
JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 7th of October 2024.

We did not receive any apologies for today's call. 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. All right. If assistance is needed updating your SOI, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

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, and please note 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. Thank you. Over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie. I still see a few people attending that might want to come in. If you haven't received your prompt yet, it's coming. And if you have, please click it.

So this is the agenda we prepared for this time. I have seen the e-mails in the last few hours regarding metric 18. I'd like to keep ample time to have the discussion, but we have a whole hour to go through

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.

everything, so we should be good. Does anybody have anything to add to this agenda? Any AOB that we didn't think of? I'll give you about two seconds. No? Okay, good. Let's go with this.

So item number two on our agenda is the action item follow-up, as you remember, Feodora added for us a tab to our new Impressions document, which is no longer called the Impressions document, but right now I can't remember what it's called. Somebody will help me. We should go through what needs to be completed then keep ourselves honest. Who wants to drive us through that?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Hi, Seb. I can do it quickly. So it's called the Workbook now, not the Impressions document anymore. Last session, I was not there, but my colleague Caitlin told me that there were no relevant AIs. So the ones remaining are from the sessions before and which are a continuous one, so the ones to complete the outreach tracker, so events, meetings, webinars, and so on, and also the feedback—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

We will talk about it in the AOB today anyway.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Good. Yes. The one that seems here not completed, but is in progress are now the surveys with RDRS UI and the users, and which will take place at ICANN81. Lisa can probably share more on this. I think it's on the agenda. The other three are related to the letter to the GNSO Council.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Which is clearly on me.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay.

FEODORA HAMZA: That should be it for now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So next item on the agenda is indeed to talk about ICANN81 and what is on the planning there. Did you want to take us through that, Lisa?

LISA CARTER: Yeah. Thanks, Seb. The first bullet was actually more to allow the Standing Committee to kind of discuss any planning around the session

that would take place with you guys there. And then the second bullet, I will talk about the user experience interviews.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. As I understand, there will be multiple sessions again on RDRS, a bit like there was in Kigali. There was our session, which always has, because we're in ICANN, a component that is a sort of outreach or reporting to the community component, explaining what we're doing and where we're at. And another one, a session for us to work and do our normal work. Then there will be, if I understand well, as there was previously, at least a session from the CSG. And from the registrars, I think that they're going to have something thematic, but I don't remember that it was going to be on RDRS. I think it's going to be on something else. I think Roger is on the call. If you can confirm either way. But yes, indeed, it would be good to know what you guys want to discuss. I think we should be ready to start kicking the discussion of— it'll be a longer discussion but the discussions on what the outcomes of the Standing Committee will be, if not the full recommendation, but at least to start working on it. There is always—how should I say this correctly? There's always a bit of a difficulty having these discussions in broad public even if our meetings are recorded and everything that we do is available. It's one thing to start this conversation between us and another one, to start them at ICANN. But I have no issue with it as long as we recognize where we're at when we're starting these discussions. But I think I understood from Sarah from previous discussions that at least the registrar part will be ready to share first thoughts. I don't think she's on the call today because of calendar reasons, but maybe, again,

Roger can confirm. Otherwise, I'm open to topics, to ideas, to anything that the group wants to discuss then.

As a quick reminder, before anybody rushes to the mic, remember that there is also a session the week before where we already give some update to the community. And if I remember well, we had the hand raised from the group to also give their thoughts there. Roger, to save me. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. I was just jumping in to confirm that Sarah's got us on track to provide that input prior to ICANN. I didn't see her last schedule, but it'll be coming shortly, and it'll be prior. She's been working us to get to that spot. So I just wanted to confirm.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Confirming also that there's no registrar session like there was in Kigali on RDRS this time, right?

ROGER CARNEY: Correct. Exactly. That is true.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Good. Anyone else? Otherwise, I will prepare a schedule like we do normally. Maybe this time we'll prepare for the next session and we'll share then where the thoughts are for 81, if nobody has any urgent. Again, unless anybody has a major objection, I'd like to start the

discussion, particularly if Roger confirmed that the registrar at least will have their input and we can start working from there. That would be great. Now, Lisa, do you want to talk us through the RDRS user experience interviews?

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Thank you. If you guys will recall, maybe a few meetings back when we're talking about metrics, there was some discussion about the need to do potential in-person interviews. I think Steve delBianco brought that up, and so we took that back and came up with a plan to do RDRS user experience interviews at ICANN81 with the idea that we would sort of promote for requesters and registrars to schedule time, specifically with me, I'll be there, and potentially Feodora may be able to help, depending on her schedule, to just talk about their experiences with RDRS, top five things they think will improve the system, any challenges that they've experienced or what they like about the system. And we'll promote signing up for these interviews through the daily newsletters. I think there's a community digest. And then also on what they call, I think, barker boards, where the digital boards are around the venue. We'll promote it there as well. And there'll be a way to sign up. We'll also have some acrylic stands around registration in multiple places in the venue to promote signing up to do interviews as well. And then I would like to ask for the requesters in the Standing Committee. I can send through some of the language we're going to use in our promotion. If you could share that with any of your colleagues as well, that would be great. The idea being, we're promoting doing interviews in person in Istanbul. But also, if there are people who during that period would like to sign up to do an interview remotely via Zoom, they

can do so as well, and then some of my colleagues back in Los Angeles will conduct those interviews remotely for the people not in attendance in Istanbul. Does that make sense?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see a hand from Steve delBianco. I don't know if you see it, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Yeah. Go ahead. Someone's driving. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey, Lisa. Thank you for mobilizing on that suggestion. A couple of questions. Is it the requester community that's the target? Is there a timeframe you tell them, like a 15 minutes of what to expect? And if you drafted the kind of questions that you'll pose, because I'm sure that we would love to offer some input on what the questions would be. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: The promotion talks—it's for registrars and requesters. We will be sending direct communication to the registrars as contracted parties because we can kind of hit them more directly without having to get permission to send e-mails. So if they're available to meet in Istanbul, we'll do that as well. It describes like a 20-minute meeting. It also kind of just talks about the questions. It's a short list of questions. We don't want to take up too much time. So there's seven questions that we have to start pretty much what I mentioned. What's working for you with

RDRS? What are your challenges with RDRS? What are your top five suggestions for improving RDRS that would be beneficial to everyone? Any feedback you might have in general on RDRS and any sort of specifics that you think would add value to what we understand about the system. That's kind of the gist of the questions. But again, it's a short list to keep it concise and not—

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I would ask you. Can you consider adding one final question, which would be, do you see any legal or regulatory things on the horizon that could impact your interest in using RDRS?

LISA CARTER:

That's a good question.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

You know what I'm thinking of, at least, of course, is transposition of Article 28 of NIS2, which affects a good deal of the folks who are going to be there in Istanbul. And they may say no, not worried about it, or if they give us some indication that ends up being important for our consideration of how long we keep this thing running, right? Do we need to run this for another six months to factor in what RDRS and NIS2 implications are? Or have we learned all we're ever going to learn? Right?

LISA CARTER: Yeah. I think that's a good suggestion for a question. So we can take that back. And then I see Farzaneh is asking something about, do you have access to the interview questions? So we can send those questions. After this meeting, when I send out the language to you guys to help spread the word about setting up the interviews, I can include the questions that we originally had, and we can tack on Steve's question. I don't want it to get too wieldy with the questions because I'd like to keep it conversational as opposed to just hammering people with questions to get through the 20 minutes.

STEVE CROCKER: This is Steve Crocker. I apologize. I'm the one who's in the car. I don't have my hands on the steering wheel but I also don't have a way of raising my hand, at least I can't find it. A quick question here. You obviously have a list of all of the people who are registered to make requests, and I imagine that you have statistics on what requests they've made, why not use that database to build a sample of people to go reach out to directly as opposed to this more indirect process of advertising that you're looking for volunteers?

LISA CARTER: I think there may be some legal implication in that, Steve, in that unlike contracted parties, requesters have not necessarily opted into getting e-mails directly from ICANN to ask things like this, right? So one of the challenges we have there is we need to get consent to send them that type of information.

STEVE CROCKER: So send them a note asking for their consent to send them a note. This is nonsense. Seriously.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, it's a legal implication. I don't know if she's on the call and she wants to speak to that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'd link and can weigh in, obviously. But is there a way—I don't know how to do this and not put ICANN in trouble—but at least identifying of the requesters, those that have signed up for attending ICANN in person, and we send each other invitations for meetings from the attendee list. That's part of the reason why people tick in having their name appearing in the attendee list.

STEVE CROCKER: And further, they don't have to accept the request to be interviewed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Anyway, surely something that you guys can look into and maybe come back to us. It seems like indeed a risk of losing opportunities to meet people who simply would never realize that it's happening.

LISA CARTER: We can take it back to discuss internally.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay.

LISA CARTER: Thanks to the Steves and you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Anything else on this topic? Thomas raised his hand. Go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Just briefly on the last discussion that we had, maybe as food for thought for ICANN Org to tweak the sign-up process for our reporters so that they are given the opportunity to opt in to such communication at the point when they submit a report. Under European laws, it's difficult to do that after the fact, so that's where we would need to become a little more innovative. But since this is a pilot, I think it's perfectly understandable that we're asking for users to maybe subscribe to communication or consent to being contacted to ask about their experience in order to be able to improve the service. But what can be done within the existing framework? I think that would need to be looked at more, but maybe for as a general idea, that's something to add to the to-do list.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Just seconding what I heard from Thomas. But actually, it occurs to me too that we should note this for our qualitative feedback on the process that may be included in our final report, that this is one of those considerations that we're running into, that if we had done something slightly different at the outset, we'd already have these permissions. And so as we draft our final report and have suggestions for what a successor system should look like, this is one of those things it should look like. It should contain the ability to at the very outset of any engagement from any requester to get their permission to send follow-up communication, to improve the system.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Noted. Maybe something we should add to the tracker, to the Workbook it's called. Lisa, I see your head up, and then we'll wrap this and go to the next topic.

LISA CARTER: I just wanted to add one more point. We are going to be offering a more ongoing way to provide feedback directly to ICANN by including a link to schedule an appointment with ICANN after the Submit page in the RDRS system, so it will live there on an ongoing basis, and we can continue to do interviews in an ongoing basis and people can just click that link to set up interviews as well. That's also in the works.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. That's good news. Any further hands on this? I see none. So maybe we can move to item four. I'm sorry my throat is a bit

scratchy tonight. So on item four, Lisa had an update. She shared—I have to look at my e-mail exactly when you shared it—but she shared a few days ago last week, it would be Friday, the fourth exactly, the table below, and there was a few reactions in the last 24 hours over it. Again, this follows the original request from NCSG to be able to have a per country report, particularly on law enforcement requests. There were some discussions in the group and people requested to have this, not just for law enforcement but for but for all types of requesters. And indeed, when I was presented that last week, I thought that we may have missed the original point, but I'd let the members of the committee have the discussion rather than have it for them. Does anybody want to take this? Maybe you, Farzaneh, since you sent an e-mail and explained the original position?

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Yes. Thank you. Hello, everybody. When NCSG requested for the law enforcement agencies' location of request to be reported in the RDRS monthly reports or whatever periodic thing you have, we had in mind transparency of these requests, and we made sure we discussed with Gabriel. We wanted to make this happen in a way that does not put the confidentiality of the law enforcement request at risk but it brings some transparency. I'm glad Gabriel is here. When we discussed it with Gabriel, both on the mailing list and during the meetings, it seemed like that our request was okay to just have the law enforcement number of request and the country or the jurisdiction that it came from.

So that was our initial request, which I was very happy. We celebrated because we did it in such a collegial consensus-based approach and the

group agreed, and then they said that there was no objection. And then somebody, I think it was Steve Crocker, who mentioned that we should also have the data of the location where the request is coming from other requesters, which NCSG agreed it was not specifically NCSG request. We don't care about that. We care about transparency of the law enforcement request.

But then, now we see this metric and the display that ICANN has come up with, as I explained in the e-mail, it defeats that original purpose altogether. We want to know how many requests from law enforcement came from which country. It's a very, very normal practice. Many tech companies do it. We have mentioned it in our request document. RIPE NCC has transparency report that discusses it. Even when there is one request from a law enforcement agency, they report on it. But at the moment, this table and how it has been displayed, it does not really address what we agreed to, essentially. Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks. Go ahead, Odeline. Sorry, go ahead.

ODELINE MACDONALD:

Thanks, Lisa. I think it's fair that I respond instead of you, since I'm probably the reason why we are not displaying all the numbers. We had some mockups of the numbers and we asked our tech team to put that all together in a table. Looking at the numbers, most of them were below number three, like three requests per country. First thing, we went back to our initial statement that we've so far stick to is we're not publishing raw data. The purpose of collecting and publishing the data is

to inform on the SSAD and/or the future of the RDRS. Here we agreed to publish the data there. I think, correct me if I'm wrong, Lisa, it's above five, but because we're only collecting the data from now onwards, some of the requests numbers are really, really low. It's not like we are publishing the data from the day one, which also is corrupting. So it could be that the list is increasing. We're not publishing raw data because we made the statement from the get-go that we are... I mean, I understand this is not a data protection issue. It is not a data protection issue. It's not a privacy data protection issue. It's more confidentiality of the request. We don't want requester to be isolated, to be identified, to be in any way or form taken in isolation. We've made a statement for the get-go. And we thought that providing the aggregated data as it is presented now so everything above five requests is going to be published in the list. So it could be that next month the list will increase, etc., etc., would be sufficient way of disclosing the data and inform the Board and of course the Standing Committee, but also the Board on what to do with the SSAD and/or RDRS. The other point is we were missing a little bit the point of publishing saying, I don't know, Australia 1, and Germany 2, and etc., etc., for the purpose of what we're disclosing the data.

So that's the rational beyond and this is what I think Lisa pointed out in our e-mail at the very bottom. We're not saying we're right 100%. We're following the messaging we've been having from the get-go about what we do with the data. Protective of the data, maybe we are a little bit reserved. We try to encourage usage. We try to make sure that the requests remain confidential, etc. But I see Sebastien and Paul, you have your hands up, so I'm going to stop now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Double question. First of all, this table is for all requesters. Do you have the same mockup where law enforcement would be separated? Because we're not asking—what you're describing for general requesters, I tend to agree. For law enforcement—and we had the discussion with Gabriel too—it's different, it's not individuals. You're right. It's not privacy. These have some duty to transparency. Gabriel, keep me honest here, but I thought that was the discussion.

The other point is when you say, for example, U.S. 374, and I assume that it's all requesters and not law enforcement only. But let's assume that it was law enforcement. Whilst I know that it's not Gabriel that sent us 374 requests. Bottom line, it's, in some way or form, the Department of Justice, the FBI. It's the same entity. For France, it's going to be the police de la gendarmerie. So whilst we're not identifying the individuals, being at 26 or 3 requests or even 1 request, it goes back to the same governmental institution. Again, there's a pyramid. I understand that there's some institutions under it. But all in all, report to the same flag, which is what was of interest to the NCSG, if I understand it well. Thanks.

ODELINE MACDONALD: I don't want to jump in, but if I may.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do. Please do, yeah.

ODELINE MACDONALD: Simon probably will be able to tell you exactly the data points because he has a better view than I do. I see them going through and back again. Our concern is if we could get documented as how is this informing the decision or is it another purpose, which might have been discussed in conversations but hasn't been documented when it reached out to me, basically, for making the assessment, how is this informing the Board, knowing that, again, bringing Australia, Australia put like two requests from law enforcement? How is this informing the Board and/or the Standing Committee? If there is another purpose, happy to have it documented and brought back to us so we can revise the assessment. That's probably the point I'm missing here. But now I can pass it to Paul.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You're muted, Paul, if you're talking.

PAUL MCGRADY: The universe was trying to save you all from my voice, but no luck. I guess I'm just trying to understand why staff is doing a 180 on us on this. It's not confidentiality. There are from last count that I saw in the interwebs around 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States. The way we're set up here, the Department of Justice will not be getting every single request. It could very easily come from a sheriff in wherever county USA. And we're not asking for disclosure of which agency made the request. So there's no confidentiality issues there. It's just an aggregate number per country. If the answer was one request from Country X, if you were the target of that investigation and you happen to know it, then you could connect the dots, but you'd be the

only person that would be able to connect the dots because we're not asking for disclosure of the information of who the request was about. So I don't see confidentiality issues, and I thought that that was already water under the bridge. It sounds like that the basic issue of transparency is being discarded in favor of a new standard of how does this inform the Board about the RDRS and the SSAD? Well, the Board is great. We like the Board. Yay, Board. But the Board is not the final—I should say final, maybe the final—they're not the only party of interest throughout the community that wants to know how the RDRS is functioning, how the SSAD might function, whether or not the RDRS is being abused in some way, whether or not there's gobsmore abuse coming from one particular country that we could find out about through the number of law enforcement requests. So I guess adopting a new standard—and, everybody, I want to just sort of gently say I don't agree with the get-go rhetoric that I'm hearing. I don't think from the beginning, from the get-go, that our standard for knowing things about how the RDRS is functioning has to do with only if it informs the Board. I'd be happy to look back into transcripts if we could find that somewhere, but I don't think we've ever said that. So I'm just trying to figure out where's the new standard coming from? If it's coming directly from ICANN Legal and you guys are getting leaned on, let us know, and we can take that up with ICANN Legal. But otherwise, we'd like our data. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Paul. I think, Odeline, I'll let you answer if you represent ICANN Legal in totality, but Odeline comes from that team to start with.

ODELINE MACDONALD: Thank you. Indeed, I represent ICANN Legal. I'm the legal liaison on the RDRS and part of the Legal Team. I report to Dan. You know Dan very well, I'm sure. I've been working on the RDRS from pretty much my first day at ICANN. So I've listened to you guys, I've participated in all these calls. There is no hidden agenda. It's just probably it's me missing one call. It's me missing one written explanation on what is the purpose of collecting and displaying and disclosing this data, if it's not in an aggregated format. And I'm going to stand by this. We agreed we're not going to disclose raw data. We're only going to disclose aggregated data to avoid any recollection. Maybe you cannot recollect the data, Paul. I 100% agree that I don't have all the scenarios possible in my head on to whether or not the RDRS, the collection of the data and the reports were to inform the Board and the Standing Committee on the usage of the data to decide on the SSAD. Maybe I'm missing a point again, but that's what the RDRS was created for. It's a pilot. I want everybody to remember it's a pilot for two years, which purpose is to facilitate the request of data disclosure of nonpublic registration data from one entity to another, from a requester to the registrar. It's a pilot data system that the Board, also the RDRS—it's not Standing Committee but I forgot the terminology—before agreed on developing. Again, if I could get minimum transparency, a little bit more explained, more displayed, then I would appreciate—Gabe, for example, I see your hand is up—to give me a little bit more information on how is this necessary to do it now after one year in a pilot format. I'm not saying we're not doing ever. I'm just saying please explain all of this to me so I can document it properly, and then we can make sure that we have all of this done

adequately and eventually displayed in the report. Again, not saying we shouldn't do it. Maybe I'm wrong. I'm accepting wrong. I'll accept being proven wrong, I would say, but please document this and we can move ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Gabriel, I'll give you the mic in a second. I just wanted to note, because these things take a long time, this is not after one year. We want this. This has been requested since June, I believe, before I get into it. So it's been a while. Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Hi. I'm not going to be able to answer everything that was asked of me here because I wasn't the originator of the request to publish this, but nor did we object. And speaking in my capacity here as a co-chair of the Public Safety Working Group, I went back to the group and asked if there were any objections, and I heard none voiced to this level of reporting. As I understand it, I believe what my recollection is matches Farzaneh's, but as I understand it, we're talking about by country and we're not talking about by organization. So, U.S., not FBI, for example. Or U.S., not LAPD. Purely for folks' reference, I'm going to paste in chat here, just an example of how other large tech firms do similar reporting that I'm aware of. This one link here is just to Google and I drilled into to U.S. just to show it. But this is something that I think is not atypical of community reporting in the tech sector to report on how many requests from law enforcement you get.

And the last point I'll make before I hang up the mic is I saw Simon put a comment in that there's no clear way to know if the requests are from law enforcement, and that's valid, because we still haven't tackled the problem of identity of the requesters and validating those identities. But as I understand it, the request here was just to report on the self-identified requester categories and you know how many of these requesters are at least identifying as law enforcement and so forth. I think it would be somewhat educational to know just purely by percentages how many of the RDRS requests from law enforcement are coming from which nations. But I think ultimately, we still have the challenge that surrounds law enforcement being largely ignorant of the existence of RDRS still. That's a separate conversation. I'll end there.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I would have liked to hear from Gabe or someone related to law enforcement. Would they have objected if there had been a third column to this table, which said 89, 4, 2, and 1? To give the number of law enforcement requests from those countries. What I heard from ICANN was because the numbers are so small, 2, 3, 4, they didn't really want to present them. But from my point of view, given that we don't say what agency it is and we don't say what the domain is that's been asked for, it doesn't sound like it's harmful to me, but I guess I would like to hear that from law enforcement, whether they think that might be problematic or not.

Just one other thing, and then I'll finish quickly. The other thing that troubled me with this table is it's presenting the three top countries and all others. I would have hoped that there was some threshold under which we group countries together and above which we show them individually. Because grouping all other countries together, if they're not in the top three, doesn't quite sound like it's going to be as revealing as it could or should be. So I would have liked to see some level of threshold to determine whether they're grouped or not. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Alan, I think that—and you can shake your head if I'm getting right—but I think Odeline said that was three. So other countries are basically requests with three or less. Is that right? Was it five? But it was a number like that you mentioned.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understood that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, okay.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Can I quickly...? Sorry. I didn't mean to interject. The question was asked of me, and I just wanted to clarify my prior point. So yes. There was no objection that I've heard from my law enforcement counterparts about doing a by country level number from law enforcement, just to be clear. Even if there's a low count, I don't envision that one's going to be able

to derive much information from a by nation or by economy aggregate count. Again, this is just based off of querying the folks that are in the Public Safety Working Group and hearing no objection thus far. If and when there's ever any contrary opinion, I'll let you guys know. But as of yet, I've heard none.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabriel. I see Marc and Simon. I might call upon you too. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. As I understand it, there's sort of two conversations we have going on here. One is on the metrics 18, whether or not it makes sense or we should be providing information on the number of requests by law enforcement per country. I think that's one conversation we've had, and as I hear the conversation, it sounds like group is in support of that. Gabriel has voiced no concerns about that.

A separate conversation or the second conversation seems to be on why we're not breaking out the requests per country by more than just the top three listed here. And we've heard from Odeline—and I appreciate your explanation—my reaction is similar to Paul's. I'm slightly bothered that the line you're drawing is that you don't feel that that information is directly pertinent to the Board in making decision on the future of SSAD. I agree with Paul. I don't think that that's a line or a distinction we've drawn previously in creating the SSAD pilot. I think we've tried to create a fully functional pilot that provides useful function and information and not focused solely on whether or not

that'll be useful for the Board. If that is your line, frankly, I do think that that's useful information in making a decision about the future of SSAD. I think we all recall the Operational Design Assessment talked about the challenges of the SSAD and how to validate and verify requesters, particularly requesters from law enforcement and requesters from law enforcement across multiple jurisdictions. So I would think that it would be very useful to know what jurisdictions the requesters are coming from. I appreciate that you listed 143 countries so we know the number. But I think it would also be useful to know which countries to get a better feel for the verification challenges that a future SSAD system would be facing.

One last point. I understand that the requester location by country, I think you said you drew the line at five. I think you said anything under five is not shown. Unless I'm confused, that doesn't really math for me. I subtracted the U.S., U.K., and France's numbers from the total and divided by 143, and I got 8.35. So that seems to indicate an average of over eight requests per jurisdiction. So I don't know if I did my math wrong or am confused by the metrics, but it seems to be there's a little bit of a disconnect there. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Marc, and thank you for the math. I didn't even do that division. There was a message from Simon, but I don't know. Can somebody indeed explain a bit what's behind the numbers? Lisa, if you can, or Simon, if you're able to, Odeline. I don't know, but somebody from ICANN.

LISA CARTER: I'm going to hand that to, actually, Simon, to explain the metric itself because that's his area of expertise. Simon, maybe you can chime in a little bit to explain that.

SIMON RAVEH: Sorry, I'm not sure what the question is, what needs to be explained.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We have a number here, 1600 other countries. The point that Marc was trying to make, it looks like there's a number of countries in these 1600 that would qualify at least for the minimum five requests. The average that Marc calculated, the remaining was eight, seven requests per country. And then in general, of these requesters, the topic that we brushed through very quickly, your assessment is that we don't know what is law enforcement or not. But at least in terms of self-reported law enforcement, what are the sorts of numbers that we're seeing?

SIMON RAVEH: On the self-reported, we can based on the request category. We can look at request category law enforcement. If that's the criteria that we want to look at and decide that those are law enforcement, that's something that we can add. As far as the numbers here, I need to go back and look and see. I didn't look at the actual numbers. I can report back on the numbers after I look at them exactly.

LISA CARTER: Just to add to Simon's point a little bit, because we asked for a classification of the category, not the actual requester, some people may be submitting requests and selecting law enforcement with the idea that it's about law enforcement because of what their concern is and why they're asking for the data. So that category in itself does not mean law enforcement made the request.

SIMON RAVEH: Exactly. We already know that the registrars have asked to check the ability to change the category because they see this happening a lot. So we already know that we have missed a categorization of request.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: This is definitely a learning that we need to take on board for the next iteration of this. This will be important. I don't know if it's worth then throwing the whole law enforcement request just because we're not sure of the data, something definitely for the group to put in a response. I have noted at least that Odeline would like to have more details on what we want in writing. We will have to specify that to them in the same.

Alan Greenberg, I see your hand. I just wanted to note that we have 10 minutes on this call. We have a few AOBs. I wanted also to give time to Lisa to give us maybe a bit of an explanation. I see Gabriel's hand up but I never saw it going down. So I don't know if Gabriel—is that a previous hand or is it a new hand? I wanted Lisa also to give us a bit of an explanation of the difference between what we're seeing now and the other, the metric 19, which was about jurisdictions. Thank you, Gabriel.

So, Alan, and then Lisa on metric 19. And then we'll have to wrap this for the AOBs.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll be very quick. In terms of Marc's calculation, he subtracted out the other countries from 1604. 1604 is in fact the other countries only. So that's 140 countries going into that, which averages at about 11 each. So again, the threshold of five is certainly in question.

One other thing is the question of why we should do this. Aside from the fact that it came from a request came from NCSG and no one has objected to it, remember, we do extend to law enforcement or people who claim to be law enforcement. Because, clearly, the law enforcement numbers we have is an upper limit because of potential misidentification. We extend to law enforcement the right to not notify the registrant, if that would otherwise be done by the registrar. And therefore, since we're extending that right to them, it's reasonable to know just how many queries fall under that potential envelope. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Alan. Lisa, on what we're looking at and jurisdiction, and then we'll go on to AOBs.

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Thanks, Seb. For the jurisdiction metric, we were going to present the data in a very similar way to what's been discussed. For this metric, it was going to be a breakout of the countries or jurisdictions and a

quantity that were indicated for each of those countries as far as jurisdiction where the data would be processed. That particular question, just as a reminder, is not specific to only law enforcement when you go through the process. Everyone who submits has to answer that question. So it's not only a law enforcement question, which I think some people may have thought of that it was only a law enforcement question in the past. So I think likely you'll have the same considerations and discussions with that metric as this one. It's just that that one is not ready yet. It's still being worked on, and so we didn't have a sample to display here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I'd raise my hand to it. That was my understanding that that jurisdiction was law enforcement specific, and obviously it wasn't. So whatever solution we find for this and whatever we send back to Odeline and the ICANN team about this will apply also on jurisdiction. They're—I understand now well—exactly the same problem that we're facing.

With this, if I see no further hands, I'd like to put a bow on it. We have something to send back to Odeline. I'll reach out to the voices that I've heard on this, and there was quite a few from the group, and see if we can send it. I saw also Thomas, your message. At some point you put in a brief explanation. I think we'll use that as a base. It sounded good to me, but I'm not very good at following the chat at the same time. But I took it and I'm copy-pasting it.

Good. So, AOBs. As Feodora mentioned before, we wanted to track events. Remember, we had a discussion in August with ICANN going and

having events that at least I hadn't foreseen, and I was bit puzzled as to why we weren't more involved in it. The opposite to that is also, I guess, for us to keep track of what we're doing, and so on. I think, Lisa, you had one Europol webinar that reached out to ICANN that you wanted to talk about, and if we can find others like that, that would be fantastic.

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Thanks, Seb. We were notified that Europol asked ICANN to come do a training, so to speak, on RDRS. I'm trying to find out currently whether someone like Gabe could assist in attending since there's familiarity with Gabe and law enforcement and using RDRS. I'm still waiting for the feedback on that, but it is not an open event. It's a closed event and it's only for Europol, so I'll have to find out and let the Standing Committee know about attendance of others outside of ICANN. But my thought was someone like Gabe from the Standing Committee might be helpful in that scenario.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

As always, I'm offering my neck if there's an invitation, but I think it's a lot more interesting to have people that are actually using the tool. I'm just watching a bunch of people using it but I'm not a user of it. So I'm happy to represent, but I don't think I'm the best representation in this room, so I'm more than happy to pass the baton to anybody else. On this, indeed, Lisa, you'll have to check who can be invited, who's welcome in these meetings.

LISA CARTER:

Yes. And I'll let the Standing Committee know when I hear back. So the next item, I can just move on if you want, was for the Prep Week webinar. We were a little more solidified around that. We did get a registrar volunteer, Reg from Tucows, is going to do the presentation for the Registrars, and then John McElwaine will still do the requester side. So now we'll have both represented. So there'll be a section dedicated to that. There'll be a section, I think, that Seb will cover, as far as the GSO Standing Committee's role in the whole process with RDRS. So those slides are being prepared. And then my set of slides, that kind of intro, will just kind of talk about where we are now with RDRS, what are the milestones we've hit over the past 12 months. I'll go through some of the metrics at a high level, and then maybe a little more of the detail on the approval denial rates, etc., and also the request categories and who's submitting the most requests, etc., and then it'll move right into the other aspects of the presentation. So I just wanted to let people know that. And then the last one—oh, go ahead, Farzaneh, if you have a question on this one.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Yeah, I do. So, you have a requester side and you have a registrar side to present, and I have to advocate here for my own group. Can you give us like two minutes of time to talk about... I will go back to my group and discuss if we want to bring something to the table. But if it would be possible, it doesn't have to be a presentation. We can discuss our activities and what conversations we are following during the RDRS.

LISA CARTER: Sure. Right after that is actually a Q&A session. But are you saying you want to add slides, or you just want to—

FARZANEH BADIEI: We have been always in the peanut gallery and in order to bring that, not to [inaudible] forum—

LISA CARTER: I think you could join as part of the presentation maybe for the requester. So maybe it's you and John McElwaine, if you want to do it—

FARZANEH BADIEI: I will discuss with NCSG and if we have a point that we want to pick about registrants and how they are affected, how the system protects them and stuff.

LISA CARTER: Go ahead, John. I see your hand.

JOHN MCELWAINE: It's just important to note that this isn't like an advocacy thing. It's just informational. So I walk people through like how to sign up for the RDRS and what forms a good request. I'm not saying that users or nonusers of the system, I guess registrants could have something to say. But just assuring, maybe, Farzaneh, you can listen to the transcript of the talk we gave to the LAC so you can get better feel for where they might be able to add information. Thanks.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, John. That's helpful. Does that work for you, Farzaneh? You can maybe get an idea of what he presented previously from the link we provided for the LAC region.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yes, sounds pretty technical. I will look into it. I will get back too if we want to do something. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry. Out of principle here. Did many people around this table—the requesters and the registrars are obviously key here, but they're not the only ones. So yeah, absolutely. If you have points to me made and presentations too, yes, you're very welcome. Yeah, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: I just wanted to go over the last item really quickly. The Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, Seb and I were having a chat about this and we talked about having that team come to talk to the Standing Committee about their engagement efforts, how they're setting up webinars, trainings, etc. So we were slating that to potentially take place on the 21st of October for that Standing Committee meeting. So I just wanted to let you guys know that that's coming.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I know that we're past the half hour, so I'll move quickly. But I think I mentioned this before. I had a quick conversation with them where they went through their efforts, current and future. And I thought it would be interesting for the committee to understand also what they're doing. I think it's a good effort. We need to know about it.

With this said, thank you again for a great conversation, and we'll talk to each other in two weeks. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, everyone.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Sebastien. Thank you, everyone. Have a good rest of your day. This meeting has concluded.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]