

---

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, this is Devan Reed. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, 9 September 2024. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. We do have apologies from Farzaneh Badiei today. 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, and back over to Sebastian. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Devan, and hello, everybody. From Stuttgart, I've just moved to Germany over the weekend. I took the day off, so you're witnessing my first minutes of work here in Germany, and I'm not fully set up yet. I'm literally on my terrace outside, trying not to make too much noise inside. It'll get better. I warned Lisa last week that today was going to be a bit hectic on my side. So, Lisa, I'll have to lean heavily on you to help guide this conversation because things are a bit disrupted around me. But we'll get through it.

---

*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.*

---

Before we get started with the agenda, it's already pretty packed. One of the things we discussed last week is that we should avoid overpacking our agenda and not getting through it. So, I'll just check if anyone has any additional items to add. I see no hands. That's great, as we already have a number of things to talk about.

Let's start by bringing up the [inaudible] document, and Lisa or Feodora, who worked on the document, can walk us through the new tabs that we briefly mentioned two weeks ago. How do we intend to use them, and how will we start working with them more and more as the weeks go?

LISA CARTER: I can talk a little bit through it. You may need to provide additional information on the tab specifically for the feedback for the final report. Tab four in the document is created to include feedback from the standing committee for the final report. The four assignments are pasted at the top, and there's some space for people to add feedback they think should be included in the final report for the GNSO council.

FEODORA HAMZA: To give a bit of background, this is still early, and we're only halfway down the course. But there are a few things we can start looking at in terms of directions for the report. Sarah, this came from a comment you made a few weeks back inviting us to start

---

pivoting into that. So, it's not just for you but for everyone else. If anyone wants to share observations, comments, or points we would like to make in the report, this is the first receptacle for that. Obviously, I know how these things work. Some things we will share with the group immediately, while others we might want to discuss before putting them on paper. But whatever we want to include in the report will eventually live here.

LISA CARTER:

So, the next tab was created to track standing committee outreach. Seb and I had a discussion a couple of weeks back about the Standing Committee being more involved in events that take place for RDRS. And so, to that end, we created this tab, which each person can use to put in the information they have for whatever events they are working on. For RDRS 4, we also uploaded the generic deck as requested to the wiki. There's now also the flyer that's linked. There's a resources document that gives you quick links to the FAQs, the videos, the training videos, all of that stuff is located here in the wiki. So, you can find it here, and then for any events that you do, you can just track those in the tab. And then we can start incorporating any outreach that the Standing Committee is doing and what we present as far as engagement, etc., going forward.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, this comes up from a reflection that frustrated me personally, but I know from discussions that I wasn't the only one. Where the engagement, the ICANN engagement team was doing some presentations, webinars, etc., about RDRS, which is great. Just, you know, the more we get people involved, the better it is. But it sort of

---

obscured the fact that the ICANN engagement team engages people who already listen to ICANN, which is essentially the community, us, which is all great. But it fails to reach out to the rest of the world, particularly in terms of the requests, all those people that have never heard about RDRS or ICANN for that matter.

So, I wanted to be able to see, to gauge where you, and particularly on the requestor side—I see your name there, Gabe, but I know that you're not the only one—when you reach out, when you participate in forums, when you have these discussions, presentations with people within your community, to sort of log that, to help us also see what the level of engagement is, etc. Can we [enter] past events? Yeah, if you can remember them all, Thomas, that would be fantastic. The more we know about it, the better it is.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yes, absolutely happy to add some of the events that I've got on the calendar for outreach. And I hear and agree with your concern that the folks that are already paying attention to ICANN know about this. The ones that are not already paying attention to ICANN make up the bulk of the requester possibility space, and they're not hearing about this, in my experience. So, everything that we're doing to go beyond the bounds of the traditional ICANN mediasphere is very much necessary. And I'm happy to track the engagements that we do.

I also raised a hand thinking that it'd be great if we do get to a point where any of the registrars or registries voluntarily include within their

---

WHOIS data returns the links to the RDRS. Let's track that here as well, as well as the date that the link goes live. Thinking that that is really the only way, as I've said many times before, to be sure of hitting the entirety of the potential RDRS user base—using the existing WHOIS infrastructure. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

A point that you made already, and that reminds me that I need to chase that again, are discussions that we had internally, at least on the registry side. But that petered out a bit during the summer, so we need to get that back on its feet.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

In terms of logging and tracking for all parties, I can also envision, if that makes sense, cases where you might be presenting, but where the presence of a registrar explaining their side of the story is also good for the engagement. And so, it could also be something to flag upcoming events and invite cross-participation there. And to that extent, I'm not a professional requester or responder, so my point of view is probably not of great value. But if any of you, for your own presentations, [inaudible]

But yeah, trying to track that, I think that will also be a form—at some point or another, some annex to our report. Our task is not just to watch this happening but to promote it and sell it to the rest of the world in some way or form. To make sure that we're able to, if not

---

count the requests, at least witness a wide enough range of times to request that response, etc., to have something to say about.

Any further questions about this? I see your hand up, Lisa. Go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, thanks, Seb. This is Lisa. I just wanted to add two comments. So, on the heels of what Gabriel said about the link in the WHOIS to RDRS, we actually did add a link in the ICANN Lookup tool results page to RDRS. So, that's already live as of last month. So, that's going.

And then, I thought maybe because we're already discussing engagements and things, it might be good to just talk about the events that were listed in the agenda for item four, so we don't have to go back to that again. There's a webinar on the 17th of September for RDRS. I wanted to point that out to see if anybody from the Standing Committee wanted to participate in a section of that webinar that could be a discussion on experiences for requesters and registrars. Let me just drop the link to the registration information for that, one second.

And then also, there is going to be a prep week session on the 30th of October for Istanbul's ICANN 81. For that presentation, we're also thinking maybe the Standing Committee could participate, where I would do maybe a 15-minute presentation on the general metrics. Potentially, Seb or someone from the Standing Committee could speak to items pertinent to what the Standing Committee is working on. And

---

then again, we could have a section where requesters and registrars are discussing their experience with RDRS. So, I did want to put that out and see if there were maybe any volunteers for one or both of those going forward. I'll get the link right now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I would very strongly encourage participation. Again, let's be bluntly honest—I personally don't know what I'm talking about in the sense that I'm not a professional requester or responder. I'm here just to state that in our discussion, I don't know that I'm the best person to speak about all this to the rest of the world. But if anybody is interested, that would be fantastic. Marc, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Seb, and thank you, Lisa, for all that. Just a quick ask: there were a bunch of items there, and I'm concerned that I won't remember them all once the call ends. Could you put that in writing, send an email to the list with those items, the asks, and then the dates? I think that would be helpful. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, absolutely, Marc. We'll do that after the call.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for reminding us, Marc. Does that cover what we wanted to show about...? Oh no, the last item that we wanted to show about the

---

impressions document is, of course, the orphan requests. You remember that we said on the requestor or the registrar side that we would contemplate, evaluate, and prioritize any requests for improvement coming from the community. But we wanted absolutely to have, within this group, a champion for each of these items, if only to explain what it is and help us ensure that it's delivered on time and on target.

There are still a number of elements that are orphaned, particularly on the requester side. Did you want to go through a quick review of them, Lisa? Some of these have been there for a few months. If nobody raises their hand for it, we'll have to take them out. Again, some of these things were duplicates to other items that did have an owner, so it's not the end of the world. But there's some stuff that is just on its own.

LISA CARTER: If Feodora can actually click on the tab where she dropped the orphaned enhancements, that would be great.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, it's that last tab that says no SC owner. If I remember well, most of them come from the requester side?

LISA CARTER: Yes. And it looks like a lot of these are from an event that took place in APAC, where the account manager actually dropped a lot of the things



---

in here. I think Gabe maybe picked up one or two of them, but no one else added their names to these. So, I think most of these are actually from that APAC session.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I think you're right. So again, one last invitation—go and browse through this. If there's anything that you see value in and you want to own, please do. If you don't, they'll just be off our table.

And I see in the meantime, John raising his hand to participate in the Latin American Caribbean RDRS Webinar, which is great. Thank you, John, if you can do that indeed. That's on the 17th of September. Is that what you said, Lisa? Next week?

LISA CARTER: Yes, Tuesday.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Perfect. Well, thank you, John. So, that closes item—didn't count them—item two of our agenda. If we can maybe go back to the agenda and request any questions on any of this? Sarah, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah. I apologize in advance for what I'm about to say. I noticed that the agenda doesn't include talking about the

---

reporting cadence, which we had talked about last meeting and on the email list. Is that intended that we're not going to continue that discussion today? Or should it be on the agenda? Because I did have a couple of thoughts on it, if it is for today. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, no, it's an oversight. As I said in the beginning, I was trying to make sure that the agenda wasn't overflowing or bending and missing points. But very happy to talk about it. Maybe we just immediately add it as an AOB, and then we commit to actually getting to AOBs.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, and I just wanted to comment from the last discussion we had had, since there was a little bit of back and forth. Seb had mentioned to continue doing the monthly reports until we get to the one-year mark and then revive that discussion on the cadence going forward into the second year of the pilot, which is FYI.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Yeah, true, true. I didn't know that my voice had such power. And I have been, indeed, [inaudible]. Fantastic.

So, item three of our agenda is the update on the latest [inaudible] requests. And that's something I requested too. There were a number of things that were discussed, particularly about making the requester address contact data mandatory and everything that was flowing from

---

that. I just want to make sure everybody is on the same page from where we're at with this, with the reporting of the jurisdiction, and so on and so forth. Lisa, it's all yours.

LISA CARTER:

Sure. So, as everybody knows, the request to make requester information—address, phone number, etc.—required has already been released. That's been, I think, released since July. So, what we're looking at now, based on having put that out, is on the registrar's side, item two, which is the request from registrars to allow them to change the request category. For example, if someone submits a request that's law enforcement and it shouldn't be law enforcement, it should be something else, they'll have the ability to do that. Just to reiterate, that would function very similarly to how it functions for registrars to reprioritize requests. So if someone submits that it's expedited and the registrar doesn't think it warrants expediting, they can change it to standard. This functionality would operate in exactly the same way. And the metric recording would operate in exactly the same way, meaning that if it starts off as expedited and a report shows expedited originally, if the registrar changes it, the tick mark will come off of the expedited category and into the standard category. So that's how you would see reports going forward.

And then the second one is item 18 for the registrar, which is the request to actually have a better user experience and take the registrar back to the list of pending requests instead of leaving them on the page

---

that is for the request they just finished. So that one actually will take the registrar back to the pending list of requests going forward.

So those two are the items. And then for the requester side, the number one priority was the one that Farzaneh brought up. She's unfortunately not on the call today. And that was tracking a requester country, a requester country metric, and then also a request jurisdiction. So displaying where the requests are being processed, basically.

And I did have a couple things to mention for both of these in terms of timing and what will happen for item number one for the requester side. So back to the timing in general, and I can drop this in the actual impressions document so everybody can see it going forward in both tabs in terms of how long things will take. A low LOE is between a one- and three-month duration. A medium LOE is between a four- and six-month duration. And a large LOE or high LOE is between seven and 12 months duration. And that's once the request itself has been slated into a sprint cycle, right? So I just want to kind of level set that in terms of the expectation.

In terms of the item 2 and 18 requests, and we have the item 18 is relatively low. They're predicting they can have that done by the end of October. For item 2, however, it's a little more involved, and that one wouldn't be able to be started until November. And then for item 1, which is on the requester side, we're looking at maybe a completion for that one around the end of November. But I did want to, for the item 1, which was the requester country and the jurisdiction, to kind of explain

---

sort of what we're going to provide for that data. So the data displayed for requester country, slightly different than what was indicated in the document here, and I'll explain why.

In looking at the data, most of the requesters are either in the U.S. or U.K. or Canada, and then all the other countries, maybe a one, two, or three, like a very low number of requesters there. And also having the request category kind of potentially, how do I say, potentially, it would be easy to determine who the person was that submitted that if that were published. So because, as we outlined at the start of the project, we aren't going to provide raw data or any data that could potentially allow the identification or resemble individual requests. We kind of want to do this to ensure privacy and confidentiality. So we're only going to show the top three countries, and then all others that are small would be aggregated under a category of other. And that data would only start tracking from back in June when we kind of started talking about this and the technical team kind of separated out the data for country. So the data going forward would be June going forward, June 2024 going forward.

For the request on jurisdiction, again, similar issue of how the data is aggregated and who's submitting those types of requests. We would basically include data, a count of the countries where requests are processed. And then similar, anything that is aggregated with a small number would be grouped together in another category. And data tracking for that, since we have to still do the work to separate out that information, would only track from whatever date that is going forward.

---

So we wouldn't be getting historical data on that one. And I just kind of wanted to put that out there, make sure everybody understands what's happening, etc. And if there's any questions, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much, Lisa. I had two questions. The first one, and Gabriel, I'll look for you maybe to help me here, is the fact that we're trying to protect the identity of individuals, individual requesters. In this particular case, law enforcement is, I would assume, agency requested. There might be an individual requester within the agency, but we're certainly not asking, and nobody's asking for that to be revealed. But for, again, the jurisdiction, and yes, we can derive what type of agency, or at least the provenance of the agency. But I'm a bit puzzled as to, I understand where legal, ICANN legal comes from. I've had these discussions before, but I just want to make sure that we're not overcomplicated.

The other one, if you can complicate it more, is a question as to, if we can't, let's say, I'm in Germany right now. If you have a single request from Germany, yes, we will derive that it comes from the, whatever, some federal bureau here in Germany. But what if you were able to aggregate maybe for Europe in general, or the European community in general, or some regional subdivision where there might not be heavy representation of requests, but at least we get, instead of having a global other, at least we get some idea of where it might come from around the world. Thanks.

LISA CARTER: So just an FYI, the way the report would display is across all categories, not just for law enforcement. So, it would be aggregating all categories together, and we would not be displaying which categories. I think maybe what you're asking for, Seb, would be more of a manual effort, given how the data is set up in the system. But that's the discussion we'd have to have with our technical team.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, and I'll let Farzaneh champion that then, because it was her idea to talk with. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. I just wanted to confirm a couple of notes that I made. First up was about the timing that I noted as you were speaking, but it looks like Gabriel and I got the same thing written down, so that's good. And then I also wanted to confirm the user experience improvement. You said that would be done by the end of October?

LISA CARTER: Yes, for item 18, that would be by the end of October.

SARAH WYLD: To start or to complete?

LISA CARTER: To complete.

SARAH WYLD: Oh, I like that. Okay, expected completion by the end of October. All right. So that's a bit quicker than three months.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, that's a low-level effort. So, that's the one to three months, right?

SARAH WYLD: And then the other request to be able to recategorize RDRS submissions, that one can start in November and will take at minimum four months. So, we're looking at completion in March 2025 at the earliest?

LISA CARTER: So what I was told was that they had to wait till November to start because of other projects ahead of it. In terms of the time it takes, I think they'll know more on the actual amount of time once they actually get into, right, the requirements and scoping all the things and the user stories, etc. So, I don't actually have an end date. I have the start date, and once they can look at it, then we can get more detail on that.



---

SARAH WYLD: So the medium level of effort, that was more of an estimate and not really scoped by the developer team yet?

LISA CARTER: So in terms of LOE, yes. Obviously, they say it's a medium effort. I think all the JIRA tickets need to be created, right? The sprint stuff needs to happen. So, all of these are ranges, right? It could come in sooner, but that's sort of the range that they give when they say medium effort. And if it ends up being a little bit easier going in, then we can let you know and it might come out sooner. But those are the ranges for anything slated as low, medium, high level of effort.

SARAH WYLD: Okay, thanks a lot. Anyone else?

LISA CARTER: I'll drop the level of effort timing details into the actual impressions document on each of the tabs for request and registrar so everybody can see that going forward and understand the timing.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm sorry I was typing at the same time, and I'm completely unable to do two things at the same time. So, let's stop the typing for a minute. I'll follow up with Gabriel in a second. And so that gets us to item four. Fantastic, not only are we going through our whole agenda, but we'll – well, I'm not going to jinx it, I won't say it. So, item four, events. You've

---

already spoken about the 17th of September RDRS webinar, and we already had the hand raised from John, thank you again for participating. If on the registrar's side anybody wants to participate or is already slated to participate, that's also great. The more the merrier. I think that last time, because I believe it was Ashley presenting about registrars, it wasn't the same region, not the same audience, [inaudible].

And then the prep week session, so, for now, my name is slated on it, but I don't think I'm the most relevant person to speak about this to the whole world. So, if anybody else wants to join in the fun, or do it on my behalf, or instead of me, you're very welcome. We've got a name from this group, but I'm more than happy to give my seat to anybody else that has something more interesting to say. And it doesn't have to be answered right now because it's for the 30th of October, so if you want to think about it and raise your hand later, that also works. Absolutely no problem. Anything else I'm missing, Lisa, that I should add? I'm looking at your screen.

LISA CARTER:

For that one, no, I think for the events, that's all we have for now. But whoever volunteers, I'd definitely like to sync with you for topics, because I will need to – especially for the 17th – I'll need to add a slide basically for that so we can chat about that outside of this. But yeah, anybody that signs up, we'll definitely want to sync so I can update the slides appropriately.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: [inaudible] So again, if you have an event that you will be participating in and want us – myself, Lisa, anybody else – to participate, please raise it, and we’ll see if we can fit it into our agenda. We can’t fit everything into our agenda, but I commit to making my best effort to participate and pass on the good word. It’ll be my pleasure. I’ve heard the same from ICANN, from Lisa, and others, so let’s use that.

There was a brief hand up from John, who then suddenly went shy, or maybe had his questions answered. John’s gone. Okay. I guess we resolved all that, which, fantastic, leaves us a whole 24 minutes for your AOB, Sarah. Oh, now we’ve got Steve up before that. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Seb. I’m happy to defer to Sarah about the AOB. Mine would be AOB, Sarah, so if you’ve got something on what Seb just talked about, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I’ll note Paul McGrady who is also volunteering and—but anyway, [inaudible] I would like to [inaudible] anyone but me. Thank you, Paul. Helpful. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. So, with regards to the reporting that we had talked about by email, I asked a question earlier today in the email

---

thread about whether the CSV file that we're considering instead of the fancy report would be published on the website for the public to access. And the answer was no, it was intended only to go to the standing committee. So that actually surprised me, so I was very glad to have asked because it was not the answer I expected. So, three thoughts.

Number one, the registrars are not particularly opposed to moving to a monthly CSV and a quarterly fancier report. Not wildly in favor but also not hugely opposed, so that's probably okay. We do, however, think that any reporting should be published on the website and not only sent to the standing committee. And this is partly for broad transparency purposes, because I think we all agree that's important, and partly because I looked back at the charter and it really seems that we have a commitment to publish monthly reports and make sure that they get to the GNSO council. So, I would say let's try to keep publishing them on the website.

And then finally, we would really appreciate confirmation that the time being saved in not making the fancy PDF reports will instead be used to work on the changes that were requested in the impressions document. Because any time savings, we think really should benefit this group's work. So, hopefully, that can be a commitment, and then the reporting could be a little bit easier on a monthly basis. Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

So just two things. One is that the same group of people don't do reports and improvement requests, right? One is the technical team,

---

and one is more administrative, so removing something from one doesn't increase the other, I guess I would say. The technical team's pipeline of things to do is sort of set based on other priorities and all the things that are happening, and they don't actually put the reports together. So that wouldn't necessarily change their ability to go faster at the requests enhancements, if that makes sense, just to clarify.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Can I also add something? And Lisa, correct me if I'm understanding this wrong, but the amount of effort required is really to produce that PDF with all the explanations that go around it, which ICANN is committing to producing monthly reports. Each month will have its own report published, but it's suggesting to do the full work quarterly, so every quarter, we do the last three months and so on. This is disconnected from the CSV report, which is itself not just a button to crunch but a lot lighter in terms of effort to produce. The CSV report would continue being produced monthly. So we would have numbers monthly; we just wouldn't have the whole explanation around the numbers monthly. That's what is being suggested, right?

LISA CARTER:

Right, yes. So the CSV itself will continue to be created. We're actually potentially looking at moving to a CSV, if we do this monthly for you guys, that actually has all the months in it together. So each time we give it to you, we just add a month to that CSV, and then you'd see all the months up to the one that's current in it together. And then yes, the

---

report that is the large PDF, that is literally a manual process. Getting the images in there is manual, a lot of those grids are created from scratch, etc. So it is labor-intensive. But if we did it quarterly, then you'd still see all the appropriate months. It would just be that we do that all at once on a quarterly basis.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. Does that close it, Sarah, or anybody else on this topic?

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa didn't really address Sarah's other question of can the CSVs be made public. I'm assuming our mailing list is public anyway, so if it's sent to us, it is, in fact, public, but I presume normally it would be posted onto the appropriate wiki or website.

LISA CARTER: Yes, sorry, Alan. When I say publish, I mean actually the publishing to the RDS page of ICANN.org. Obviously, if we're sending you guys the CSVs through the mailing list, I do think it actually is considered public, so you guys would still be getting that. It just wouldn't be published on the website.

ALAN GREENBERG: And is there a reason why it couldn't be?

LISA CARTER: That's something we can discuss internally. It could be, but for consistency and for people understanding why all of a sudden there's no report and there's only a CSV, I think that might be a challenge, whereas if we just delay the cadence, it's a little bit easier to explain. But it's something to discuss, for sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I would suggest that it would be made public. Certainly, for my community, I'd want to be able to point to it and say the data is still available. It's still available monthly, even if the fancy reports are not. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Sure.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So if this closes this topic, then I'll give you the hand, Steve, to present the other AOB you wanted to share.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Seb. And this is as much a question for Sarah and others on the call. We're eight weeks out or so from Istanbul, and if you recall in Kigali, we did three extensive deep dives into the RDRS. The Standing Committee met shortly after that. The CSG conducted a session. It was

---

really just an open session with both contract and non-contract parties. Then we also had the roundtable in the tent that Sarah led. Frankly, I'd be fine if we did the same three events in Istanbul, but this is the time when we have to start to plan for blocks and avoid conflicts. So, Sebastien, what are your thoughts about that and what does everyone else feel about how many sessions we want to hold and what nature in Istanbul?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I know that before Kigali, there were some discussions about us running these shows and having it under our own flag. I don't want to put you on the spot, Paul, but I think you did mention something, which has a lot of virtues. But in my humble opinion, it would not give us the airtime that we got in Kigali on this topic. I can't remember exactly what it was, but I think it was...

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Well, we did conduct the session and you wanted to split it roughly half and half between where we've gone for and where we're going next. I don't think it was enough time to cover those topics.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

On our own session?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

On the CSG session, yeah.



SEBASTIEN DUCOS: On our own session. Okay, sorry, I misunderstood your question. I think that we should still have the different groups if they're willing to organize sessions about it. I think that was very, very fruitful. Our own session.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would agree. I mean, it's just a challenge to schedule two things back-to-back like that. And then, Sarah, I'm interested to see your level of interest in reprising the roundtable, although not in a tent this time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sarah, you want to take it?

SARAH WYLD: Sure. Thank you. The registrar group is planning a session, but it will be on a different focus and not, again, sharing example RDRS requests. I would be happy to support a standing committee session. I would be happy to share my template if somebody else is interested in gathering sample requests. I would be happy to support my registrar providing sample requests to somebody else organizing such a session. And just a note that I will not be in Istanbul in person. I will be attending remotely. Thank you.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Sarah, the third leg of that stool would be if the CSG convened, as we did at the last meeting, a discussion of RDRS, we'd want registrars and registries to be at the table, just like we did last time. And I'm assuming you guys would participate, right?

SARAH WYLD: Thanks, Steve. I would say yes. I would be at the virtual table. Other registrars will be there in person. And yeah, just send a message to the chair, I would think. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, I think that's a good idea. And maybe contrary to Kigali, I will represent a group that I shouldn't be representing because I found myself in that weird position, not always speaking the way I should because I didn't know what I was always talking about. Anyway, that's a problem for me to resolve.

On this, and if that was also part of your question, what are we doing ourselves for this, as this group goes? And indeed, last time, we did open a discussion, which I think... I [inaudible] think that maybe the same people but not under the same role or the same mission should be at. And it's the more political side of where we're going from this, or policy-oriented. Where are things going to go from this in terms of policy? And I think, and this is a discussion that maybe I need to have with the Council, Council leadership, before Istanbul and see better how they view it. I think it's probably the same people, but it needs to be a

---

different discussion as to where are we going to go policy-wise with this. It might be a bit early, I don't know, but it's certainly not part of the mandate of this group as I understood it. And I would want to rely on Council guidance on this before dipping myself into the waters too deep, and possibly not doing it myself at all, but finding some other person to shape the discussion.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

I've succeeded at floating the topic and showing that the CSG is very interested. Sarah is confirming registrars are interested. I believe we can easily fill the time should you find a way to schedule the Standing Committee to have a 60- or 90-minute session. And yes, Sarah, let's take a look at the example templates by all means and see if we can work those in. I wanted to make one other observation. This is more of a disclosure item for the last, I guess, four or five years. All of the IPC, BC, CSG participation on EPDP, RDRS, and so on. We would frequently point to the eventual arrival of NIS 2 Article 28 and what obligations it might impose on registrars with European jurisdiction for purposes of disclosure, as well as accuracy. And those are trickling in through the transposition that member states are doing. And sure enough, they're all different. If you recall in Hamburg, the registrar started talking about the level of concern of a patchwork of accuracy requirements. So, the BC, I know, has been active in a couple of areas and the data processing specifications that we commented on today, that comment period closes today. And I look forward to reading what registrars put in. We commented on NIS 2's implication for that. And then finally, for the

---

accuracy scoping team, whose recommendations will be considered in Council at their next meeting. There are also discussions in Council about whether to create a small team that would continue to monitor the incoming regulations on accuracy that arise from NIS 2, in an effort to, I think, understand whether policy need is needed from ICANN and whether ICANN can do anything to assist contract parties at being able to deal with the patchwork of requirements that are going to come up. I don't need to stimulate a discussion. I'm just trying to be as transparent as I can, that we continue to believe that NIS 2 will change the landscape under which we're operating. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, thank you, Steve. So, correct me if I'm wrong here, it may not have an impact on policy. We may indeed, or the ICANN community may need to go and thread their own policy around this, and that's all. But for this group... I mean... Should there be a policy change, should participation become mandatory, disclosures under certain criteria become mandatory, any of these things, what we're doing here – the tool that we're developing here – may still be very, very relevant. It will influence, again, participation on the registrar's side. It may mandate that requests go through the tool, it may do all these things, but it doesn't change anything fundamentally about the tool itself.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: With respect to things like privacy proxy, Sebastien, take a look at that part. I don't think privacy proxy will end up being satisfactory as a disclosure, but hey, we don't have to get into this debate right now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see what you mean. But again, it may then force, for example, those companies that offered those services to go and consider themselves as a unique point of data. Anyway, I don't want to get into too many details, but the tool itself is still, in my view, relevant, and this is really what the mandate is. All these discussions afterwards are very important and very interesting, but I'm not sure that it's this group. Again, I don't doubt for a second that it'll be most of the members of this group, but under a different mandate.

STEVE CROCKER: As you alluded to, there are separate issues here with respect to NIS 2. The accuracy requirements are, in some ways, completely outside of RDRS because RDRS is a request mechanism for the data that's there, and it's way outside of the scope of what we're doing here to adjust to the accuracy requirements. That's business that's allocated to other places.

With respect to the business here, my strong feeling is that the tool that we're building here is not fit for purpose, full stop. So, it's fine for us to be noodling it and making it better and better and so forth, but at the end of the day, one steps back and asks the question, what does the

---

community need? You can interpret community to be either the whole internet community, or you can interpret it to be the much narrower community that GNSO is concerned with, the gTLD community in some sense. But there are some very, very serious flaws in the whole attitude about how to build such a system and how to field it. I don't want to go further at this point and drag everybody into discussions which we've had before and which we'll have in the future, but I do want to make the point that, for those of you, if any of you have in mind that what we're doing here is trying to refine the system so that when we finish the experiment, we have refined the user interface and this whole request system, and then we have a success to present to the GNSO and say, okay, this is what we want, and now we're just going to move forward – please don't hold on to that idea. It's just a very bad idea.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, as you said yourself, it's a point that you've made before. Again, I don't want to prejudge, and you're absolutely right. I don't want to prejudge what this tool will become – if it will become the base, the tool, or the counterexample to anything else we should do. We'll go through the report on agreeing what our recommendations are for this as we're drafting the report. All gates are open at this stage.

With this said, unless I see any other hand raised, I think that once in a month, I'm actually able to close this conversation on time, four minutes ahead. Give it one, two seconds, three seconds. Thanks, everybody. I know that Paul McGrady particularly appreciates calls that

---

finish on time. That's all for you, Paul. Thank you, everybody. Talk to you in two weeks. Great conversation. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**