
ICANN Transcription

RDRS SC

Monday, 15 July 2024 at 17:30 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/EIC0F>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, 15 July 2024.

For today's call, we've received apologies from Gabriel Andrews and Thomas Rickert. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or unmute your mic. If assistance is needed updating your Statement of Interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat only and listen only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelist.

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. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. Over to Sebastien. Please begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Devan. Good evening, good afternoon, good morning to everybody. As a welcome, two weeks ago, we had a long discussion about a letter that we were going to send to the GNSO, and I promised that I would update it. But for the last two weeks, I'm very sorry but I've been completely bogged down into important tenders that need to be answered. A second of which is due later this week. So I had absolutely zero time to look at it. But I will have that done for next time.

With this said, I'd like to spend this session of the agenda reviewing the new Impressions document. So we went from that Google Doc word type document to a spreadsheet type document. And I would like to now go and review these. Last time we went through that exercise, it was the second half of our discussion in Kigali. I think it's well time for us to get back to it and review where things are at, what is completed, what is next in the queue, and etc., etc., etc.

Now, last time, we had a chance to review a number of Gabriel's points. Because he's not on the call today, maybe we'll review the first point that will skip Gabriel's until he comes back. Unless there is something that staff sees that needs answers on those points that they're working through it or anything like that. Then we go through the rest of the list. So a caveat before that, I had a call last week with staff a bit how we can go through this document and make it readable on screen, particularly on the Zoom screen. It's a bit reduced compared to most laptops. So this is what we came up with. So it was a bit of a balance between being able to read the small print and seeing the entirety of the document. And because here the exercise is going to be to set priorities, etc., agree

on level of effort and that sort of exercise, we're prioritizing looking at the whole sheet. If you need to follow that, if you need to follow the text on your computer—thank you, Caitlin, for sharing that link. I have it also on another page and so we can do that.

The other thing that we have done—the whole sheet is available to everybody. But for columns, I think it's the column G, H, I, essentially, the drop-down columns—and, Lisa, keep me honest here, which are locked first up. Originally, staff had just locked the ones that they control, like for example, the level of effort, and I can give it. But I asked them also to keep the others locked, just to make sure that we're not constantly changing behind each other's back. These can only change when we're in full agreement and can ask Lisa to do that for us. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER:

Yes. Hi, Seb. Thank you. I believe—and maybe Caitlin can keep me honest—column G is actually open to the person who submitted the request to prioritize it. I believe column H also, I believe that one's not locked. The column I is locked, J is locked, K is locked, L is locked, and M is locked. Is that accurate?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sorry, I'm muting myself and looking at the document. I see that column G is indeed then locked. I can play with it. But H, I, L, and M are locked to me, maybe because I have the wrong Google account on the sheet. Still, even with the right Google account, it's only G that I can change.

LISA CARTER: G is changeable, whether you've agreed is locked, and then level of effort. Comments is open, so K is open for everybody?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. We're only talking about the drop-down here that are locked. But if you look at the sheet that you can open on your own laptops, everybody, like this, you'll see that only the drop-down in the column G has a little triangle to say that you can click it out, all the others are locked or you can't change. And that's done on purpose. Again, we will change them and we can change them collaboratively, apart from the priority that is given by ICANN. But I'd like to make sure that we don't change it. You see technically it can be shared with anybody else actually, too. So we just need to make sure that we all agree when we change these things because that will be used as the tracker for staff to prioritize.

Okay. With that, let's look at the first item. This item was about being able to report on the jurisdiction country, particularly for law enforcement request. But for any other requests that I should remind that only law enforcement requests have specifically that drop-down list that is called jurisdiction. Every request comes from a country or requester from a country. So in case of law enforcement, there is double entry for that country just in case the requester request from a jurisdiction that is not where he or she lives in. So I see that is still discussing. I thought that basically we had agreement from the NCSG that had requested it. And I see that Farzaneh is online. And from law

enforcement, that they were agreed that we should be able to report on this, and that we should start gathering the data and make sure that we would be able to report on this. So I don't know that we need to still discuss it. Is this something staff needs to discuss? Any elements that you need from this group to finalize your idea what needs to be done?

LISA CARTER:

Yes. So if you check in column J, the technical team indicated that it needs more details on what specifically is needed. Obviously, to start with making the requester address, etc., required, we can parse country of requester. But in terms of where the data will be processed, the details there, the system allows you to select multiple countries where the data will be processed. So it's a one to many. So we kind of wanted to understand a little more as far as what you wanted to see in terms of that, because that data, that would have to also be parsed. That's not something that's in the regular data. It's behind the secure data we have. So we have to pull that out, basically, to start tracking that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Farzaneh, since you're the one that requested this, do you want to answer or pick it up? I don't know that you have an immediate answer. But—

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Hello. I thought that in Kigali even celebrated this. In Kigali, we thought the location, because there was another request to report on the location of requester. Then it was agreed that when we make the

address a required field, then that would automatically capture the location of law enforcement, and then we can report on it. I don't know what is meant by—I think Lisa is also—sorry, do you want to say something, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, just to explain, again, for law enforcement. There are two different specific fields that record the country. So there is in the beginning when the person first identifies themselves. And there's a country of origin of the requester. And then when they say, "I'm law enforcement," they go on to a separate screen, under which there is a drop-down where they can specify the jurisdiction under which this request is made. Now, information I didn't have until two minutes ago. Lisa is now saying that, if I understand you well, Lisa, it's that second drop-down allows you to select multiple jurisdictions. Is that what you're saying?

LISA CARTER:

Yes, Seb. That's actually correct. And also the jurisdiction in terms of the question about where the data will be processed is not just open to law enforcement. That drop-down is for everyone no matter what type of category it is.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. I thought it was on a separate screen that only law enforcement sees.

LISA CARTER: No. The jurisdiction question is for everyone.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Well, to be honest, I thought that's... Okay. So what's the ambiguity? We don't know what to include in the report, whether jurisdiction or the location, or both?

LISA CARTER: We're ready to report on the location of the requester that has been parsed as part of making the address required. So we have that. We will just need to understand what you want to see in terms of the reporting itself. Is that only on law enforcement? Is that on everyone who comes through, etc.? And then for the second half of that, as far as jurisdiction, because people can select multiple, do you only want to see what that is for law enforcement? Or again, is that something that's now being parsed for every different request type?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay. That's great to tier this because we can report on the location, and then we can discuss how to sort out multiple jurisdictions. So there are a few questions that we need to answer within this group. I see Steve's hand and I don't want to take time. Is it possible to put these questions in chat so that we can discuss it and come to consensus?

LISA CARTER: Sure. If you want to discuss it in chat, that's great. If it's kind of whatever the consensus comment is on it, if that can be added to the comments of the document, then I can have the tech team address whatever the outcome is of that.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah. Okay. Great. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. We're having this discussion about capturing jurisdiction. Do we have any information on how the registrars treat the field when they receive it? Is it relevant to their decisions? And if so, how do they use it? Does this give them the information that they need?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's a very good question. Sarah is there to save me. You're going to be a lot more [inaudible] than I am. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. The question that I heard was how the registrars use the jurisdiction information that's included in the request. I have heard from some registrars that they review the location of the requester every time they

process the request as part of what they consider for making their decision. I'm not sure if they typically see two separate locations. One for like where the account holder is and one for what jurisdiction they provided. But also, not every registrar considers the same things and considers them in the same way. So I don't know that we can make an overall statement about how registrars use that data. But I do know that some of them include it in their review.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

If I can add, Steve, from what we saw in the exercise that we did in Kigali, it was typically a bit of information, it wasn't a pass/fail. But it was one of those information that registrars would use to sort of triangulate and then who the requester was better. I know, in our experience outside of RDRS, that particularly law enforcement requests seem to come from all types of angles. Some people choose to write an e-mail directly to our CEO. Others use this. Others use the old format or send e-mails at info@ or something that come out. Again, it's not a pass/fail in itself. But it's an additional piece of information to understand that the request is coherent, the law enforcement and where they come from.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me sharpen the question a tiny bit. Okay. So some registrars do look at the information, the jurisdiction, some don't perhaps. More precisely, when those who want to look at the jurisdiction do look at it, is the information in that jurisdiction field the information they're looking for? Or might it be conflated with the jurisdiction of something else?

Because there's multiple jurisdictions oftentimes. It's a question of where it's registered, what the jurisdiction is of the registrar, what the jurisdiction is of the registrant, and what the jurisdiction is of the requester. And I'm not certain that that's the end of the story in terms of getting the information about jurisdiction.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, I see a hand up.

LISA CARTER: I just wanted to just state that the actual question in the form, as this is identify the country territory or country's territories in which you are the party you represent will process the requested data, if such data is provided to you by the registrar, including jurisdictions in which any third party will process that data upon your behalf, including storage by a Cloud service provider.

STEVE CROCKER: Does that mean there can be multiple answers to the jurisdiction?

LISA CARTER: Correct. Multiple answers.

STEVE CROCKER: Uh-oh. Are we seeing multiple answers in practice when people fill out the form?

LISA CARTER: That might be a good question for registrar side, because that's on the secure data side. So ICANN doesn't automatically see that coming through. We'd have to have tech dig for that for us.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. That information is, in any case, collected. We would like to see reports and etc., but my first priority was to make sure that we capture the information. That and the location of the request, I believe, now is done. Then indeed, we can have—sorry, I should pause there. I believe that is done. Can you confirm that that is the case, Lisa?

LISA CARTER: Yes. We can parse that data has not been added as a metric. So the next question on top of that, for the one that's ready to go, is what does the Standing Committee want to see as far as reporting on that metric? Is it only speaking to you just want to see reporting on law enforcement jurisdiction, or is that something where you want to see overall by requester category, what the jurisdiction is?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Farzaneh stop me here if you need to. What I've heard of the group whenever we discussed this is definitely law enforcement. And probably as a first measure, the location of the requester. I hadn't understood that jurisdiction was going to be that complicated. Because [inaudible] what is important is to sort of understand where that law enforcement requests come from, which countries, and etc.

Then the second one—and I see that Paul just joined—I seem to remember hearing Paul saying, “As long as we’re doing country of origin, why don’t we do it for everybody?” So maybe we do for everybody, but then parsing that law enforcement and non-law enforcement per country.

LISA CARTER: Does everyone agree with that, Seb’s suggestion? Can we capture that in the document from the requester side to indicate that that’s how you want the metric to look for it? And then I can go back and get feedback on creating that metric.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Since your name is on it, Farzaneh, can I put you in charge of adding that to the sheet?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good. Fantastic. So that’s one point done.

LISA CARTER: Wait, wait. One more thing, it needs a priority. There’s no priority that was given by the requester.

FARZANEH BADIEI: It's high priority.

LISA CARTER: One to ten is your option in that drop-down.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: One is the highest. Because we've got all the data and everything, again, I don't know how much work is in there, but I would call that low-hanging fruit, it's ready to go. So I would be in favor of saying high. I assume that it's not a huge amount of work. I mean it's work but you've got already the setup to do the reporting and you're adding one metric.

LISA CARTER: For the requester, yes, easy-peasy. For the jurisdiction of where the data will be processed, that will be the more challenging component.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So priority one, that you could change too, Farzaneh? And then we're good to go.

LISA CARTER: Do you want to look at the priorities, the other things on the list before you prioritize, give it a number for agreed to by the Standing Committee? Because this is only the first one you've looked at. So there might be others you want to consider in weighing against this one as we go through the document. Just something to consider.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. We can cancel that one, and if we see something else that is absolutely needed before, we'll change it. Okay. I'm swapping with the others. Then there's a number of points that all belong to Gabriel up until criminal investigation. So I'm done down to point 12, which is CSC but we still haven't found [inaudible]. Point 15, I've got a CHD security. Is this something you are familiar with, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: I don't think so. I'm tracking too closely here. Where is it exactly? What's on the screen here? I don't see.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It's at line 15 of the new Impressions document. There are many new malicious domain names every day. Requester can only request data for one domain at a time in the RDRS.

STEVE CROCKER: I see. Okay. I didn't participate in creating this but I understand what we're talking about. Bulk requests and searches, both of those are, I think, very important. They do raise issues about overloading system about being abused in their own right. But just suppressing them doesn't lead to good results either.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Lisa, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Sorry. On line 15, I will say that the inclusion of the ccTLD is in the scope of access to nonpublic registration data would require the ccTLDs to be on RDAP to have that happen.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes and no, because actually, in the gTLDs, we're very much focusing on the registrars responding, and that doesn't map exactly to the ccTLD. In the case of ccTLD—and I'm just throwing it out there—but we can decide that the role is different. In the case of ccTLD's request for a particular TLD goes to the ccTLD manager for them to work it out afterwards. But there could also be a rule because indeed there's no consistency in RDAP. ICANN doesn't have a link to many of those ccTLD registrars, etc. Steve, I see your hand up, and then Lisa.

STEVE CROCKER: My recollection of the back and forth on this point is that the first reaction was, well, we can't handle ccTLDs because they're not part of our contractual process and we don't know if they conform to the system. And then not me, but others came back and said, "Yeah, but some ccTLDs are fully prepared to conform exactly to the process and make a point of doing so." Then my recollection is that there was a subsequent response that, "Well, even so, we can't trust them or we can't deal with them because we don't have a contractual relationship or whatever." It felt like there was an attempt not to be accommodating even when the various parties involved, particularly the ccTLDs, were in

fact trying to be cooperative. So that's where my understanding of what the bidding was on this.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, but my understanding is that it was discussed at length with the ccTLDs in Kigali. I don't know formally or informally, but there was some interest from some ccTLDs. And obviously, we'll make everybody participate, probably the ones that want to raise their hands. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER:

I just wanted bring up something else to consider as part of considering that they're not contractually obligated is that registrars by contractual obligation have the naming services portal and a place to go actually review requests, process requests, give the feedback, etc., ccTLDs do not have that as of now. There's no central system where they all come to process but have a place to process those types of requests.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

All understood. So ccTLD is definitely not for tomorrow. Definitely not a low-hanging fruit. But again, if the ccTLD community is interested and is ready to come to the portal to do the efforts and etc., I think that we should maybe look into it. That's my personal. Marc I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hey, everybody. I guess two points. First, I'm going to just echo what Sarah said in chat. This is two different topics, they should each have

their own line. The first topic is on multiple domain requests and the second one is on ccTLDs. These are very different topics and shouldn't be conflated.

My second point I want to make is on ccTLDs. We keep having this conversation and we don't seem to be on the same page as far as resolving it. What I'm going to say is my take on ccTLDs. It was brought up multiple times, the possibility of having ccTLDs included in this. What we heard from ICANN is that that would be a very large level of effort. And with less than 18 months left in the pilot, this does not seem like a good use of anybody's time to ask ICANN or to take on a very large LOE to get something potentially included optionally at the end of this pilot period. That to me just does not make sense.

On the other hand, we have this further consideration tab. So my takeaway is that while it doesn't make sense to include ccTLDs in the pilot, as far as further considerations go, my take is that we would include a line there saying that any future or successor system should include the ability for ccTLDs to participate. But it sounds like we're hearing that there is demand desire to include ccTLDs and so future considerations or recommendations should take that into account. But it just to me does not seem to make sense to try and take on that as part of this pilot. So I understand that this is not resolved because it keeps coming up, and that's fine. I just wanted to give my take on this topic. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. I fully agreed on the on the fact that it's two different topics that we should split into three different lines, and then look at them separately. On your second point, sure, absolutely. But then it's just a question of putting it as a low priority. I think it is still interesting to have the topic in this document so we can track it. We just agree then that it's a low priority or any other code that we want to put to say this part for later after the pilot. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess my take is a little bit different from Marc's. First of all, I agree, we have to separate them. And once we separate them, let's get a degree of effort. I want to make sure we don't have a degree of effort on the merged one, which indeed would be a difficult issue. Because all we're really saying is for a specific list of ccTLDs, who does ICANN essentially send the message to? I may be wrong, but that doesn't sound like an immense job. Maybe it is, but I'd like to formally get an evaluation from ICANN on what it would take to essentially include ccTLDs that are willing and prepared to work in that environment. Then we may change the priority, we may assign the priority. I think inherently it's a relatively high priority, even though we may not do it if the work is too hard. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If I can just give you a tiny window on it, Alan. It's a completely different circuit that will land on the same form eventually. But to identify who to send this to, then it wouldn't go through RDAP. It would need a separate database because it's not the contact details of ccTLD

managers, it's not something that we have readily. So we would have to ask them to build a database or at least the participating ones, and so on and so forth. So there will be at the very beginning of the process a different logic to identify who the receiver of that request needs to be. It's not the end of the world, but it's a different logic and a completely different path. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien. I'll just point out for Alan—maybe if we could scroll up to line 12, requester input number five. Row 12, requester input five. There you go. Thank you. Alan, I don't know. Maybe you missed this one. This is another request for essentially the same thing, it includes ccTLDs. And you can see here, this request came from Gabriel Andrews. I think he was the first one to raise this topic. But you can see we have a high LOE from ICANN on this one. So when I was referring to previous discussions, this was the line item I was specifically referencing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Sorry, I was without power at the beginning of the meeting, so I did miss the first part.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

This was discussed in Kigali. We skipped all of Gabriel's points today. So you didn't miss that, Alan. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER: Hi. I just wanted to address that question of ccTLDs. Gabriel did actually send an inquiry in, asking specifically about ccTLDs participating back in, I think, maybe mid late June. I'm trying to look for the date of the response, and I've provided a response from ICANN to all of his points. So if someone wants to see what ICANN's stance is on that, it is described in that mailing list response to Gabriel. I'm just looking for the date now. So give me two seconds and I'll find it. Hold on. And then you can keep going with the questions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You can put the date in the chat for our record. Paul McGrady?

PAUL MCGRADY: Hey, what's up? This is an interesting conversation but I think it's squarely premature. This is a GNSO effort, not a community-wide effort. It's an interesting idea. But I think that this is exactly the kind of content that should go back to Council and say, "Hey, someone suggested we include the ccs in this." That's not what we're doing over here. But we thought we would pass it on to you, and you may want to talk to the ccs about it. And there's a mechanism for the two Councils to talk. So trying to figure out what to do with this idea now to me seems way, way early. We would need for Council to come back and say, "Okay, we're changing your remit and find some way to include the ccs in this." And so there's a big old step missing. So I suggest we kind of push it back to Council.

Then, secondly, Seb, I've been ruminating over your idea that we need to find a way to hive off that the customer feedback from the technical

aspect of, “Is this working?” This is, from my point of view, a classic example of a customer feedback, again, not just the getting together in meetings and talking about how to do a better request or those kinds of things, but ideas like this. That customer group would be able to send the technical stuff this way, would be able to send ideas like this to Council, would be able to send other issues directly to staff, depending on what it is. If people are fighting, hopefully not, but they could alert the Ombudsman that fight has broken out, that kind of thing, which would free us up to focus on being more narrow about this and making sure that this is working, right? So I’ve really come to grow into believing that your suggestion—and my first reaction to it was meh. But I’ve really come to grow into believing that that’s the sort of standing customer feedback group makes sense. But in any event, this particular topic, I’ve never wanted to shut down speech. But I just think that we’re talking about something that we don’t even know if the Council wants us to talk about, for what it’s worth. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Fair enough. I appreciate that. I came up with a good idea. And unless you missed the beginning of the call, I was meant to finish that later, but I really hadn’t had time in the last two weeks. I’ll do that afterwards. I have a good idea. Thank you very much.

So should we go back to—where are we at? I think it was point 15. As we discussed the fact that this needs to be split, maybe, actually, it just needs to remove the ccTLD aspect of it reviewed somewhere else. But I haven’t had time to look in it together to make sure that they fully encompass each other. And then the bulk request, to go back to that, I

think that we continue saying that each request needs to be reviewed individually. So I have nothing and I think that we've gone back and forth, an API, not an API. It's something that you would develop or possibly develop with law enforcement in order to sort of recourse through or pass through a list of requests that a requester may have. But in the system, they still need to exist as individual request. Every domain name needs to be looked at individually. More often than not, there's multiple requests might be targeted at more than one registrar. So the system, I don't see how we can do it differently. The system still needs to progress individually. Again, I'm all for having a way to make it easier for requesters, not to have to repeat themselves a hundred times. That's a separate problem. The solution that we discussed, the API type solution that we discussed, you personally kept on suggesting that it wasn't probably worth the effort of staff on this and there are ways to do this outside of this system that would be more efficient. I don't see and going up. It's very possible I said twice in a row something that makes sense.

If we go to 16—and I'm reading those very, very quickly. Requesters: institutions versus individuals. I'm going to put Sarah on the spot here because I know that this was discussed amongst registrars. But in the meantime, Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien. I'm just going to check my recollection here. I don't know if I'm remembering correctly. But my recollection is that the full SSAD recommendations would have called for a way to have individual accounts as well as entity or institution accounts. However, in the

process of putting together the RDRS pilot, which is a very much slimmed down version of what was in the SSAD, we agreed to streamline things a little bit and just have individual requester accounts. That's my recollection. And I'm wondering, can anybody confirm, do I have that right? Am I remembering correctly? Or am I completely off base?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm not going to be able to answer that. I wasn't part of that PDP. But anybody else wants to scratch their head whilst I give the floor to Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I feel like Marc is right, that sounds really familiar. But I haven't had a chance to try to go look it up. I've heard from registrars that they require there to be an individual human being who is responsible for the request, although that person should indicate that they are working on behalf of an organization where appropriate, which now they can do, now that we've added in another organization field. So I would say we should leave this thing alone and just stick to the changes we just made and see how those go. Or I'm not familiar with CHD security, so I guess if there is a Standing Committee member who wants to sponsor this request and maybe we do proceed with it, and otherwise, I think we should put it on hold. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

In terms of practice, because there's nobody on it yet, I'm fully on board with you. I think that we should put it on hold. I think that it's a slightly different request. What they wanted is to avoid having as many accounts they have employees in order to be able to track things, having a single account to be able to track multiple requests, even if they were formulated by different people. I understand. And I've heard the same as you, Sarah. There are some registrars that will insist on having an individual responsible and an individual naming it. If the intention is to deliver data, they want to know whose hands are holding that data, not just the institution. They want to know who normally is responsible for it. So maybe these institutions will have maybe some halfway somebody that is normally responsible for the institution, putting their name into one account that is maybe been shared by. I don't love the idea because, actually—I'm thinking as I'm talking—ICANN is probably going to hate it because of the portal and the securities around it. But yeah, it needs to be resolved immediately. And again, as Sarah said, we have the list. It can be parked, which means that we can also skip 17. I'm just looking at if there is not anything super important. No. Okay. So we skip 17 now and we get to point 18, where Steve DelBianco and Steve Crocker's names are attached to it. I haven't seen Steve DelBianco yet. I don't know if he's on the call. But otherwise, Steve Crocker, if you want to talk us through this one?

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, I think it's a piece, it fits with the other things we've talked about, how to facilitate the work of the requesters, make their life easier, simpler, more streamlined, more efficient, etc. We've heard from various requesters that they have multiple requests that they want to

make. And the natural thing would be that there'd be a way to put those in the hopper and have those all go through instead of having to manually push through each of them one at a time. I think it's as simple as that.

Now, if this system were going to persist indefinitely, my prediction is somebody would gin up a bulk upload process that doesn't need any kind of change to the system and be smoother. Of course, it had an API that one could do a first class interface. But even without a first-class interface, one could gin up something that would simply fill in the screen and push the buttons automatically through a script and be a jury-rigged version of bulk upload.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. I don't know whether the box has gone blank all of a sudden, it's on my on my screen.

STEVE CROCKER: I didn't do it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no. I'm not accusing you. We've been going back and forth on this. Is this something that you see as part of this interface? Is this something that you see as an API? Or is this something that you see as something living completely outside of the interface and that you will discuss with Gabriel, like I heard in Kigali?

STEVE CROCKER: If that's directed at me—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes.

STEVE CROCKER: My sense of things is that there's a kind of [inaudible] that has set in to this whole process of "Let's leave this thing alone. Let's just move forward and get it done." I don't sense that there's much appetite for improving the functionality or whatever. We're all sort of marking time until the hard questions come up again for consideration. I have pretty strong feelings that as a legitimate experiment, this ain't it. But I know we're all committed to the process, by process, overall content and common sense. So let's just move through and do it. And 18 months from now, or 17 or 16 months from now, we'll begin to have the necessary conversations.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that we'll have to agree to disagree. I don't know. I think that we're going through that process to actually find enhancements that we can do and that fit in what we're doing here and what we're trying to achieve. I don't think that we're waiting for another 17 months to go, but agree to disagree. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I have a question, and this is not necessarily directed at Steve. It's just a general question. I recognize we might not be able to

answer it here. But I know the requesters do have the ability to reuse templates. I know this isn't exactly the same as a bulk upload tool, but if you have multiple requests that are similar in nature, is that template usable, or is it completely unfit for purpose? When we have this discussion about bulk uploads, I often have that question. Well, what about the template functionality? Does that help? Does it does it not help? So I've been curious about that. Is it all helpful in these circumstances? Or is it just completely not fit for purpose? Or is it something in between? I suspect it's probably something in between. But it's an item I haven't heard direct feedback from requesters on and I'm curious if anybody here has heard anything or has feedback or anything they can share on the template tool?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I haven't had any feedback either, Marc, and I don't see any hands up answering. Steve, you might have your mic open with some kind of a fan behind you. It's making a lot of noise.

STEVE CROCKER: Apologies.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. No, I haven't had that feedback. But we'll take notes, and if the templates will help.

Item 19 is another one for Gabriel, and so is item 20. We've got seven minutes to go. Is it worth going through the registrar sign? And maybe

this time, given the fact that you've got the contact for most of them, is there an item in this list that you want to—I see a hand up. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. I noticed something interesting here, which is that I reordered the tab. But I feel like what I'm seeing on screen is slightly different than what I'm seeing when I look at, and I don't know why that would be. That's very confusing. Yeah, that's really weird. Maybe because it's got filters. Is it possible that when I sort the input section that it doesn't store it for everybody else? Is that how this works? So my issue here is that there's a bunch of things on this chart that are completed or that are canceled and we retracted their request. And it's difficult to go through the open requests when we can't see them because they're completed steps in the way. So what I did, but I guess it wasn't effective somehow and I don't understand why—and sorry, I just got distracted because I see there's a filter option but I still can't filter.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sarah, I think it is because that column is actually not accessible to us. So maybe it is for Caitlin or Lisa, whoever's got a hand to filter the completed.

SARAH WYLD:

If Caitlin could sort by column F as in Frank, because that is the priority requested by the Scoping team by me. So when I look at it sorted by column F, the first item here is to allow registrars to recategorize request, and that is currently the top priority item for registrars. Right

now, we get a lot of requests that are just under the wrong category and it would be really helpful to be able to recategorize them.

Our second top priority request would be to add a pending input status which is similar to another request, which is to allow us to change an outcome. So I guess we could talk about what would be better for everybody else in this group. But that's what the registrars are looking for. I hope that helps.

LISA CARTER: Hold on one second. I think Caitlin's having technical difficulties so I'm going to try to share the tab.

SARAH WYLD: Thanks.

LISA CARTER: Oh, wait. It won't let me.

SARAH WYLD: Well, we can all do look at the document. We're all looking with our own Google account.

LISA CARTER: I did filter it out, Sarah, just so you know. So see tell me if you see it when everybody's in the document itself. I filtered to not show canceled

or completed on the Registrar tab. Tell me if you can see to be discussed.

SARAH WYLD: I do see completed. I think what you're seeing and what I'm seeing are different because at the top I see the words temporary filter three. And I know that Google does weird stuff.

LISA CARTER: Can you hit the Refresh on the browser and see if that helps?

SARAH WYLD: Okay. Yeah.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I have a hand from Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I apparently have a lot of opinions today so I'll share them on this as well. The allow registrars to recategorize requests one, we have a medium LOE for that. But I guess I'd like a little more detail from ICANN Org around what do we mean by medium LOE, like how long would it take to get that one? I'm not sure what this means as far as a cost benefit analysis, I guess, is the level of effort worth the value to registrars.

On the other one, the ability to indicate when a request is pending input from the requester, I understand why this would be desirable for registrars. It's something we've talked about before, and I get why this would make sense. But I do see that we got a high LOE from ICANN Org on this one. I think I recall Lisa has given us a breakdown on that one and why it was a high LOE. As I recall, if maybe I was to simplify the response, it's just the workflow that they have just isn't designed for that. And so this would considerably break the workflow, and so that would be a very large LOE. While I understand the value that that would provide to registrars, I'm not sure that that makes sense over the course of this pilot. So my take is that may be something we punt to a further considerations type item. Again, just my thoughts on this. Hopefully, that makes sense.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That does. We're getting to the hour. Sarah, maybe next time we start with your tab. We can figure out how it's filtered and sorted. I assume that you want it sorted by your priority list. Lisa, I see your hand up. Afterwards, we're rounding the hour. Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER:

Just really quickly. I didn't get a chance to show you the screenshots. But metric 10, as Gabriel originally asked for, which was to show both from launch to current and percentages, is actually in the report that was published today that I announced to the Standing Committee. Metric 8 would look similar if we were to do the same thing with percentages. I just wanted to point that out. That's all.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. We'll go through Gabriel's points when he's back. I wanted to make sure that he can comment on them. We will look at the report next time—there was also a question on the chat—in two weeks' time when we have the new report. In the meantime, enjoy the heat for those that are in summer heat, as I am here. Talk to you all in two weeks. Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]