
JULIE BISLAND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 4th of November 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Steve Crocker. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. All right. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view 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. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording. All chat sessions are being archived. And as a reminder, participation in ICANN, including the session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. And with that, over to you, Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Julie. Good evening, afternoon, morning to everybody. This session, I would like to spend some time on the item three, the session planning. But we have a number of other things that we need to go through, and including the Europol session brief that we asked Gabriel to present last time and didn't have time for. But first and foremost, I will ask Feodora, if she's there, maybe to go through the action items.

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.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. Thank you, Sebastien. We have a few pending action items or reminders. We had one that has just completed, that ICANN Org will follow up with the law enforcement agency list for RDRS. Lisa provided an e-mail a couple days ago on this, so this is now completed, but just a reminder for you. And there is the pending letter to the GNSO Council, and I know you will discuss this or edit this further. Then the continuous action items for the final report, SC members are kindly asked to provide their input. I thank Sarah and the Registrars that they already did so, as they said, and also the outreach tracker to populate if you present the RDRS to any audience. One pending one was for the chair also to ask the GNSO Council about the follow-up policy process after The RDRS pilot phase ends, but I guess it will also happen during ICANN81.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We will discuss. Thanks.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yeah. So I hand back over to you. Anything else?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Feodora. Any questions on this from anybody? I see no hands. So maybe we can go back to the agenda just for a second because I forgot to ask if anybody had any AOB before launching into the meeting. I guess not either. Gabriel, if you're ready, we're only about your possession.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

I'm happy to, Sebastien. This won't take long, so we'll save you all some time here. But just as a quick recap the other week, so week and a half ago now, I was at a European cybercrime conference session at Europol headquarters in The Hague. There was a training session for law enforcement practitioners that led into this cybercrime conference. We had as well Dimitris. I'm going to butcher the pronunciation of his last name because it's Greek, but I would say Zacharias. I think it's softer than that. But we had ICANN staff giving an overview of the RDRS for the assemblage of law enforcement practitioners there, after which I took over the helm and I just threw open the tool itself and logged in and did a walkthrough of a data request. Helpfully, ICANN Org has created the rdrs.test domain for folks to use for circumstances like this. So, again, my gratitude for having stood that up because it makes it a lot easier to show the tool in real time in practice. So we did that. We walked through the request and showed, I shall say, how I would fill out the form as a practitioner, noting that perhaps others might have different circumstances, and called out the importance of not highlighting something as being urgent if it's not urgent and so forth, to really make sure that we're providing information that will help get a positive return on that test. At the conclusion of this, I asked. There was a room of, let's say, 20 something odd law enforcement agencies there. I asked how many had been aware of the RDRS before this training was provided, and there was one hand in the room. So out of about 21 agencies or persons had been aware, and I asked if they'd used it, and yes. And so my immediate question was—okay, I know this is anecdotal at this point with one respondent, but I asked, "Was it successful? What were your feelings and what was the impression that you got from it?" And the response was, "No, it wasn't successful." And the information

returned in this case said that the information he was requesting was already public. Now, those of us on this call, we know what that means, but to him, it wasn't immediately apparent why that was a response and so forth. Just to not belabor the point, we understand that means there's a proxy in place, probably the affiliated proxy of the registrar in question that the registrar chose to not divulge information about their affiliate proxy customer, and rather point it to the proxy service instead. I just note this because this has been and should be considered too in the future, continue to be a pain point for requesters because there's not very good understanding as to why a registrar would participate while simultaneously operating proxy services. That's something I have to explain every time that we have these engagements. So just calling that out because it continues to be an issue that I'm explaining. All right. That is the end of the recap.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Thank you very much. I see Marc Anderson with a question.

MARC ANDERSON:

I have two questions. But I suspect Sarah might actually be asking one of mine. So I'm going to ask one, and I may get back in the queue later. My first question is about the test domain. I remember the request for a test domain that we could use for demonstration and testing purposes, but I didn't know that we actually had one and that was available. I would love more information about that. I would like to be able to use that myself to demonstrate for people. I see rdrs.test was recently implemented. Okay. That's great. I see Lisa has raised her hand. If you

have more information, you could share on that. That would be very helpful and appreciated. So thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Maybe you want to answer to that, Lisa, now if Sarah is okay to wait.

LISA CARTER: Sure. If that's okay, Sarah, I'll go really quickly. The test domain actually was created at the request of Gabriel and team in regards to the front end solution they're working on. So I believe that's item seven of the workbook on the Requesters tab. They asked for a test domain, and they asked for someone at ICANN to have as a contact while they work on a potential front end solution that could integrate RDRS for law enforcement. So we created it for that. But obviously, now that it's available, it's rdrs.dot test. It can be used for demonstrations of how the tool is used. It will not be tracked in the metrics. It will not send anything to registrars and it so it's definitely available for everyone who would like to pound on the system a little bit or demo it for someone.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Sarah, you had a question or comment?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yes. I have a couple of comments. First off, I will verbalize a couple of things that I put into the Zoom chat. So to what Gabriel shared, two thoughts. Thought number one, my goodness, I'm very surprised that law enforcement did not know what that response

meant. Info already public. It's so interesting to me that seems very straightforward. It's right there in the name, but I guess it's not. So it's really helpful to understand what is missing or what is not always evident. And this really does show the need for educational materials and outreach. So it's good that we're doing that. I do note also, with regards to that person's response, I think we shouldn't make assumptions. And it is possible that it was a domain with a proxy service on it, or a privacy service, but it's also possible that it really was real registrant data and the requester either did not recognize that or had not previously done a WHOIS look up, which we're seeing a lot. So I just wonder if Gabriel got that information, and if not, caution against making assumptions. That's thought number one.

Thought number two was about the test domain. I would like to just understand if that test domain, if lookups on it appear in our metrics or are not counted towards our metrics, and apologies if Lisa said that just a minute ago and I missed it but I didn't hear it. So thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, do you want to answer to that?

LISA CARTER: Sorry. Can you repeat the question? I was actually typing.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The question is—the tests, are they in the metrics or are they out of the metrics?

LISA CARTER: Yes. As I mentioned, they're not in the metrics. It does not go to a registrar and does not get counted in what we publish at the metrics reporting. Sorry.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Marc, who went back in the queue because his question wasn't asked.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. Sarah got to it as expected. But I do. I have a different question. First, thank you, Gabriel, for the recap. I think this is great information and great for us to get read-outs on outreach like this. So thank you for that.

To your comment on privacy/proxy, I think it's super important that that be captured in some form. We have the spreadsheet for tracking that. I don't know exactly what form, exactly how to capture that. I don't know what words I would use, but I just want to encourage you to put that into the spreadsheet, because I think that's an important factor that we as a group are going to have to take into account when we're providing our write-up at the end of this pilot period. That point about privacy/proxy, I think we've heard that really, since the start of this pilot, it's a theme that keeps coming up, and I do think it's important. So I want to encourage you to make sure that's captured in the spreadsheet in some form. That was what I got back in the queue for. So thank you for that and thank you again for the read-out.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Well, thank you for the comments there, Marc, and for the question, Sarah. I just wanted to, I guess, respond to the other question that Sarah had, apart from the RDRS test domain, the other question with regards to what the person was describing. So this officer, as I understood him to be telling me, he was hoping for information about the person that caused the domain to be registered, the person who actually went out to register at first, what we in law enforcement circles we still tend to use the word registrant to indicate that, which differs somewhat from the way that registrant is sometimes used in ICANN circles now, including in this committee, where you're talking about the information that exists in the field of registrant. There's sort of a split there between how those words are being used. The officer described to me that he was hoping to get information about the person who actually was causing that registration to occur, and instead, he got information that he knew was already public, that pertained to some intermediary entity, which I interpret as a proxy. But if you would like, I could always try to go back and reach out and get the actual name of the proxy to refer, but I tend not to want to name registrars nor services nor commercial entities and discussions because I'm not trying to throw them out at any one particular such organization. End.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a small note. For those who are not in the privacy/proxy IRT, there's a big discussion going on there on the definition of privacy proxy and making sure the definition matches the reality of the world we're living in today. The definition that's in the privacy/proxy report, for proxy it says that the proxy organization registers the domain, which it does, and licenses it back to the original requester, what we sometimes call the beneficial registrant, that doesn't map to how the world really works today, and it certainly doesn't map to how it's thought of by law enforcement or any other users. So the definitions of these terms, I think, is something that all of us are going to have to work on and make sure that the terms we use actually have meaning in the real world. Unfortunately, we're far from there right now. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Alan. Let's look at it again maybe from the requester's perspective how it looks. I think that indeed, you say yourself, the person knew what was public and possibly we could have better answer before they even started that what was in the end, what they were going to get. I still see your hand up, but I assume that it's a prior hand.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Oops. Sorry, prior hand. Taking it down.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. All good. All good. If that is all on this and I see no further hands, I might call, if we have time, Sarah. I understand that you did a

presentation to the Canadian Mounted, maybe as an AOB, if you can give us a short on that one too. I don't want to put you on the spot, so if it's not ready, it's not ready. But that could be interesting. And I think that Lisa wanted to talk about the interviews that she's been preparing for ICANN, if we can give her a minute as an AOB. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Sorry. Did you want me to talk about that now or later?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I said it's an AOB. But if you're ready now, now, go, go.

SARAH WYLD: I'm also happy to be ready later, whatever you prefer.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good, good, go.

SARAH WYLD: Go. Okay. We are speaking with members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. And if I'm very lucky, they will be wearing their beautiful red jackets. We're going to talk about registration data overall, start to finish. So like, what data do registrars collect? Where do registrars put that data? Do we send it to the registry? Do we escrow it? And then, what are the requirements around keeping the data up to date, whether the domain owner's rights and responsibilities? And then

what happens if somebody wants to access the data? So we will talk about what's available in the public RDDS, differences between a privacy, a proxy, sort of general masking for GDPR reasons versus real public data. Then I will talk a bit about registrar specific processes for disclosure requests and the publication that the Registrar Stakeholder Group put out a few years ago about minimum required information for disclosure requests. And then Lisa will share about RDRS and how it works, I think, a walkthrough of the platform, and then expectations for what information can be requested through that platform.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That was brilliant.

SARAH WYLD: Looking forward to that, and that is happening tomorrow.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And if indeed they're wearing their red, then we want pictures.

SARAH WYLD: If I can get some, I will.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So then we get to topic number three, which is the ICANN81 session planning, because we've talked about it many times, but we haven't really pinned down what we wanted to talk about. So here are a few topics. Sorry, I'm trying to tabulate because I had a few notes also.

But essentially, what are we going to talk about? What are we going to talk about at ICANN? There's always in these sessions. So I'm talking about the one session that we have ourselves. There's always in these sessions a bit of time to give a recap to the public, but it still gives us 45 minutes, half an hour, to discuss what we want to discuss now. One of the ideas was to start discussing the points that have been gathered to go forward the elements of our future report. Sorry, guys. It's a bit late. It's just 7:00 here, but my brain has gone too much. But I'm open to anything else, and obviously the points that are here in the slide. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON:

When we have these public sessions at ICANN meetings, I am typically a proponent of taking the opportunity to provide an update to the broader ICANN community. I think that's an important function of the public ICANN meetings. That said, I feel like in this case, we already did that as part of the Prep Week session. I attended that last week. Lisa, you, John, Reg, Gabe, I thought you all did an excellent job. I thought your Prep Week session last week was excellent. You gave a really good overview of RDRS, the history, what we've done, and what we have left to do. Based on that, based on the fact that we had that very good Prep Week session, my inclination is for us to focus less on providing an update to the community and make this more of a working group session. Take advantage of being face to face. Give us an opportunity to roll off our sleeves and get some work done. I know, Sebastien, you've talked about starting to look towards our report, our recommendations, on what to do post pilot, and I like to voice my support for that. I'd like to see us start having that conversation. I know we've had some questions and some thoughts, some initial conversation about that

during meetings and on the list. I think we should take advantage of this face-to-face meeting to get the ball rolling on that. So just my two cents, but hopefully that's helpful in helping us move forward.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That sounds brilliant. I'm perfectly happy with it. I think that there will be an expectation in the room, but it might be just a slide with a link to the Prep Week session, and inviting people to go and check that. And possibly also maybe in the agenda, to have the Prep Week recording link. I don't know how that works, but obviously people are not going to take notes off a slide on the screen. Or maybe we'll put it on the chat or something like that. But that sounds good. Then we can have that closed in a minute or two, and then move on to some work. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I strongly support what Marc said, especially in light of the last week's Board consultation on what should we do with RDRS, and how are we going to know how to proceed, and the fact that this group hasn't really talked about it and ultimately we have to. So I think doing that in public actually is a good use of the face-to-face time. And by the way, I will not be in Istanbul, but for the most of you, the face-to-face time, and in fact doing it in front of the public may well help generate other input into the process. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. That sounds like a plan. Do we want to discuss a bit? No, I don't want to preempt the discussion. I want to be a bit careful in those public ICANN meetings but there's no reason. There's nothing that we need to hide, and these recordings anyway are public, so we should go with it. Now, I understand that the Registrars indeed have shared their first input or are about to. I'm sorry I was on leave last week, actually, coincidentally, in Istanbul. I'm back here in Germany to fly back to Istanbul later this week. So I haven't checked the tracker. But do we also have input from other parties? Are people starting to react like, "Have you checked?" I would love for it not to be a just a session, just responding to what the registrar—I think that we should look at it obviously, and if it's a good guideline, we'll use that. But I wanted to make sure that everybody else is prepared to and that we're not discovering that altogether. So yeah, it looks like there was a lot of work there. Sarah took full credit for it, but I know that the Registrars worked on it. But under Sarah's guidance, so credits all due.

So this is going to be a very short meeting, if we've concluded already what everything that we're going to do in our session. The session is on Thursday, if I remember well. I can't remember exactly.

FEODORA HAMZA: It's on the 12th of November.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: 12th of November? That might be Wednesday or Thursday. Anyway, we'll find out. Any other proposition there? Well, that sounds like a

plan. Okay. Well, fantastic. We're half an hour down, and we've done most of the agenda, fantastic.

Next point was on the metrics. I think, Lisa, you might want to walk us through this.

LISA CARTER:

Sure. I actually wasn't planning to walk through the metrics, but I wanted to see if there was any additional feedback on the metrics that got posted. For September, I did note that approvals have gone up a slight amount. I think back in June, it was at 20%, and it seems to be leveling out at about 22% approval rate right now. Everything else to me looked pretty similar in terms of where we're going and how many new users, etc. I didn't know if anyone else had any commentary on that, but I wanted to open up any discussion you guys might want to have around the metrics before we go into showing you what the mock-up for Metric 19 looks like.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I see no hands. It was a few weeks back now. I'll give you a second to... Okay, no hands. Well then, maybe you want to show us, Lisa, that Metric 19.

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Feodora, if you could share the document that I sent. This document has both 18 and 19 just for refresher. This first document, and I wasn't here, I think I was on vacation when you guys saw maybe a view of the mock last time, but this was what the mock would look like

within the report itself. It's quite large. I think we would present it in landscape mode within the Metric report.

Did I just lose you guys? What happened?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no, no, you're here.

LISA CARTER: Something happened to my computer. This is the base of the Metrics report itself. There were CSVs. Then scroll down and down and down, Feodora, to Metric 18. This is just for the purpose of the mock so there's no announcement done yet to how it would look. Keep going. That's 19. Right. Slip a little bit to the top of 19. Okay. This is the report for 19 that you guys hadn't seen. I don't think we had a mock available then. The data for this one start tracking as of October. This shows the number of disclosure requests by processing jurisdiction and request categories. On the left, you have all the jurisdictions, and then across the top, you have all of the request categories, and then all the numbers for each of those is indicated within the cells below. That's what this metric would look like, and I wanted to see if you guys had any feedback on this one. Farzaneh says it looks great.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: One quick question. Two questions. First of all, if you pan out, did I see that the previous mock-up was with the two letter codes rather than the countries?

LISA CARTER: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Is there a reason why the previous is two letter codes, and can we align them?

LISA CARTER: We can take that back. I don't know if Simon's on the call. If you want to speak to the distinction between the country codes in 18 and the full spell out in 19. But that's something we can definitely take back. Taiwan is—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I suppose it's because of the way the drop-downs are organized, but to make it coherent, it would be probably better. Just to double, triple-check, we will also have that in some CSV format that we can play with.

LISA CARTER: Yes. 19 will be in CSV as well. Taiwan is in the country code list, Farzaneh, and also in the jurisdiction list.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. That sounds fantastic. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Any other questions? Then the only other thing I wanted to just mention and we've talked about it before, but whether or not sort of you guys are in agreement that this is our final metrics change, wanted to just talk about that and see if we can pin down that these will be the metrics going forward into year two.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: This was raised within roughly the first six months, maybe the seventh month. We haven't found anything else since. I think that we can draw a line and that would be reasonable. It doesn't mean that in the future, a final product of this won't have more, but for now, I think that we can stop chasing that and start building data.

LISA CARTER: Okay. Any future ones—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: In my authority as chair, I hope that the rest of the group agrees. But I see Marc's hand. Obviously, I'm not choosing on my own.

MARC ANDERSON: Slightly different. This isn't specifically on whether we're going to freeze it or not. I'll just say to at least this point, I think we should have a really good reason if we're asking ICANN Org to change the metrics again for all the reasons we've previously discussed. But that said, I raised my hand, I wanted to ask on the last call, we talked about the fact that the data being presented in Metric 18 and 19 is unverified. It's a self-

reported data and that we would have some kind of caveat calling that out or disclaimer making that point. I didn't see that in the mock up. I'm sorry if I missed it. I'm wondering if that's been taken into account and if that's something we can see or is available yet.

LISA CARTER:

Hi, Marc. Yes. I did not put the language in the mock here because everything has to go through review processes, etc. The language may not be final. We have to get all the input and feedback. We can share it once it is final, but there definitely is disclaimer language to indicate that ICANN has no way to verify what the requester indicates. When they say they're law enforcement, we have no way to verify that, etc. So we will have language on both of that disclaimer language on both metrics within the report itself.

MARC ANDERSON:

Okay. Thank you. I just maybe ask if you could share it on the list as soon as it is available.

LISA CARTER:

Absolutely.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I'm not sure who's showing the stats. Feodora, I guess. Are you trying to show us something in particular?

FEODORA HAMZA: Sorry, I tried to show the wording we just discussed, but I can go back to the stuff.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, it's all right. Then I should—

LISA CARTER: The wording is not included in what we'd shared yet because not approved. But we will share that wording once it is approved.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Approved, you mean on the ICANN's side? Legal?

LISA CARTER: Yes, on the ICANN's side. Right. We can share.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The Standing Committee will then decide if it's all good. Can we have then the agenda back? I'm sorry. Unless there are further questions, but I see no hands. On the agenda, remind them maybe, we were going to talk about the enhancement updates.

LISA CARTER: Yes. That's me again.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's you again. Go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Okay. We have a few to talk about. The first one was going to be the test domain, which we ended up talking about earlier due to Marc's question. The test domain rdrs.test was created at the request of Gabe and team. That was item seven on the Requester tab of the workbook. It can be used, as I mentioned, for demos. You guys can go and look at the system in a little more detail without affecting stats and without request being sent to registrar. I encourage that for more familiarity.

The second thing was for Registrar Item 18, which was the request to actually take the registrar back to the pending list of requests to review once they close a request, sort of a user experience improvement, that was actually released last week. That's live now and that should be seen by all registrars using the NSp system to process requests.

Then number three, Requester Item 7. Again, that was Gabe and team asking for RDRS schema and test domain. We got that done. And he has that.

The fourth one was what Feodora started to share before. That's a screenshot. I don't know if you want to share that now, Feodora. But of the submission completion page in the RDRS interface, we added some language to that page to solicit feedback directly to ICANN. It's under the gray box, to solicit feedback to ICANN for RDRS. So there's an e-mail there. Anyone can e-mail us to say, "Hey, we'd like to give you direct feedback." That's in addition to the survey. That lives on the page now going forward. Something similar will be added to the Registrar

interface as well. That's going to be in a later spread, however, because there's other things ahead of it. But we'll have that same option on the registrar side going forward.

Then lastly, I just wanted to give an update on the timing of item two for registrars that Sarah requested, which was the ability to recategorize requests if they are submitted incorrectly. I was told that work on that request will begin after ICANN81. However, it's going to take about three sprints to complete. The team working on that is the same team working on next round so they have a lot of things to get through. Because of that, this particular request likely won't be done until January. I just wanted to put that out there for everyone so you have a sense of timing.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: While you're talking about that, there was a question from Farzaneh about the Metric 18, 19. When can we expect those in the reports?

LISA CARTER: Those will actually be in the next report that gets published around the 15th of November.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Any other questions on enhancement topics?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sarah's asking if we're talking about two weeks or three weeks sprints. That's fine.

LISA CARTER: Typically, the sprints are a couple of weeks. It'll take three of them and we'll be in the new year by then.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: She was trying to calculate. January was the information she was looking for. Okay, good. Fantastic. Any other questions on this? I see Gabriel's hand. Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi. This is a question for Lisa. I'm trying to think of a way to ask this very softly. I do not want this to be perceived as any sort of attack. Purely just as clarifying from my understanding of how well you folks are being resourced for the RDRS improvements versus other tasks. Noting that you mentioned that you have additional responsibilities pertaining to the next round of gTLDs. I just want to make sure I'm not mishearing. Is it fair to say then that there's work that the folks that are responsible for taking these RDRS improvements, like there's additional work you have to do above and beyond that and you have to devote some attention to one category of work and some to the other and we should just have those reasonable expectations then that is the case? That's fair, right?

LISA CARTER: Yes. The resources are shared, basically.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Copy that. It just occurs to me that as a group, as we're drafting our report, this might be one of the things that we have to give some amount of consideration to in terms of the total volume of feedback that was provided at the earlier half of the RDRS pilot and the amount of work that was actually practically able to be done just as a practical matter. I think this might be one of those things that might play into some feedback. I just wanted to highlight that now, because while I very much appreciate the work that has been done to address some of the feedback received, I note that we had to do a fair amount of prioritizing and that not all of that feedback is likely to be incorporated within the two-year pilot is what I'm seeing as our current track rate. If I'm wrong about that, maybe that's just me making a bad estimate of scale and pace of this work. But I just wanted to call that out as something that might be one of those topics we have to address in our final issue at the end. I.e., asking for more resources is the short of it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Maybe it's something we need to look at again face to face, it might be easier. But I'm a bit puzzled as to what other amount of stuff needs to be done that will take another year? We've itemized all the things that we wanted to have done and I thought that we were getting close to it.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: What percentage are we done at right now if it is itemized? I've lost track. I haven't visited that itemization sheet in a little while. Maybe this is just me failing to keep up with it. If this is not something we can easily answer, maybe it's something we can carry on list.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It's all in that spreadsheet. I don't know if it's easy to answer just like that but I thought that we had gone down most of the items. As you remember, there was a number of items that never found any home, any host, any owner.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Fair. I guess if we rank by status, how many are pending versus complete? There's the column L. And maybe this is just a misunderstanding on my part, but I had been under the impression that there was still a sizable number that were marked as pending and that weren't necessarily on track to be resolved by the end of the pilot. But maybe I'm wrong about that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, maybe something to look at. Sadly enough, this sheet is fantastic on my screen, but once in Zoom, it's completely compressed. Lisa, I see your hand up. I'm sorry, Sarah, for skipping you again. But do you want to answer that?

LISA CARTER:

I don't have the full answer, but I will note that I think there are still some items in the requester sheet that don't necessarily have agreement from the Standing Committee or agreement to move forward yet. I think you had one still. I can't remember off the top of my head, it might be item 10. There might be some things that the Standing Committee still needs to go through to get agreement to prioritize for enhancements and, in general, just recommend maybe a once over to confirm by the Standing Committee that there's nothing else that they want to put in the queue after these are completed. But definitely deserves another once over, I think.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Well, fair enough. We'll need to shut your data. Again, maybe something that can be done more easily face to face. I'm starting to pile up things to be done there. Because yes, indeed, the sheet is fantastic again, of course. But in Zoom because of the way Zoom zooms, it's not always easy to read. Gabriel, your hand is still up but I assume that you're done. I'll pass on the mic to Sarah. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. A couple of thoughts. About the number of open tasks remaining here, I do note that the Registrar tab shows four things still open. That's because everything else is hidden because of the filters. I cannot remove the filter so I cannot check to see what is filtered out. I would assume that it's filtered to remove anything completed. There we go. We're not seeing canceled. That makes sense. Now that they're not filtered—yeah. Probably, if we only had four tasks

remaining, that's pretty great. But some of them I think didn't show a status so then they disappeared even when they shouldn't have. That's one thought.

Next thought. Sorry. With regards to the track, somebody could do more work to figure out how many things are open and what status they're in and create a report. I'm just not sure if that's really necessary because we've identified which things are the top things to work on and ICANN is working on them. So that's great. That's one. Thought number two. Gabe makes a good point. It is not about judging, right? Everybody has resources issues to deal with. Everybody has a limited amount of developer people that are going to work on the platform. It's not about judging whether that's good or bad. It's about documenting and understanding the reality that we are all working within. It doesn't necessarily mean that it's the wrong amount of resources or the wrong level of priority as compared to, for example, the new gTLD programs. I mean, maybe it does, but not necessarily, right? But what we've learned is that there's a limit to how much work the ICANN Development Team can do in a given period. And that is a factor that would affect use of the RDRS. Because requesters and registrars have all requested changes that are either in progress or not yet made. Maybe if all of those changes are done, then more people would use it or maybe not. But we don't know that. I don't really think that the requested changes are of that big a difference to completely change uptake of the platform. But I do think it is appropriate to note in our report that it was a factor. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Great point, Sarah. If you remember early days when we weren't talking about the RDRS but we're talking about the full SSAD, there was also very strong questions as to should it be an ICANN developed tool or should we go out and put this to tender and find an external provider to develop it. I guess that's also part of the recommendation that we'll need to put this into consideration. Good point. I know that the Board or at least several members of the Board that I spoke to about it at that point were concerned about it and were keen on looking at that thoroughly. With this, I see no further hand up. Mental note to add that to the list of things to talk about for the recommendation. Good point.

Back on the agenda, I think that we reached AOB. From memory, Lisa, you wanted to talk to us about your great work on the interviews.

LISA CARTER:

Yes. Thanks, Seb. I just wanted to give another shameless plug for seeking the Standing Committee's assistance and spreading the word that there will be interviews being done at ICANN81, and/or if you're not at in Istanbul directly, you can have people sign up to do interviews remotely via Zoom. Currently, we did send out e-mails to invite registrars currently participating in RDRS to provide their feedback. I have two requests so far. I also did an interview with GoDaddy last week. That was my first one. We had three potential for registrars and then we have two potential currently for a requester. Just seeking more assistance and getting the word out and hopefully getting a few more signups to get more feedback directly if that's possible. How was it?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That was good. That was good. Any questions on that? Anybody wanting to volunteer? Anybody to volunteer somebody else? Sorry if I missed this, but is there a list of the people that are going to be interviewed that we can look at if somebody sees a gap that needs to be passed?

LISA CARTER: I can tell you who signed up for interviews because the list is very short right now. Tucows, Namecheap signed up. We obviously did one with your company, Sebastien, GoDaddy. Then Gabe signed up. And I'm forgetting his name now. It's French. But he just signed up today. Two on the requester side, one of whom is Gabe.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. The French individual is also requesting?

LISA CARTER: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you know people that want to talk, people that want to share, maybe it's a good time to invite them and if you're one of those, please line up. Paul McGrady, I see you hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Just a note to say that the non-ICANN insider requesters will be at the INTA annual meeting, or our leadership meeting, not at ICANN's

meeting, which is somehow scheduled at exactly the same time, even though both organizations are very well aware of each other. So that's always confusing to me. I mean, it's fine that we're doing inreach on this issue to requesters, no problem with that, the more the merrier, but I think when it comes time to do outreach, we probably should do it outside. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Would you be able to suggest somebody on that side to liaise with to try to pass on the word?

PAUL MCGRADY: Right now, the current IPC president is Lori Schulman, who's an INTA senior staffer. But there are all kinds of people within the IPC that participate within INTA. It wouldn't be hard to make a connection. I think ICANN has its own direct connections to INTA after 20 years of being in each other's orbit, but happy to help make connections if ICANN staffers don't have those yet.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: That would be helpful.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: First, we'll reach out to Lori. Then Lisa, if you can check within staff who is the liaison with the INTA, that would be fantastic. With this, Paul's hand is still up, but I assumed that it's a previous one. I think that we've gone through the agenda. Any other other business? Any open question? I don't know if you can do a show of hands. But I'm guessing, Alan, you said that you wouldn't be there. But I'm guessing that the majority of you will be there in Istanbul joining us. I see Farzaneh's hand. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I'm sorry. I'm late to the game. Do we actually have our session during Istanbul?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, on the 12th.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay. It seems like you've discussed this on agenda number—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes. I didn't know that by heart, but somebody mentioned it on the 12th.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay, great. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Last call. I think I will have in the end made it the whole hour or we will have that. Well, if that's it, see you guys soon and safe travels. See you in Turkey.

LISA CARTER: Bye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]