mind.

My observation from ICANN81 is we had both conversations at the same time. And I think that, at least in my mind, confused the conversation. And I'd like to delineate the two conversations: what are the lessons learned, and what are our suggestions and recommendations? And there I said I try to incorporate Thomas's point. I think that's a fair point that he made. I think that's reflected in the fact that there were a lot of discussions at ICANN 81 about RDRS, and I think that's a great thing. I think it's on

---

people's minds and we're having conversations about it. That's what we want. But a lot of those conversations that I heard focused on the percentage of requests that were disclosed.

And so to Thomas's point, I think that maybe is a focus on the wrong thing. And so I would put that in Assignment 3, Specific Lessons Learned, that should be factored into considerations on how to proceed, rather than recommendations to ICANN Board and Council on next steps.

So hopefully that's not too rambling. But my feedback in general about ICANN 81 is that I thought it was a good conversation. I'm glad we had that opportunity, but I'd like to see us focus on separating the conversations on lessons learned versus recommendations for next steps. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks, Marc. Great points. Steve, over to you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. I want to echo Marc's concerns here. We certainly want to glean as much as we can out of the RDRS experience. As I have said multiple times and will probably say multiple times again, the framing of RDRS as a quantitative experiment to see what the demand is in order to feed into a decision about whether to go ahead with SSAC is deeply flawed, basically just an incorrect assumption. If one looks at what a

---

system that genuinely serves the community would look like and looks at the different criteria that it should satisfy and then looks at RDRS, there's a huge gap.

So I think separating what we're learning out of RDRS versus what the path forward might look like, whether it's SSAD or something else, is a very important distinction. And I think we should not have any sense of an automatic recommendation that, now that we've done RDRS, we're ready to go with SSAD. And that expectation, I think, should be kept in check. I'm not sure that we all agree on that. I suspect that we don't, but I feel very strongly about it, and others do, too. And I think it's vital that we not set that expectation that things are just going to proceed automatically going forward within our own group, within the GNSO, with the Board, or with the community in general. I think that would be a really bad idea.

There's much more to say about it, but I want to add one other thing. I've noticed in the reports of these meetings that comments of the kind I've just made tend not to show up in any form at all. They just get ignored in terms of the summary. So, however the summary is prepared, it feels to me a kind of an implicit bias in the reporting process. So I want to flag that. Thank you.

---

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Steve, for those comments. Looks like Marc has his hand up. So, Marc, you have something to follow up on?

MARC ANDERSON: I do. Thank you. I want to respond to something Steve said. Steve is concerned that—or what I heard from Steve; hopefully I'm characterizing this correctly—some people ... He wants to avoid the outcome being to just proceed with the SSAD recommendations. And he's concerned that people may disagree with him. And I'm curious about that. In conversations in hallway conversations and discussions, I have not heard a single person advocating for just proceeding with, with the SSAD.

And I'm curious if Steve has heard differently or if there's anybody on this call that would like to say their assumption is to proceed with the SSAD. I think what I've heard from conversations with people and what the data seems to indicate is that we should not proceed with SSAD and that we need a different solution altogether.

But I'm raising my hand because my understanding and what I'm hearing seems to differ from Steve. I tend to be a little concerned when I'm thinking differently than Steve, and I question why. So I'm asking, does anybody want to jump in and say they think the results of the RDRS is validation for SSAD and we should proceed with SSAD? I don't think that's the case and that's not what I've been hearing. So I want to maybe try and level-set a little.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Marc. Paul, you have an answer for us?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah. So I don't have a direct answer other than to say that I don't think that we need to worry about the ultimate conclusion. That's going to be councils. I think what we need to do is focus on what we've learned through the RDRS. And to the extent that we think it would have some effect on the now-quite-aged SSAD recommendations, we can certainly point that out.

But ultimately I think it is a false hill to die on to come up with the notion that we all need to agree or not, or even reach rough consensus or not, on whether or not the SSAD needs to go forward. That's not the role. That's Council's role. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for those comments, Paul. Gabe, over to you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I think that, hearing your summarization of what Steve had said, I missed one point that I would like to chime in with because I think it's something that Steve and I have both said in various contexts. But, really focusing on the difference between qualitative and quantitative lessons that can be learned from this, I think it's important to recognize that the metrics, such as they exist, are

---

more of a function of things such as the awareness of the RDRS existence than they are about any potential demand for a future SSAD, and thus it's very difficult to derive quantitative lessons that would then be able to put forth to that question of whether or not the issue proceed with an SSAD as exists or as was originally contemplated, whereas there are very clear qualitative lessons that can be derived from this pilot project, and doing so would be constructive[.] But without weighing in on any GNSO decision that will be made in the future[,], I think that's the constructive feedback that we might be in position to make.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thank you, Gabe. For what it's worth, I do agree with you on the qualitative. As a person who submitted a number of requests, the quantitative trends are what they are. But the qualitative is where I feel like I can provide the most input myself.

I believe those hands that are up are old hands. Anybody else want to have any further discussion? Paul, is that yours? All right, anything else on the ICANN 81 session?

All right, we move on then to a discussion on the final report timeline. So this is all very, I think, important to discuss now with our majority of our work moving to this phase. And Feodora is going to help present on this. And in doing so, you may have already intended to cover this, but if you wouldn't mind, also

---

cover where folks should provide feedback in the particular sections of the workbook. Thanks. Over to you.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, John. Yes. So, feedback. You should be able to see on the screen now the workbook. And there's a tab called Feedback for Findings Report. And any suggestion would just be added at the end as a new line and associated with an assignment.

As you can see here, we already included comments and feedback that were mentioned during the ICANN 81 working session. Yeah, you can have a look, but I can also see that others already added their feedback on other parts. So thank you for that. And you have time until the end of this week to add more.

And I have to stop screen-sharing now for a second to change the document and show you the timeline. So yes, as we already said, we are still collecting feedback on the workbook until the end of next week. This week[,] if the workbook and the spreadsheet is not convenient to you, you can also share this feedback with us via email via the standing committee list.

Then after that, the standing committee will have the chance to comment on the feedback provided by the members. So for that, ICANN Org support staff will add two more columns in the tab that I just showed you to provide the rationale for that observation and then also for other SC members to describe if

---

they agree or disagree with those comments with their observation and so on. So that happens until the 16th of December.

And as also, I think, commented by some members, we will then divide. So we will then collect the input and put it in the final report template. That will be done by support staff, and then the standing committee will work through it based on assignment number. So on the 13th of January meeting, we will discuss assignment one and the input there and the drafting, and then the committee has time to provide their input or discussion on Assignment 2 on the 27<sup>th</sup> of January and so on, as you can see here. And the final review and editing should then probably take place at ICANN 82 and the time after. This was discussed with John and Seb last week, but this is also open for consideration. This is currently the state of play. So back to you John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Feodora. Marc, I see of your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I guess I have a slightly different take on our assignments, particularly Assignment 1 and 2. I looked at Assignment 1 and 2 as the ongoing work that we as the standing committee have been doing over the last year, and Assignment 3 and 4 as being specific to our final report. And in fact, I think that 1 and 2 has already

---

been pretty well encapsulated. In the pre-ICANN 81 briefing, there was a session on RDRS, and in that session we had a really good update from ICANN Org that covered, really, I think all of Assignment 1 and 2. It provided information on the trends, relevant information that had been identified in the monthly reports. And at the end of it, it covered the technical updates that have been done to the system over the course of its operations. And to me, I think that's what's intended by Assignments 1 and 2.

In fact, my recommendation for those would be to ask ICANN Org to refresh that presentation and include that in the report, but maybe more as an appendix. I think the meat of our final report is and should be focused on assignments three and four. And I think my understanding at least is that that is what the focus of our workbook assignments were, populating feedback for considerations on assignments three and four for our final report. I'm happy to be corrected if I have that wrong, but that's how I see it and have been looking at it at least.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Marc. Gabe, over to you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: So I take your point, Marc, and I'm on the fence hearing it because I think that you're correct that some of the key learnings that we've hadn't yet really have opportunity to dive into are

---

going to be embodied in those assignments 3 and 4. And yet, from what I heard in our meeting, and this is (I don't want to put words in people's mouths) a a de facto expectation by many that the RDRS [inaudible] at the submission of this report that there might still be a period where it remains a relevant concern and that many of the potential technical updates that were suggested or might be suggested in the next year, if this two-year pilot [happens], might still have time to be implemented or cause to be implemented, and that iteration on the RDRS might be something that we as a group are comfortable with going forward, that GNSO might be comfortable with, and that there still might be productive value to listing and enumerating those technical suggestions, the promotion suggestions, that have been put in place in our past discussions.

And I'm also reminded even of the discussion (I know I beat a dead horse here) about how very hard it is to conduct push messaging to raise end user awareness of the existence of the RDRS and the value of the registration data as a evangelization tool, a marketing tool, that has been brought up a number of times but still has yet to really be seized upon in a manner that could really drive end user awareness far beyond what currently exists. And I think it would be important to really denote that these are issues that have been discussed in the past, whether or not they have been incorporated to date.

And yeah, this is the issue that I brought up in person about using the registration data as it currently exists, either through the RDAP protocol or the deprecated WHOIS protocol to say at the very same time that you're saying that this data has been redacted to comply with law or however it's phrased. I think it just says that "this information has been redacted" very often. But in the very next piece of data, [it'd say], "and if you have a lawful purpose by which to articulate that you'd like access to this data," etc., or however you want to phrase it. You could point people to the fact that the RDRS exists within that same data that they've been using for decades. I'm not going to belabor the point. I think we've all said this many times.

So the key point is that there could still be value to enumerate within the assignments 1 and 2 what's been done, what's been suggested and whether or not it's had time to be incorporated.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Gabe. Sarah, over to you.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I also had a bit of a different take on those assignments from what Marc had said. I do agree with Marc that numbers one and two were the ongoing work that we've been doing over the past year, but in reviewing those four topics with my registrar colleagues, we did still find that we had input to

---

---

share on those points. It was a bit more overall or a bit more high-level. So I think it might seem incomplete if we don't include those numbers one and two in the report. And also I think that what we put in the report would be a bit different from our ongoing work.

But this does also raise a question that Farzaneh put in the chat and Gabe touched on, which is, what is the plan for further updates to the system as we're working on the reporting? Are we also going to continue to do that work that was in the requester and registrar feedback tabs of the sheet? I mean, I know that the work that was agreed to already happened or is in progress, but on the process of triaging and continuing to make changes, I'd like to understand if that will also continue. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thank you, Sarah. Just to reply to that, I don't know the answer to that and we can take it back or discuss it as a group, but I just didn't want to leave that hanging out there. So I'm going to send this over to Steve. I see his hand up. I'm sorry.

STEVE CROCKER:

So I'm in agreement with much of what I've just heard here. What's emerging, I think, are two identifiably distinct discussion points, both of which are very important. One is we have RDRS, we have experience with it, we're going to report on it, but in addition it's a working system. And the open question is, is it

---

going to continue indefinitely, is it going to be shut down abruptly at the end of two years? Those are two extremes. Or what is the plan for that?

And my opinion for it is that, as long as it's up and running and providing some level of service, there's no reason to be rough about it and just shut it down abruptly. And as I've also said, there's also no reason to think of it as what an eventual system should look like at all.

But the roadmap for that is one thing. And then separately, what are the considerations, what are the questions that need to be answered to create a roadmap going forward? And that, I think, there's been very little work on. It's sort of an implicit assumption that, well, we run RDRS and then we have the data necessary to make future decisions. I'm not sure that that is good enough and that there should be some more explicit planning process or thought process leading to a plan that is distinct and separate from the commentary that we're running on RDRS.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks, Steve. And I'm going to let Farzaneh speak, but I'm going to cut off this topic here so we can get to the rest of the agenda. One important next agenda item is going to be getting an update on the RDRS user experience. So, Farzaneh, over to you.

---

FARZANEH BADIEI: I just wanted to clarify what I said in chat because, Gabriel, we can definitely discuss. We've been talking about this for the past six months: how can we have a link to the RDRS when people are doing WHOIS lookup? And I think that's what you mean. And I think that definitely merits a conversation and it makes sense. But I wouldn't call it a marketing tool. This is why I asked, what do you mean by marketing tool? But if you want to discuss that, I think that, as part of the outreach plan for people to tell them how they can use it, we can also [show how we can have] the RDRS link or if we should have RDRS link somewhere visible that people can go and use. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you for those points. And as I said, I'm going to turn it over now to the next agenda item, which was to get an update on the RDRS user experience interviews. And so, Lisa, can I ask you to come on and provide us your update on that?

LISA CARTER: Sure. Thanks, John. So I don't have anything to share on screen, but I did want to kind of give a general anecdotal update on the interviews that took place at ICANN 81. I did a total of eight interviews. We actually have one that had to be postponed to this week, but I did want to kind of let everyone know, just as a reminder, we had eight questions that were shared ahead of time

---

with the standing committee in an email that went out on the 8<sup>th</sup> of October.

There were a total of eight questions asking, for example, on average, how many requests for non-public registration data does your organization submit through RDRS and outside of RDRS on a daily basis? Second question was, what aspects or elements of RDRS as a system are working well for you and your organization? Third question was what aspects are not working well or presenting challenges? And then we asked the users to please describe their experience interacting with either the registrar or requester, depending on who was doing the interview. Once the registrar receives the request, how does that work? What challenges are happening there, if any? The fifth question was what are your top suggestions (up to 5) for improving the user experience in RDRS?

6 was what would a future version of RDRS need to look like for your organization to use it regularly? Question 7 asked if there were any additional comments, and then question 8 was a question that actually Steve DelBianco asked to add on behalf of the GNSO standing committee in relation to whether there were any legal or regulatory things on the horizon that could impact someone's interest in using RDRS. So it's just a recap of the questions overall.

---

As a summary of positive feedback in general ... By the way, just so I did interview two registrars and then there were six requesters. I will have a third registrar interview this week. So it was really mostly requesters that were responding to give their feedback. But in general in terms of positive feedback, registrars liked the layout. They thought it was easy to train staff.

Requesters, in terms of positive feedback, liked the template and pre-population of data to help with multiple requests at one time using RDRS.

Someone also mentioned that they actually use RDRS as a lookup tool, meaning they would go to the system to check to see if the registrar for the domain they need to find out about is participating. If not, then they would go use other avenues to get the information. So that actually could explain some of the discrepancies that the standing committee was talking about previously as to why searches are so high and requests are not as high, if that is actually happening a lot.

Also requesters said system performance was good. They didn't really have too many issues.

Challenges. In summary, as far as registrars go, some registrars indicated that the bulk feature in the Naming Services Portal was a challenge and that in fact it was actually easier for them to process requests individually than through the bulk features.

In terms of requesters: not enough information provided by registrars to explain denials. We've heard that before. "Language in the form was a bit difficult to understand" was another comment, even for lawyers challenging. Another user echoed that that was also a challenge.

There's also a note that registrars actually are not communicating with requesters outside of RDRS at all. It seems that pretty much everyone I talked to requester-wise said they would submit the request and get a response or denial or approval. But there was no communication with registrars outside, which I don't think we expected.

And then one of the other things ... Hold on one second. Okay, so there were two comments about the language in the form and maybe making it a little simpler to use.

The other thing was that there was an ask to clarify the description of requesters and which type of requester should be selecting which type of request category. That was indicated as confusing.

And then for top suggestions for improvement: obviously allow registrars to provide an explanation for each denial reason, more registrars participating, maybe get closer to the SSAD model in terms of functionality. The example given was that registrars should provide more information in terms of denials. There should be service-level agreement. And maybe also registrars

---

---

disclosing which applicable laws are preventing disclosure also would be helpful.

And then also there was a suggestion that was mentioned earlier in this call about registrars providing a link to RDRS in their RDAP results for WHOIS lookups, etc.

And then API is definitely on the list. “RDRS should work more like Port 43 where responses are automated” was another suggestion. And then also there was just commentary about the intro language and the pop-up kind of being a bit prohibitive to requesters when they see that it's not ... They tend to not want to use the system. So it's turning some people away. I think that was the thought there.

And then also for future version requirements that would ensure participation, there were a few [:] API[,] inclusion of all registrars, RDRS closer to what SD was supposed to be, registrars with affiliate proxy-privacy to include that information in their disclosure. And then also ccTLD participation was suggested.

And then for the last question that was about the regulatory issues on the horizon that could impact interest, actually most people said there was no current issue that would impact their participation in the future. However, one or two people did say NIS2 would improve the value of information received. And then from the registrar side, there was a concern that requesters think NIS2 will make the data automatically available.

---

So that's generally what I've gotten so far. I was going to put together a document that could kind of summarize all of this for you guys, and, we can put it in a publishable format to include in your findings, etc., if you would like.

I was going to wait through maybe the end of this year to see if we got any other requests for interviews. If that works for you guys, I can do that. I will note that there's now a link in both the RDRS interface and the naming service portal interface that asks people if they would like to have an interview with ICANN and tells them how they can actually sign up to do so. So we are promoting that across both platforms.

And I see a bunch of hands. So I don't know who was first because I was looking at a different screen, but if you can help me out on that one, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yeah, so it should be Marc. So Marc, over to you.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. Thanks for the summary, Lisa. You answered one of my questions which was, will we see a written report of this? I think there would be value in that. So I think it'd be good to have a written report or something we might want to put in an appendix of our final report. So it makes sense to have a cutoff time (you suggested at the end of the year) for participating in

---

---

that. And then, maybe some point after that, a written report would be good to have. I think a lot of what I heard was similar to discussions we had at ICANN 81, so I think it's good to have that corroboration.

One question for you. At ICANN 81, Volker came to the mic representing a registrar and expressing frustration that integration with RDRS creates more work for him. And I think there's an indication that he was one of the people that was participating in the survey. As a member of the standing committee and putting together recommendations, that's concerning for me to hear. I think we want to provide recommendations for a system or enhancements to the system that don't create a lot of extra work for registrars. And you don't necessarily have to answer this now, but I'd like to understand that more and see if we can better understand why it's creating so much more work for him and are there things we can do to improve that? So if you have an answer, great. If not, I think that's something the standing committee needs to look into more. Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

Sure. I can speak briefly to that because I know Volker has commented on this in the past. And what I understand from him, at least partially, the challenge is that he would like RDRS to at least email him. So, he wants everything to go through his system.

So he would like an email mechanism where the email can go to his system and populate his tools so that there's no copy-and-paste required. The only mechanism that RDRS in terms of registrars has now is that a PGP key would be required in NSP that would encrypt all the information that comes through for a request and email it to the registrar and then that gets decrypted. But I think there's still a challenge with importing whatever gets decrypted into the system. And that also doesn't accommodate the attachments that get uploaded by requesters.

So that's one of the things for sure that I know he was concerned about, and I think an API might solve that. I don't know that that would be solved during the pilot though. But he's actually my interview later this week, so I will get more detail from him on that. When I do publish everything though, everything will be anonymized. So we're not going to name who said what, but his feedback will be included in the report, if that helps.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Lisa. Sarah, over to you.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. It's interesting to hear that requesters said that (and maybe I misunderstood) they're not getting information about the denial beyond whatever is in RDRS. And so I just asked some registrars that use RDRS (because we have a group chat) what

---

they do when there's a denial, and it sounds like they're using the options in the system. So if there's a clear option to select that explains why it was denied, they would just use that and not think that any more info is needed. And if not, then they would select Other and then add more information right there in that box.

So it sounds like a disconnect of expectations rather than information not being provided, maybe. So I just thought that was interesting.

And then I have this raised in my head—another question—which I would like to add to the question about what we're doing in terms of new changes to the system platform functionality, because I don't really expect it to be answered right now. So we're going to send to the council, I guess, a report that answers these four topics and then also they or the Board or both are going to look at the metrics reports. Will we continue to create and issue monthly metrics reports or is there like a cutoff date after which it's been sent out and so we're not tracking those anymore? Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

So can I just speak to Sarah's really quickly? So in terms of the metric report, Sarah, just for clarification, are you asking if metrics reports are going to continue through the second year of the pilots?

SARAH WYLD: I guess I am, yeah. And they will, because that was the plan. Even if we're issuing a report before the two years are done, we'll continue with the metrics.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, the metrics [inaudible] the full pilot.

SARAH WYLD: Okay. Thanks.

LISA CARTER: And then related to the comments you made about registrars' interpretation of the comments that they're not providing enough explanation, I think (and other requesters on the call can correct me if I'm wrong), because there's only one box to provide feedback outside of the denial (each denial does not have its own box for further explanation) that's presenting a challenge. So potentially requesters do not know which comments relate to which denial reason. And so, multiple times, people have asked if there could be denial reasons for each additional explanation for each denial reason provided. I think there's also in the user guide a suggestion that for each denial reason provided, the registrar provide individual comment. But again that could be confusing

---

because there's only one box for everything. So I think that's what that's referring to.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, thank you for that. Steve, over to you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. A couple of thoughts, the first one triggered by the description of PGP key and encoding and so forth. I understand pretty well all the technology involved there. It's doable, but it's a kludge. It's a very awkward band-aid and, as has been mentioned in a couple of different ways, it's a non-trivial amount of work for each registrar to go and build something that does that.

Now, the question of an API has come up right from the beginning and over and over again. If you provide an API, then each registrar would nonetheless still have to build an interface to and integrate it into their system. But in doing so, it would make it much smoother and the way it should be, in a way.

All that said, we have a couple of interesting worked examples. I'm going to mention conversations I had with two people who were on this call. Gabe has shared (and I hope I'm not doing you any harm, Gabe) that in his group (not the PSWG, but in the organization he works for), a very substantial number of requests for registration data take place outside of the RDRS and use existing tools that they have and have existed. And so it raises the

---

question, at least in my mind, of what constitutes success if a primary and an obvious requester organization is going around it or ignoring it or not using it at all? And we're talking about not a little bit, but a whole lot, like order of magnitude or more, not going through. That means that RDRS is close to being a rounding error for them.

Separately, I had a conversation with Sarah, asking about the relationship between requests that come in through RDRS versus the system that they've had in operation for quite some time. Then I got roughly a related response of "It's extra work to use RDRS." And Sarah, I hope you correct whatever I'm misstating. I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but it's that you have a system that's up and running, and running these two systems is extra work as opposed to helping at all.

So I've tossed out bait, if you will, for people to respond to. Gabe has his hand up.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Steve. I'll turn it over to Gabe. Oh, and Gabe, before we start, I'll remind people that we've got about three minutes left, and we do have two AOB items. So go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Copy that. So very swiftly, my agency I think had about 35,000 regular WHOIS requests for three of the WHOIS open source tools

---

I was able to think of to ask them to check for over a 90-day period. I mentioned that in Istanbul. It's orders of magnitude more. And this just goes back to why I keep harping on why it's so important to raise awareness through the use of these data returns, through these publicly available tools to point to RDRS. And I won't belabor that point further, but, yes, Steve's comments are accurate in that regard.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Gabe. Okay, so I'm going to cut this off and move it over to our two AOB items. The first is to get a debrief on the RCMP presentation by Sarah. So, Sarah, if you can come back on, that'd be great.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. So Lisa and I shared a presentation to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. They showed up digitally, not on horseback. There was about 45 people there. And I went through just registration data start to finish. What is it? What are registrars required to collect? How do we do verification and validation? What happens when a domain gets renewed a little bit? And then what about disclosures, public registration data, the ability to publish rather than masking it, and requests made directly to registrars? And then Lisa spoke about the RDRS system itself, shared a walkthrough of how the platform works, what a request looks like, what the response looks like. And the I don't know if we

---

got to the template process or if we ran out of time, but we definitely touched on the templates.

So they did not have a lot of questions, but we did hear positive feedback from the RCMP leadership afterwards, saying that it was useful information. Happy to share anything else? Thanks for that reminder, Lisa, that we ran out of time on the templates. Any questions? Super-duper. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay, Sarah, thanks for that update. And Gabe, you asked for one AOB item, so over to you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah. Lisa's comments actually tickled this out of my memory. I learned in Istanbul that one of the largest of the registrars that's participating in the RDRS experiment has changed their stance in a very productive way. I want to really express gratitude and pleasure at what I've learned here: that they are now responding to RDRS requests on behalf of their affiliated proxy service. And that change happened sometime at an unknown date to me, fairly recently, but I don't know exactly when.

And it occurred to me that that would be really helpful when I'm going through the process of creating those metric charts, the Sankey diagrams (I don't know when that change happened, nor do I actually know if it's just GoDaddy that has made this decision)

---

as we look at these metrics to know which of the participating registrars are choosing to disclose on behalf of their affiliated proxy services versus which aren't. And I note that maybe we can't compel them to say that, but at minimum it might be really enlightening to ask. And I wanted to float that because I think it very much is changing the final disposition of the outcomes in that Sankey key. But I don't know where those changes occurred in the timeline. And it's now a very interesting question that is unresolved.

LISA CARTER:

I just wanted to comment. I think there may be some hesitancy in sharing that. A registrar deciding to do it on their own is one thing, but I think that whole influence thing is causing some people to see that they're getting pushback when they suggest that they're doing it. So I don't know. And Sarah, I know, put a comment in the chat as well about that being out of scope. But at least from what I've heard, there's a little bit of discomfort for some in disclosing.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Okay. And I do see Sarah's question. I concur that the RDRS pilot is not about privacy and proxy disclosure, but there's also nothing about the RDRS that says one way or the other whether a registrar should or shouldn't disclose on behalf of their affiliates. But it very much does impact the metrics at the end that we're

---

collecting in terms of the final disposition. And noting why those metrics are shifting would seem, at bare minimum, to be useful so that we aren't deriving false lessons from data shifts. So that's why I'm asking. No other ulterior motive other than to better understand what the actual landscape here is.

But I think I've made my point, so I'm going to pause. If this is too politically sensitive, that's not my call to make. I just think it would be very nice to know, personally.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Okay. Thank you for that update. And I think that possibly it is such a large data point that we do need to talk about it some in the future, but we'll leave it at that.

I think we are officially two minutes over. I apologize to everybody for that. I will say thank you so much. And I think we conclude this meeting and remind people to get their information into the workbook by this Friday. And thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**