
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call on Monday, 16 December 2024. We do have apologies from John McElwaine. 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. If assistance is needed updating your statements of interest, please email 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. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN's expected standards of behavior and the ICANN community anti-harassment policy. And all chat sessions are being archived. Thank you. And over to Sebastien, please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Devan. And good evening from here in Germany. And good morning. We have an agenda that was shared last week. Before I go into the details of it, did anybody have anything that they wanted to add to it, an AOB or anything? I see no hands. Then we'll leave it as is. As part of the welcome, I wanted to see with you, our next meeting is in principle scheduled for January 13th, which is a Monday at this time, but which also coincides with the eve of the SPS. So I think I'll be in D.C. mid-call. The SPS is the retreat that the council does. So it's a concern mainly for councilors. But John told me already that he'll be able to do

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.

the call instead of me. But I wanted to see with the rest of the group, councilors or others, if you wanted to have the call, if we maintain it, or if we postpone it. I don't need the answer now, but maybe before the end of the hour, I'll come back. And if you've had time, particularly for those that travel to verify if you would be available at that time. But otherwise, it doesn't matter. I think that might be three or four of us that are concerned. So that was one thing. Pending, so that's going to pending Als. Feodora, do you want to walk us through that?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Yes. Thank you, Sebastien. So the only pending action item that we have is the further input to the RDRS standing committee workbook. We received already quite some good feedback. But since we have also this week and until 13th of January, it would be nice if RDRS standing committee members would continue to either add new observations based on the four assignments. But also more importantly, to have a look at the observations and feedback provided by other RDRS SC members and to comment on those if they agree, if they can add more. What is also important when we make feedback to include a rationale or a conclusion, for instance, from a trend that the standing committee observed and add for the rationale to those observations. We added two more tabs to it. So here, as you can see on screen, rationale for the background on any other information for the observation and comments provided by others. So as you can see, Sebastien has already provided some, but other standing committee members are invited to also provide their feedback. And just to give you a bit of information on the next step on this, as presented last week, we would then, so we in this case, support staff would start populating the final report template

and we would start with assignment one. So based on the feedback that the standing committee members provided, we would draft the first chapter, which would be shared with the members in advance, but then discussed on the 13th of January meeting for further input and feedback. That's it from my side. I hand back over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So I listened to the call last week, but I missed it. And right now I'm racking my brain. I can't remember exactly what was agreed. At some point, that spreadsheet document that I haven't heard much love for is going to be pivoted into a word like document or a Google Docs, right?

FEODORA HAMZA: Correct. Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: At what point are you envisioning to do that, that pivot? Presumably before the 13th of January.

FEODORA HAMZA: So yes, I've already started with the assignment one chapter. And then I will further populate based on what is coming in. But I thought also based on what we discussed in the past, per assignment, so I do not have everything at once and then take it per assignment. So a word document would be shared in advance, let's say with the chapter of assignment one that then reviewed. So not only the workbook anymore,

but of course, the raw information would be maintained in the workbook, as you've seen.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yes. For everybody else's benefit, again, I know that the spreadsheet format is not the friendliest. I've been playing with it again this morning to put some comments to John's points. But at the same time, it allows us to go and back and forth into the different tabs and see a bit from other parts of this work that we did. So I still like the idea of having it all in one place before we pivot. But then indeed, we can go chapter by chapter or assignment per assignment and sort of fine tune our responses.

With this said, I guess that brings us back to point three of the agenda, which is to actually look at it. So we had initially the input from the registrars, from Sarah. I can't remember exactly what you did last week. I don't know if you went through this, but I added my two cents on one or two of those points, a few more actually. And then a big move since last week, John added a bunch of comments from the IPC side. Is it worth going from the top or did you guys do that last week? I must have listened to that call doing something else because I can't remember much from it.

FEODORA HAMZA:

We didn't go through the workbook. We went through the timeline and how we want to tackle the final report. And one point was feedback on the ICANN 81 session. Kind of more input if you wanted to discuss, but

we didn't go through the feedback or the workbook last time. So we can do it now. So you can start at the top.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Yeah. Sarah, you're around. Do you want to talk about... Oh, I see Marc's hand first. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, this is Marc Anderson. I'm raising my hand a little bit in reaction to what seems to be we're going to go row for row through the feedback in the workbook. And I'd like to point out that there are 63 rows filled out as of now. Yeah. And I think maybe as working group members, we should be expected to read all of these and maybe just flag and raise ones that we have specific questions or we think are worth discussing. If we try and go row by row, we will not get through them all.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It wasn't my intention. I call upon Sarah because she she's the one that drafted the top ones and maybe to go if she had comments. Indeed, I would suppose that you have already started reading it because you were supposed to put comments in it. And well, your rows, maybe a bit less from registries, but your rows and input and then indeed started putting comments on other people's. No, I was just going to invite Sarah to go to maybe highlight the ones that she wanted and then opened the conversation there. Indeed, we're not going to go through every row and like that, because otherwise it's going to take us. We planned for half an hour for this and not and not and not two days. The other thing

that I wanted to make sure is that everybody sees who's put some input, what sort of directions these are going and if it can get inspiration in in comments starting, that would be fantastic. So not with the aim of reading every single line, as Marc suggested, Sarah, did you want to take us through what you've added, knowing that we talked about it during ICANN? So maybe indeed, we don't need to go in detail.

SARAH WYLD:

Right. This is Sarah. So, I mean, I could, but honestly, I I've covered what this input is several times in our meetings. So I'm just not sure it's the best use of our time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That's fine. Then then we move on maybe to the next step to the next input. What I'm trying to get here is to tease some reactions and maybe some comments on each other's. And maybe as Marc suggested, maybe we should change the question around. And I see your hand, Marc. But maybe indeed, if somebody has a point that they see salient and really want to discuss, maybe we should start with that. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson again. I've been looking at the at the spreadsheet and I've been giving some thought into what we might ask ICANN org to contribute to. And one of the things I was thinking of that might be useful for us to include in our report is if they had any lessons learned that they would like to share with us around their experience

building the system. I'd be interested at least in hearing if they had things that they thought worked well or things they wish they hadn't done, what learnings can we gather from them having put this system together in the first place? And is there anything that they would like to contribute there towards follow on work? So I thought I'd throw it out to the group as a thought I had and sort of thinking more broadly around what kind of input we would like to ask from ICANN org. But at least I think I would like to hear from them about any lessons learned they would share around building the pilot system in the first place.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That's a very good suggestion. Thank you, Marc. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. So two things with respect to the point that Marc just raised. My recollection is that the board chose a path of sort of repurposing or reusing existing software as the short path for getting this going. I don't know what their thinking is about going forward or what comments they would make, but I would hope that they would make some comments along the lines of, well, if we were really going to field a real system, we would do the following as opposed to trying to do a quick and dirty bootstrap from the existing system, which was intended to get going. That's one thing that I wanted to say. The other is this exercise of preparing this report and so forth is useful. But the larger question is, where does this fit in? What's the roadmap going forward? And is there a roadmap going forward, I guess? Is it intended that this system will be

shut down? Probably not, I would guess. Is it intended that this is the working system going forward indefinitely? And if not, then what is the plan or plan for making a plan for developing a real system? And what are the decision processes associated with that? Where would the decision be made about what such a system should look like? What are the specs? What are the criteria and so forth? And I don't know that there's any organized discussion along those lines, whether that is out of the scope of this group. And if it is, which wouldn't surprise me, then where is such a discussion going to take place? Is it going to be initiated by council? Is it going to be initiated by the board, et cetera? So a series of questions like that. I think that would be very, very helpful to see as best we can what the future looks like so that we know where to put our energy and what kind of contributions to make, what kind of questions are unresolved, et cetera. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. Sarah, I'll let you go first and then I'll share my thoughts.

SARAH WYLD: Sure. Thank you. This is Sarah. My hand was not raised in relation to what Steve said. So do you want to answer Steve and then come back?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Number one, support Marc's suggestion. I do think that ICANN would also have learned valuable things that we should consider for inclusion in the report. Yes, that's one. Number two, the leftmost column in this workbook is an ID number. So I guess just the number of the comment that we're making. And I just noticed that it's missing some like one and three are gone. And I don't know what one and three were. But I'm curious as to what happened to them. I'm sure it's something that made sense. I just don't know. So I would like to understand that.

And then the third thing is what I can offer. So I have not yet, although I did see the request in the meeting agenda, I didn't have time to go through the comments put in from other groups. I can dedicate some time this week to doing so. And then we'll be on holiday. So I don't know that I can fully commit to getting them all reviewed. But there is some days after. So I will do my best to review those. And I see Feodora's comment that it was filtered by assignment number, but it looks like the filter is turned off now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

What she probably meant is sorted, maybe.

SARAH WYLD:

Okay. All right. I still don't see assignment one, but I'm sure it's somewhere appropriate. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And now I see Marc's hand and I don't know how my hand disappeared. So put it back up.

MARC ANDERSON: Cutting the queue. I was just going to say real quick, like ID number three is now row 34. So if you scroll down to row 34, you'll see a number three is there, for example. So they're not necessarily in order there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And I think number one was just an example to say what was expected there. Unless you're the one that put the number one, Sarah. So my hand keeps on going down. I have no idea. I'm not doing it. So, Steve, about the system, I recall exactly the same conversation. I recall that indeed the board level, there were discussions and surprises by some as to why we would we asked ICANN to develop this rather than going outside. It is a comment that has been made by somebody in Istanbul, and it is recorded in there. So it is indeed one of those discussions that we need to have. I don't know that we're the final decision maker on this, but do we sort of underline the fact that we do not assume 100% that this system, as is right now, plugged on to Salesforce is the one that we want to have in the future, and that we should at least somebody should study the possibility, even if it means starting back from scratch and starting a new a new development session, possibly externalized, if we should start from scratch. It is very much in my mind a question. I remember discussion that I had with Becky Burr back then who was also very much of the view that this was not to be an internal project

forever. But in the case of the pilot, and in the interest of time, that's what we did. So to me, that is a big question.

From there, there's a number of questions that cascade. Because if we decide indeed not to continue developing on this current platform, it means that we're not going to add anything on. We may leave it on and turned on and working until something better is finally developed. I would assume that we would stop further developing anything major in any case, might tweak wording and that sort of stuff, but not doing any major development. So that's also something to consider. How long would it take to get to the next version in order to see some of the improvements that we've been looking for, for example, the API, for example, a circuit for ccTLDs, which again, ccTLDs have a tendency to do their own disclosure, they don't rely on their registrars, very often they have a different system of accreditation. And some ccTLDs essentially operate with resellers rather than their registrars. And so I would assume that for ccTLDs, that would be a different route going to the registry operator.

The other question that I have, and it's not completely linked, but it was also something I'd like for this group to think about in the way they want to draft this report, is do we assume—we all assume that there will be a policy work to be done after this to bring back the set of recommendations that we had under SSAD to something that is more of an RDRS like if it is indeed what we want to recommend. Do we see that exercise as a review of SSAD to pare it back to an RDRS? And by pairing, I don't, this is not a qualitative comment, but SSAD was bigger than RDRS. That's what I mean by paring back. Or is our recommendation that we're so far off from what SSAD was that we might as well do it

from the ground up or might as well invite council to do it from the ground up. I think that they would be interested also by that, our points of view there because we're the ones that know best what we came up with and how it is very different from the SSAD. I wasn't part of the army of people that participated in the SSAD, so I'm not putting value in the work by saying we should scrap or whatever. Originally, I thought that we would pare it down, to be honest, but I don't know that it's all that relevant. I'm saying this because you will see below in the comments from John, he went actually through the effort of going back to the SSAD and noting the stuff that he would see as important to keep. So at some point, there's going to be an exercise there, but do we see this as a from the ground up to get to RDRS or paring it down from SSAD for you guys to discuss? With this set, Alan, let's heat your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. By the way, in terms of putting your hand down, there's a parameter in Zoom which seems to be set that if your hand is up and you speak, it hears you speak, it lowers your hand. So what that ends up doing is it not only is annoying, but it puts you at the end of the queue. I really wish we would not use that parameter, although it does solve the problem of people forgetting to put their hand down.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I thought it was a polite way of telling me that I speak too much, but thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Periodically someone says can you hear me? And you answer yes, and suddenly your hand goes down. And in terms of the questions you're asking, I think it's fair game for any of us or this group to ask ICANN penetrating questions about should we develop something inhouse or should we contract for it? But I don't think it's our job. I think that's a management decision that has to be made for good reasons, but I'm not sure it's our job to decide which way to go, because it will depend very much on the characteristics of any system are and what basis we have to work on internally. So it's a fair discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think it is our job to remind council that that discussion was had early on, and that's how it turned out, and that these are the reasons why we wanted to we adopted this particular platform was speed and expediency. Speed and expediency. And so reminding maybe council, maybe a recommendation, but reminding that what we have here on hand is not a decided final product. It is what we developed because we had little time to do so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, if ICANN had looked at the SSAD as can we modify some existing system to create it, they may have ended up with a very different answer. So from the get-go, it has to be an option. It should be an option, but I'm not sure it's our decision. But you're right. It's not something we or council or staff should forget. Sorry, what was the second issue you were talking about now? My brain is...

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The working the SSAD down or...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, yeah. My gut feeling is, yes, we are inevitably going to have to do some policy work, and I would like to think that we don't throw away what was decided in SSAD, but don't consider it sacred because it was decided there. We've learned a lot. The world has changed significantly for NIS 2 and other reasons like that. And we've learned a fair amount since then, so I wouldn't want to consider it sacred. But on the other hand, I wouldn't want to throw it away. I'd want to give it due consideration, again, if I was the boss. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You are as a group, but I certainly am not. Gabriel, I'll see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, on that same topic, Seb, I too, like you, was not involved in the development of the SSAD policy to begin with, and so I lack very good familiarity with what was included there. And so when you raise this very important question in terms of whether or not any additional policy work would have to be contemplated if we were to proceed with the operation of an RDRS in place of an existing SSAD in the future, I would very much personally benefit if there was a document that we could point to that shows sort of a compare-contrast versus what the SSAD was contemplated to be able to do versus what the RDRS currently does, because I lack a very good understanding of where those divergences lay. And I have to imagine I must not be the only one on the

call that lacks that clear understanding. And so I think it's maybe premature for me to comment in terms of where I think there's need, because I don't understand where the RDRS is stopping shy of achieving those SSAD requirements. And I'll note just one off the top of my head that I think is very important to my constituency. I think the SSAD was contemplated as being something that would be used by all registrars, or that all registrars would have an obligation to respond to SSAD requests. The RDRS is currently voluntary for registrar participation. That is a really big compare-contrast point, but it's probably not the only one. And so I wonder if I could ask the group if that is, in fact, a useful document that others would find useful as well, how would we go about that creation? Is that on us to create it? Could we ask staff to help us with doing a compare-contrast? I would really think it'd be useful, but I don't know how to cause its existence to come into being.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So there's a few things to unfold here. First of all, I'd to make it absolutely clear that at least under my shepherdage, we're not going to start talking about policy because I'm woefully ill-equipped for that. So I'm happy to do the sort of the product development part of it. The policy was always going to be another group, at least another leader there. So I'm not talking about going through each item and telling Council what to change. I'm just talking sort of, would our recommendation then to Council say what you've just said, Gabriel, you need to go and produce a matching compare on what we've developed and whatever. Or don't worry about it. We feel like we're so far away from it that we shouldn't. To the point that you made about mandatory participation of registrars is one of those points that John raised, the

fact that it existed in SSAD. Early conversations said, we're only doing this in a voluntary basis because we're doing this out of a policy framework and we can't oblige people to do things that are not policy. The day this goes back onto a policy track becomes policy, becomes consensus policy registrars like registries have in their contract that all consensus policies are to be followed and historic. So yes, I would assume that that would mean that it becomes mandatory again, if that was the recommendation back then. Steve Corker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I like Gabe's suggestion of comparing what the functional requirements were for SSAD versus what they are for RDRS as a way of keeping track of what those differences are. I'd like to suggest in addition that the SSAD requirements as envisioned at the time may not be the exact requirements that one would want going forward. So let me refer to a third column. So RDRS, SSAD, and then a fresh look at what the requirements would be that we might want. And so I can imagine a kind of a tabular form, a table of listing requirements as the number of rows and then a couple of columns as to whether or not those are included in RDRS and suggested to be included or not included in a new system.

And then a small comment, this business of whether all registrars are included, that comment takes place in this environment where we're focused on contracted parties. If I put myself in the role of a potential user, the way Gabe is, there's registrars that are not covered by ICANN contracts. And so the question is, is ICANN focused on a system that is limited to the contracted parties or is it focused on what's good for the

entire internet, which is twice as big if you look at domains under management, basically, as just the domains under management through the contracted parties.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So all registrars that operate in new gTLDs are at least ICANN accredited and as such they're contracted parties. They may not participate in ICANN, but they are contracted parties.

STEVE CROCKER: Absolutely. Then there's the other half of the world that ICANN either is or isn't going to speak to. We're developing tools that should have equal applicability to the other half of the world, that is the non-contracted parties.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: As in ccTLDs?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Yeah, ccTLDs so far what I've read as recommendations or invitations if we want to, recommendation is a loaded term here, but it is to allow voluntary services to ccTLDs to participate. And again, for them, this is my point of view, but having spoken to a lot of the ccTLDs in the past about GDPR, they're very much of the view, at least the

European ones, very much of the view that they are the ones who own the data, responsible for the data and disclose or not disclose, which is the opposite situation from the gTLD world. And so, no, I don't think that we have the, that ICANN has the tool, the structure to make anything mandatory for ccTLDs today. I don't know if you know that better than I do, but I understand that ccTLDs have a pretty fierce view of their independence. And if they want to participate, they participate, but we can't force them.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, so let me flag that your use of the term mandatory, it sort of suggests that there's a mindset within ICANN that the only things that ICANN can and should do are the things that they can do by enforcement of the contracts. That makes ICANN a trade organization and undermines the entire thesis of what role ICANN has in the world.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Fair enough. Okay. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien, Marc Anderson. I raised my hand to respond to Gabriel's question. Specifically, he was asking about a comparison between the SSAD recommendations and the WHOIS disclosure, or the RDRS. And Lisa beat me to one of the links, the WHOIS disclosure system design paper. Specifically, appendix four has that information. But I also sent, I added another link which has older correspondence between our chair, Sebastien, and GNSO Council that has the

recommendation for building a pilot system as a pared down version. So it includes the request for a WHOIS disclosure light system. So that should help you. You mentioned not having the background and history. And so hopefully, between the design paper and that correspondence letter, that will help fill in some history and question marks you might have.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. I had completely forgotten about that letter. But two and a half years ago. But I think that what Gabriel was suggesting is to actually go through every point of the SSAD, which I don't remember this letter to have done, every point of the SSAD and every recommendation in the SSAD and say, yeah, this is to be kept as is. Yeah, this is to be kept but needs to be amended. And no, this is no longer relevant. Which I don't think is an exercise that we want to do without, again, approaching into policy. And certainly not an exercise that staff would want to do. Again, they might, but with a lot of warnings around the fact that they don't want to and shouldn't be tampering with policy. And in any case, an exercise that's probably going to take longer than this sort of time windows that we're talking about between now and end of February to have our report back. So maybe we should go back to council and say, hey, maybe you want to start ahead on this and start working because we're going to ask you to do it. Or we're going to suggest that you should be doing it. But I don't know that, I feel this exercise will take a lot longer. But maybe it's just me.

With this, and I see the clock ticking and no longer see hands up. I again cordially invite you to go back to this worksheet I did again this morning

early and went through John's comments. Please, please comment, please comment on my comments too. I know I saw your comment in the chat early on, Steve DelBianco, about wanting to comment on my poor maths to try to figure out what the audience for this was. I know where this is going. I'm happy to have the discussion if you want, but I don't. Anyway, if I see no further hands on this, again, please do take some more time to go and through all this through the comments, etc. Note also that there are some repetition there. So if you are able to grab and to find more repetition than I have, please note it. Or if it's not repeating, note how I got it wrong. I think that will also ease the work of Feodora when she's compiling that and pivoting that to a Word document to make sure that things are represented properly individually. Yes, the formula was—Okay, we'll have this discussion maybe later. I agree with you. I agree with you, Steve. I was just trying to give an idea of size of, we talk about thousands, tens of thousands or hundreds of millions. That's the main point that I was trying to make. If I see no further hands, then maybe we should go to three points, Roman two, and to discuss about the RDRS.test. I think that maybe Lisa, did you want to walk us through this?

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Thanks, Seb. Hi, everyone. This is Lisa for the record. I just wanted to actually bring to light in the sense that you guys are all putting findings in the findings tab on the document that for anybody that hasn't used RDRS, and I don't know how many of you have not actually looked at the system or used the system since launch, but it might be a good idea to actually take that test domain and go and actually use the form and fill out the form to see how things work because it might

inform what you guys actually recommend in your findings document. Specifically too, maybe from a registrar perspective, it might be good for registrars to see what the requesters are actually doing, what they see, the questions they get, because that might inform how the form changes going forward. Then also, there are how-to videos on how to use the system and the template, which I don't know if anyone has actually reviewed or seen, but that also might be helpful in what you recommend. I just wanted to add that to the agenda for that purpose. I don't know if you guys want an actual walkthrough live demo, but it might be useful for you guys to do it on your own as well. That was just for that particular 3.2. Any thoughts?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Yeah, I haven't to disconnect the discussion that we had last week. I may have known, but I had completely forgotten that we had videos on how to use it and how to test it. As Lisa mentioned, and I haven't to be fully honest, I haven't myself, but some of us are a lot more versed into using the system and to submitting a request and etc. Having that also before we make our comments, or as we're making our comments, would be very helpful to make sure everybody has it. Any questions, any points on this? Paul McGrady, I think that you're the one the other day or a few weeks back that was suggesting having it. I hope that it works for you the way you want it. And I think that it existed actually before you asked for it, but I still hope that it works the way you want it. If I see no further hands, then we can go to point four of the discussion and the presentation of the metrics. Who wanted to walk us through this? Is that you again, Lisa?

LISA CARTER: Yes, so this wasn't the presentation of metrics. The November report is probably going to be published this week. It hasn't been published, so what's up is still from October. But this bullet specifically was because I wanted to chat with the standing committee about how we'll present metrics going through the second year of the pilot. So I know originally we'd had some discussion about doing more infrequent cadence, etc. We're really still planning on doing it every single month as before. But what I did want to bring up was that in order to show all of the data, we want to kind of tweak things so that we can show all months at a time instead of having to truncate data. So we would turn some of those chart pages horizontally, the grid pages horizontally, so we can just kind of keep moving things spread out across the two-year period without having to hide any data. The other thing, and I don't know if you want to chime in now, Steve, if you want to just wait till I finish, up to you.

STEVE CROCKER: Excuse me, I'll wait.

LISA CARTER: Okay. The other thing that I wanted to note was that when these reports were first published, the idea was we would take a snapshot of the previous month, say for example, for October, we would run the report for October on November 1st. That data would be published in a November report that reported on October numbers. And as we moved forward to November, December, all the data that we originally published for October would remain the same as was originally

published in all subsequent reports. What that does is it does not give a full picture of the data that got processed during the previous month. So the idea being going forward that instead of keeping that October data static, when we produce future reports, we would be grabbing all of the data again. So anything that got updated for October or any other subsequent month would in the most current report be reflected so that you see everything, because right now you don't. You only see what was captured on the day the report was generated. I don't know if that makes sense, but we would like to actually have you guys see everything, even decision date things that post back to past months, if that makes sense. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. So I must say that's really thorough and thoughtful comments about presenting the data and what your plans are. No issues there. But I raise my hand in order to connect up what you've just described with the prior part of our conversation. What is the intended use of that data with respect to conclusions that we're going to draw and recommendations? What should future decision processes take from this data? It's one thing to have accurate and readable and understandable measurements of the existing system, but the intent from the beginning of this whole effort was that the accumulation of this data was intended to, as I understand it, measure demand, and that would be informative in terms of quantification, what's the cost of building a system that would handle the demand or measuring what the use is. There's no big surprise to anybody here, but I think that there's no realistic connection between the data that we're seeing on this system and what the data would look like for a real system, for a full-op

system. So the question that I'm raising here is what message is being created going forward in addition to the nice, clean presentation of the data that's coming out of the system? As I said, what do we intend for people to understand from that?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. I'm looking to see if, sorry, Lisa wanted to answer that, but it is not an immediate question, I guess. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: If there's a response to Steve first, because I have a different clarification question.

LISA CARTER: Thanks. I was just going to say in response to Steve Crocker, I think obviously the purpose of the metrics to begin with was to gauge usage and demand, right? So that's really why the stats are being published on a month-to-month basis. I think the Standing Committee kind of needs to assess what that data is telling you in terms of usage and demand. And you guys may have already come to some of those conclusions, but that information should definitely be included in what's in your final report in regards to the usage and demand and what it's explained to the Standing Committee about the system.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, I think the demand question is not answered in any useful way by this system. To be a little bit vivid about this, it's like designing a full-scale transportation system for the future and deciding that let's give everybody roller skates and see what their transit times are through the sidewalk system when meanwhile automobiles are being invented elsewhere.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, Steve, we also need to be cognizant of the fact that since the temporary specifications, the world has moved, and registrars have been receiving requests that are pretty much the same beasts as what we are pertaining to handle there. And they've seen that volume. And when you talk to them, they say, sure, I still receive half of those requests that I used to receive directly, for good and bad reasons. Some of them because, for example, they only accept law enforcement requests through a specific path. And that hasn't changed. And so, sure, I understand what you mean. But at the same time, we know through our discussion with the registrar community also what sort of size of what sort of volume of market of traffic there is there. We're not seeing all of it. I'm not saying that at all. We might see a tenth of it. But it's not something that is well, anyway, in my view, my opinion is not something that is going to explode once we finalize an RDRS the same way, because it still represents some relevant portion, significant portion of the traffic that registrars are seeing outside of this.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Let me suggest, I understand that. It's a perfectly reasonable perspective to have. But there's an alternative perspective, which is even what the registrars are seeing outside of this is gated by the processes that they have in place for receiving requests. And what's not being measured at all and recognized fully that it's hard to imagine how to measure this. But we have no way of knowing that if there was a very efficient system that was consistent with all of the policy issues and all of the legal requirements, but nonetheless was also operated much more smoothly and quickly, what that demand would look like. And for that, at least ask you to hold the idea that it would be qualitatively different or to use your word, that it would be explosively larger. What we saw was a reduction of the original pre GDPR open WHOIS, a reduction in, I forget how many orders of magnitude, but it was like the factor of a hundred thousand or a million fold reduction. Where did all that demand go?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hundreds of millions to thousands.

STEVE CROCKER: There you go. So there's five orders of magnitude just using the numbers that you said. I'm not suggesting that it would explode back up to hundreds of thousands, hundreds of millions more, but there's a hell of a lot of room between thousands and hundreds of millions. And even one order of magnitude would be qualitatively different. And it would not surprise me if it's two orders of magnitude more than we're seeing or so. So at the very least, I think we should be able to agree that we

don't know. And therefore using the data we have might be not very instructive.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We'll have that discussion further, I'm sure. And that's what Steve DelBianco was also hinting, I'm sure. There's a few three people and six minutes to go. So, Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, sorry. This just goes back to Lisa's comment on changing how they're representing some of the data presentation in the monthly reports. And given that I've been doing some analysis of that, I want to make sure I'm understanding what I'm being told. I noted in the past, I'm going to paraphrase this and tell me if my paraphrase is wrong, but I noted in the past that when the data is being reported, it will show for any given month the number of requests that received that month, some of which might have been also responded to that month and some not. And so there was always a little bit of a disconnect between like the number of requests that were shown for that period versus number of responses. And is that what you're purporting to want to change is to match that up? And if not, please correct my misunderstanding.

LISA CARTER: So sure, Gabe. So not specifically. So there's always, obviously, it's a moving target, right? Requests are always coming through. Registrars are always processing. So it's always a moving number. What I'm trying

to explain is that in the past, we literally just gave everyone the data as a snapshot in time. If we grab the data for October on the 2nd of November, whatever data we grabbed for you guys for October and published in the report, that October data stayed static no matter what the registrars did for the rest of the month that may have been affecting those October requests. So now what I'm proposing is instead of freezing the data in time from report to report for said month October, when we're going to do the November numbers, we're going to go back and grab everything in the past, publish whatever it says now is updated for October or previous months and publish that in the most current. So you would then see what the registrars process for October, if the decision dates posted affect October, that data would fall back in the October stats and you would see those numbers change.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Okay. So I might be looking at a November report and see in the November report metrics that were from prior months, October, September, et cetera, that are going to now be slightly different than what were previously published in those months because you're updating it to reflect the most current understanding.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Gabe. Farzaneh, you're next in the queue.

FARZANEH BADI:

Yeah, I'm just going to be very short. So I don't want to open this topic for a conversation, just a question that we can discuss it later. But Lisa,

you mentioned that we are doing these reports to understand and measure the number of requests and the popularity of the system. But then another thing that I think the reports can do is to bring transparency and accountability of the actors and the requesters as well as I can to the issue. So I think that we should have that lens in mind as well. Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, Farzanehj. Yeah. So all the metrics that we currently publish are based on what the small team requested. So just as an FYI, these metrics were basically decided by the small team and what ICANN published.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Alan, I see your hand up and then I will keep 30 seconds at the end.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. I'll be very brief. Some of us believe that the concept that we were building this system to gauge demand was ill-advised to begin with. I think the results have demonstrated that, and not to repeat what Steve said. So although we clearly have to report that information in our final reports, because that's one of the reasons that we were created to begin with, I don't think we should spend an awful lot of time because I don't think using the numbers as a measure of demand are going to be very helpful going forward. And there are other conclusions that I think we want to emphasize more. And so just as we

go forward, let's not waste time refining things which are not going to be particularly useful and work on things that will be. Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

Just to quickly comment on that, Alan, actually the way I'm proposing we present the data is actually easy for us to, makes it easier for us to put the report out month to month. So it's actually a little bit less work than it was to do it the way we've done it in the last year.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I want to wrap this up quickly. I promised you five minutes for the AOB on the surveys for year two. Did you want to take that, Lisa?

LISA CARTER:

Yes, please. Thanks, Seb. So I wanted to bring this to the Standing Committee as a topic, given that you guys are working on your findings, given that the surveys that we've sent out over the last year have, we've kind of gotten a low response rate for both requesters and registrars. The registrar response rate was I think initially quite good, but has trailed off over time. So the data is maybe not statistically significant. I had been working on new questions that I was in review with Farzaneh and Sarah on to potentially change, update those questions going forward for requesters and registrars. But I wanted to find out whether, given now that we have a Lincoln language in both the UI for RDRS and the UI for registrars, that at any point they can send an email to us to say we'd like to do a one-on-one interview with ICANN. Do you all think it's a value to continue the more automated SurveyMonkey surveys, or

do you think it's sufficient to have available one-on-one interviews with ICANN that gives us a little more specific detail from requesters and registrars than a survey might?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, so just answering the quick question, I think there still is going to be value to, and this is personal opinion here, but there still could be potential value to having that automated survey monkey for the sole reason of it perhaps might be able to capture some feedback from someone who isn't quite an ICANN insider to the degree that the rest of us are. Because I think we all have the opportunity to reach out to you directly to schedule these feedback sessions, etc. I would not expect that to be the case of someone who is maybe just responding to the survey because they got it in their inbox after trying to address once because a friend of a friend of a colleague told them to try it right I think that that sort of external feedback would still be valuable. That's my two cents.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabriel. I guess something to put back on the agenda next time we see each other. And I'm just going to two seconds. I'm assuming that we're keeping the 13th, sorry, of January as our next meeting. For those who weren't there at the beginning, I'm not going to be able to attend, but John has already confirmed that he would. So

we're just keeping it and I'll listen to the recording when I land in DC. Seeing nobody screaming against that. Then going, going, gone. Feodora, you've got your answer. The 13th is our next meeting. Thank you very much, everyone, for your contributions. Happy holidays for those who celebrate and see you all in January. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]