
JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 21st of October 2024.

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. 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, all chat sessions are being archived. 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 over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie. Good afternoon, good evening here in Germany, and good morning to everybody. Today, we have a pretty packed session. I just wanted to note for those of you who come on the calls every two weeks, first of all, that we have two guests. Albert Daniels and Rodrigo de la Parra joined us to give us some update on the good work that the GSE is putting for us, and we'll see that in item three. I wanted to also note that Eleeza Agopian is here, replacing Lisa, who's on leave this week. Obviously, Eleeza has been following everything in Lisa's absence, even Lisa's presence.

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.

I wanted to have a quick word regarding the standards of behavior. We had a lively conversation two weeks ago, which I thought was really good on the topic of metric 18 and 19, but they got a bit heated, and in particular, got a bit heated towards our friends and colleagues from staff. We're trying to keep each other up to standards of behavior. I'd like to make sure that we do that with our friends from staff too, and in particular, because, as everybody really understands, they're in a slightly different position that we are working for ICANN. And so I just want to make sure that we keep that in mind, that we keep discussion civil, and that everybody is properly respected. In particular, last week there was one in particular with discussions about outreach to users and sending surveys and these sorts of things. Lisa said or passed on the fact that we couldn't spam. We can't send people surveys just like that, that we needed to have opt-ins before, and we do for those that actually use the system. Her credibility was put in question and it shouldn't happen. So just keep that in mind. Let's keep these good conversations, but let's keep them civil. I see your hand up, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Hello. Thank you, Sebastien. I just wanted to mention that I'm sorry, you shared that agenda with us before, but I think that the discussion on metric 18 and 19 should take place earlier than the other agenda items. As you know, we need to solve this issue and it's up for discussion, so I suggest that we discuss metric 18 and 19 a little bit earlier. I'm also calling it metric 18 and 19 in the agenda items like people don't know what we are going to talk about, so it's better not to talk in numbers. I know that we want to talk in numbers on the Internet, but I believe that

if we actually use a title of what this subject is about, what this topic is about, that would be great. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Again, we have guests, so I want to make sure that we hear them first and then we free the time. For your second point, absolutely. We'll put a longer title behind it and explain exactly what it is, if that's helpful. I'm not very good with numbers either. I remember because we talked about it now for the last few weeks, but I wouldn't know what it is in six months. You're absolutely right.

Listen, actually, there's a lot of things that are into mesh. So maybe we do keep the agenda as it is, but I will try to do my best to leave at least 20 minutes for item eight, so the discussion of those two metrics. I don't know that we have any AOB anyway. But the rest of the stuff, we're going to talk about it already starting in the item two of pending action items. So the discussion is going to be pretty much for the whole hour. We're going to go back in and out of the discussion about those two metrics. If we can go then quickly to the pending action items, and I'm not quite sure who's driving. Oh, Caitlin is driving today.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Yes. Thanks, Seb. As noted, I will keep this short because we are going to be discussing this later in the meeting. But essentially, there was a discussion two weeks ago about the display of metric 18 and 19, or how we show what countries requesters are coming from. And specifically, there was a request about showing which country law enforcement requesters are coming from. So, as we can see, this hasn't been

completed. That's in part because we'll be discussing this later in the agenda.

Then I'll just make a short mention that for those of you who are participating in any sort of outreach events, we do have a tab in the RDRS workbook which I'm displaying here for RDRS outreach, where we can keep track of who's speaking and what was shared, just for the information of the group and anything of interest to the group here. So unless anyone has any questions, we can get back to the agenda. And yes, Gabriel, I see a question. We will send that in chat right now. Thank you. Sorry?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Indeed, later on in this hour, we'll have Gabriel talking about one of those events that he attended to. I don't know if it's in the tab yet or not, but all relevant.

Now, without further ado, I'd like to give the mic to Rodrigo and Albert who will be able to run us through the activities of the Global Stakeholder Engagement group and see what they're doing there for us.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Absolutely. Thank you very much, Sebastien. Greetings, everybody. Many of you already know me and Albert. I am the head of engagement for Latin America and Caribbean region, and Albert leads our efforts of the engagement in the Caribbean. But we are here in our capacity of having been coordinating the engagement efforts from the Org perspective, from the GSE, Global Stakeholder Engagement function.

We are some sort of a bridge between the project management team for RDRS led by Lisa, and our colleagues that lead the work of engagement in the different regions. So we're here to share with you a little bit of our approach that we've been taking since we launched the RDRS pilot. Can we go to the next one, please?

Okay. Basically, we have divided the engagement on two fronts. The first one is in the side of registrars, encouraging them to use the system, and the other one is in terms of those which can be considered potential requesters. Our focus has been from our side in GSE. On the potential requester side, I believe you have been hearing from my colleagues about it going in terms of the registrars that are now using the system. Can we go to the next one, please?

In terms of potential requesters, when we started this about a year ago, we tried to identify the categories of the most frequent or likely to use the system in terms of the requester side. And here are some five categories that we identify. Of course, the intellectual property professionals, law enforcement, governments. Of course, these may fall into similar categories, law enforcement and governments, but the outreach and engagement with governments has been just a general awareness campaign of what it has been doing, but we separated from those in law enforcement. Those are, let's say, more of a heavy users or heavy usage there. Of course, cyber security professionals, researchers, and finally, also consumer protection organizations. Some of them will come also from the government branch, but in some geographies, they have a very particular scope. Can we go to the next one, please?

Some highlights of the engagement and the types of outreach or events or activities, all geographic regions having targeted and covered by the respective regional teams. As you may know, the GSE covers the five official regions of ICANN, plus we do have some focus on some areas. Like in the Asia Pacific region, we have focus on the Pacific Islands. In Latin America and the Caribbean, we have a focus on the Caribbean, in Asia and Africa. We have the Middle East as well, Central Asia, covering some of those countries as well. So as we have colleagues leading these regions, they also focus some of their efforts there.

As part of the initial outreach, it was done via e-mail. We drafted some letters coming from the CEO. They were translated, some of them into different languages. After those letters were sent, some of them received some specific follow-up in terms of whether they received it, whether they understand or understood the contents, or if they had any questions. As you know, the GSE team has a calendar of events or established events that some of them repeat over the years. And in them, we considered that the audience could have been interested in learning more about the RDRS. So as part of our ongoing activities in GSE, we included the topic of RDRS. But then we also thought that it could be a good idea to make some focus events, webinars in each of the regions in order to have the appropriate time zone, speakers, and of course speaking about the language of not only the Spanish or French, but understanding the needs and the dynamics of each of the regions focus specifically on RDRS. Some of you have already learned about them and also queried about them, and perhaps even participated in some of them. We'll see in a later slide the different regions that were covered or have been covered already by these webinars.

Then during our participation in different events, or even as a follow-up of our communications, we have been having also one-on-one conversations with key people from all of the categories mentioned in the previous slides. And then, very importantly, we have found that global and regional organizations, for example, we have quoted here some from the law enforcement agencies category. They have been very helpful in helping us disseminate the information about this with their membership. So when reaching with Interpol or reaching with Europol or CARICOM or others in different regions, they have been also helping us to spread the word. Not only for law enforcement agencies. We have been also engaging with INTA, and they have been very kind to spread the word with their membership, which, as you may know, it's of a global nature. Can we go to the other one, please?

Okay. So this is a map with some examples of our actual engagement in each of the regions. As I mentioned, for the North America region, we have been having a very close relationship with the International Trademark Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Enterprise Institute, the Office of International Affairs, the NTIA. In the case of the Latin American Caribbean Islands regions, we have been reaching out to different CSIRTs, some of them in Chile. There was a focus, just for you to know, we hold this meeting every year with prosecutors, law enforcement. This is an ongoing activity, not necessarily designed to speak about RDRS, but the subject fits perfectly. These are usually requesters about the issues. Actually, this was last year in Chile, in Santiago, and now this year we're having one in Montevideo, Uruguay next week. We have judges, prosecutors, and other agencies for law enforcement in the region. CARICOM and

IMPACS as well, Eastern Caribbean courts, we have had also good engagement with the federal policing in Brazil. In the case of Africa, activities with the AfricaCERT, with the CI-CERT, and the Cyber Security Authority. In the case of Europe, we've been doing engagement with Europol, TF-CSIRT, CERT EU, the Council of Europe, and Eurojust. In Asia and Australia and the Pacific, APCERT, JPCERT, the INTA-Singapore chapter, JPNIC, ETDA-Thailand, the CERT-IN National Disaster Management Authority of the Maldives. Here are some examples. Can we go to the next one, please?

Then, as I mentioned, as part of these efforts, we thought it could be a good idea to make tailored webinars for each of the regions. So far, including the webinars and the specific events, we have 3 for North America, 9 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 8 in Africa, 5 in Europe, and 33 in Asia, Australia, and the Pacific. Can we go to the next one?

We have been working very closely with our Comms team. They have been helping us also to draft the messaging for each of the audiences, but also as part of the engagement efforts, in outreach efforts, we've been using our channels of communications. We've been publishing announcements and blogs, the monthly metric reports, which are you are very familiar with, our social media handles to promote new and evergreen content using Facebook, LinkedIn, X, the conclusion of RDRS content in the different ICANN newsletters, not only the global ones, but all of the regional ones as well. And the Comms team also created a GSE, a toolkit for us, which included slide decks, frequently asked questions, and everything that we needed to support the efforts in a consistent and homogeneous fashion. Can we go to the next one, please?

After this year, we recently got together with the GSE team and the project management team led by Lisa, thinking about what next we should do. We're going to be focusing on continuing on, including the RDRS as a topic on our regular cadence of events. You can look at those in the ICANN global calendar, which is on the [icann.org](https://www.icann.org) website. There are a great variety of these events. Actually, we participate in technical engagement events, civil society events, governmental events, and of course some of the others that are more pertinent to the categories of that. But we'll continue to include that as a topic. It is relevant from various perspectives.

Now we are also looking into the three ICANN meetings. Our colleagues from the GDS, Lisa in particular, they are trying to establish interviews during the ICANN meetings, also to get some feedback to the people, current requesters that have been using the system to see how they're doing. She's going to be there during the whole ICANN meeting to establish these contacts. We are setting some mechanisms to get the people established and get in contact with Lisa. And of course, use this opportunity to have one-on-one conversations with different stakeholders. And I think this is our slide deck. Can we go to the next one? Probably this is the last one, if I'm not mistaken. So yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Rodrigo, this is Sebastien. I see Steve Crocker's hand up. I'm not very good when presenting it following the chat, but there were a few questions about metrics and attendance and etc. in the chat that I saw. Maybe we can point where to find all the information online. But before you answer, I'll give Steve Crocker the mic.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. Rodrigo, thank you very much. Very nice presentation. Just one small comment. In one of the early slides, you listed the different requester groups. And with respect to the cyber security professionals and researchers, in our experience—and I came to this late—people explained to me that there were really two completely separate kinds of groups that would fall under that. One are security practitioners who are aligned pretty much with law enforcement type activities in the sense of tracking down problems on behalf of clients who have troubles and providing input to law enforcement in close to real time or at least more immediate. And conversely, there are a whole different class of people that do research on a more longitudinal basis and broader. As I say, I was kind of advised to understand these as separate rather than lumping them both together. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you, Steve. This is very well noted. And we'll try to provide in our reporting this separation, so that you can see in the reporting that we provide to this group the difference between these two categories, which it's, as you have said, very well identified a separate. I think Steve delBianco is having a problem seeing the slides.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I clicked on Caitlin's tab. I got them back. My bad. Thanks, Rodrigo.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry. I'm fighting against my mute button. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you, Sebastien. Rodrigo, just before I say anything further, just a very quick question. First, thank you, actually. I really appreciate all the efforts that ICANN staff are making to reach out to constituencies, especially law enforcement, public safety. I know how much work you're putting into it. I was just even last week with one of your colleagues doing the same. So thank you very much. But sort of anecdotally, to the extent that you're doing it or that you've heard from others doing this, and especially reaching out to law enforcement agencies like my own, I'm sort of curious what your experience is when you go out and are doing these, to what extent are you hearing reactions of, "Yes, we all are aware of this"? Or are you talking to people that maybe where you're speaking to them and making them aware of the RDRS for the first time? Can you just speak briefly to that?

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Of course, absolutely. I'm not sure about specifically in all of the regions, but I can speak about our own region in Latin America and the Caribbean because we have been experiencing some changes in this regard, right? A year ago that we started, it was actually news to everybody for the first time. They were hearing it from us for the first time. But now we have been having a couple of law enforcement agencies. There's a prosecutor in Argentina that has been following many of the regional and global events, and now they are coming with more specific questions about that. So, I will get back to you in other

regions, but I suspect that after some time, this is becoming more familiar to them. I don't know exactly how they have increased the usage, but in terms of learning about what the RDRS, I think it's becoming more of a topic to them. But at the very beginning, like 10 months ago or 11 months ago when we're starting this, it was very new to them, unknown.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Copy. I appreciate that perspective. And I just want to echo that, just as you and your colleagues have been putting forth really a tremendous amount of efforts to raise awareness, I, in my community of law enforcement, have been really trying to raise awareness too. I somewhat am seeing the same thing where there was zero awareness, even for a few months after already arrest launched. And now I'd say that when I talk to people, about one in 20 are aware, which is far more than zero. So we're making progress.

But I think the key point that I wanted to make is that a year into this and recognizing the significant amount of resources that ICANN staff and others have been putting into raising awareness and doing that outreach and education, I go even now to the YouTube video that I very much appreciate these sorts of resources. But there are two videos that are on how to use the system, and I note that of the two videos, one for requesters and one for registrars, there are 670 views for requesters, 220 for registrars, and this kind of general level of attempts to quantify awareness. This is very difficult to do, but I think that we can sort of take away as qualitative feedback at this point, that it is tremendously difficult to do push awareness campaigns to folks. And this is one reason

why, too—I'm going to beat a dead horse here, Sebastien, I see you nodding along. You know where I'm going with this already. There is one system that already exists that could really hit each and every potential requester in the world and hit them consistently, and that is to make sure that when people are using those decades old WHOIS tools and getting back the responses in the WHOIS system, saying that this is redacted, that right next to that, there's a message, "And here's where you go to request the unredacted data." Until we do that, I think the key takeaway of viewing all of these outreach efforts is that we're not going to be able to try to push our messaging out to ever reach sufficient awareness of this is my anecdotal experience to date that you're in. So I just wanted to highlight that, but also simultaneously to very much thank you for all the outreach efforts. Because I think a year ago, this wouldn't have been as clear to me as it is today. I think that it's only because we've done such a good job of really trying to raise awareness and still seeing the struggles with that that we are so clear right now about the importance of including that messaging within the WHOIS data itself. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you, Gabriel.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I see Farzaneh, and then we'll try to put a bow on this so that we have time for the next discussion. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. My name is Farzaneh Badiei from Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. We protect the privacy and freedom of expression of domain name registrants and generally end users at ICANN. My question is, first of all, in raising awareness about RDRS should not lead to raising expectation of law enforcement agencies that you work with. They should not have this perception that they can just submit any request and have access to the domain name registrants' private, sensitive information, as well as I did not hear in your presentation anything about engaging with civil society and the domain name registrants about the system and what are the safeguards that we have in order to actually protect their rights. And if this is something that the GSE is interested in, we can totally arrange a meeting with NCSG to discuss how we can raise awareness. Unfortunately, the person who was in charge of the domain name registrants' rights and responsibilities, I think he was a part of the GSE team and he's not there anymore. So it would be good to talk and think about domain name registrants and how they can be affected, and also telling them what sort of safeguards we have.

My final point is that when you work with law enforcement agencies around the world, we would very much like to know which law enforcement agencies you actually raise awareness. You had an "etc." on your slide, we would like to, for the sake of transparency and also to make your work easier because we can also say, "Okay, well, there is this law enforcement agency that is interested as well," so it would be great to know, if possible, exactly which agencies you would expect.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Can I?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, please. Please go ahead.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you, Farzaneh for your comments and questions. To the first point, I think, in my opinion, the way the messaging has been tailored when reaching out, I think it makes very clear the rationale to start using the system stems precisely from protecting registrants, the information, and to follow the legislation and regulation on that. That's perhaps the beginning and I think it's made very clear in this messaging.

The second part of your comment/question, I think the focus so far has been in terms of how to promote the usage, right? So we're really looking at requester to actually see the pilot or this testing working. We, nevertheless, having some presentations, I can see them from the list for a couple of organizations dealing with civil society or Internet end users from our community. We have had some presentations with some of the RALOs for particular awareness as part of the community, they know that this is happening. But I think it's interesting to continue to emphasize the idea that this system is perfectly in compliance with data protection and privacy laws. It's trying actually to help one very important but specific aspect of the request of information, which is linking both the requesters and the registrars. But then the actual provision of the information comes from different place.

As to which kind of law enforcement, I am sure that we can prepare something. Maybe we can drill down a little bit the categories or subcategories of which law enforcement agencies we've been approaching. But in general, I can tell you that those related to or part of the membership of some of the regional and global organizations you've seen in the presentation, like the Interpol or others, they may change from country to country in terms of the remit, but the at the very end, those are the ones that have these legitimate interests, not requesting information who are doing their investigations for crime thing. But thank you for raising these questions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Rodrigo, for this excellent presentation. As I said, full disclosure of Rodrigo, Rodrigo and I had a discussion a few weeks back to discuss these things when I was trying to find out a bit what was happening there and everything. I invited him, and I'm reiterating in front of the whole group, also to reach out to us when possible. I think that it also gives credibility to the pilots and the project, to hear it from us, from this team. I want to say the horse's mouth, but close to the topic to be able to present. In that sense, I know, John McElwaine, that you've participated in one of the presentations recently. I know, Gabriel, you're going to talk to us about another one that is not exactly the same way, but all this is good, and I want to make sure that we continue being able to participate in these things.

With this, I wanted to wrap because we've got a topic that I did want to dedicate some good amount of time on it. But thank you very much and

see you guys soon, I assume, in Istanbul, for those of us that are going to be there. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thanks for having us. Bye-bye. See you soon.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can we quickly go back to the agenda and we'll try to push through, make sure that we can keep the 20 minutes that I promised? Very quickly, a quick announcement. A few weeks back, I can't remember exactly what it was, but I was at the middle of moving and things. I wasn't completely there, and staff suggested that I ask somebody to join me as a vice chair of this group. It might seem a bit of an overkill, particularly because we've done a whole year without it. But I think it's a good idea. I think that indeed, I'm not infallible. Next week, I will try to take some time off.

So I have kindly asked John McElwaine if he wanted to do me the honor of being my vice chair. And for those who remember, John and I were working together on the Council, we've got a good working relationship. I think that John has earned the respect, the trust of this group and others. John very kindly confirmed that he would be available for it. Unless somebody is absolutely dying to take this very important and very hot position. Otherwise, I would appreciate or I'd be very grateful if we were able to close this topic quickly by all agreeing that John is the absolute perfect person to be a vice chair for this group and move on. Giving three seconds for everybody to assess. Everybody's absolutely happy. Thank you very much. And congratulations, John. Seriously, I

know that, like all of us, you're a busy man. But thank you very much for accepting this, very helpful.

Next topic, topic five, is the session preparation for ICANN. Let's do it as a plug and then move on. We don't have topics for ICANN. I have a big topic that I'd like to discuss, which is what we're doing, to get the ball rolling now with the report. I understand that the registrars have been doing quite a bit of work, and they will present, or they will be ready to share that work. I see your hand up, Sarah. What I really, really want to make sure of is that we don't have just a presentation for the registrars and nothing on the other side, and particularly just tearing down when sides are presentation or work, it's not very fruitful. So I want to make sure that everybody goes prepared and we have the discussion. Any other topic, I'm also ready to take on board. We'll have only an hour amongst ourselves in ICANN, and as always, there'll be some update needed for those that are not part of this group present in the room. But in general, open to topics. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Unfortunately, I do not have an excellent alternative topic idea. With regards to the registrar, contribution towards the assignment discussion topics, I have been gathering that from our participating registrars, who have all been very diligent and helpful, and I intend to submit that into the shared document next week so that it will be available well in advance of ICANN81. I had not intended to present on it particularly, and I'm happy to talk it through at whatever meeting is appropriate, although as I will not be in Istanbul in person, the time zone is not really friendly. So I might ask Roger, if he's there in person,

to talk through the input. But if you're looking for anything more formal than that, please do let us know. Thank you. I hope not. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think from your side, it's absolutely perfect, and I'm glad to hear that you will put it in next week. I just want to make sure that everybody comes down prepared. I think that you guys are but I want to make sure that everybody else comes back prepared. That's all. And it's invitation to that. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, two things. In this morning's meeting between PSWG and I guess it was the Commercial Stakeholder Group, if I recall correctly.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right.

STEVE CROCKER: There was a fascinating sequence. Steve delBianco started it off. Steve, can I keep going? Because I want to put you on the spot to share what you shared there. Then Gabe had some interesting data to support this. That was one thing.

And then the second topic that might be of interest is that the whole privacy/proxy situation really has a first order impact on the utility of any system, whether it's RDRS, SSAD, anything else with respect to the utility of the data, assuming that people actually make requests and

actually get responses back, whether or not it serves their purposes. So those are two topics. I've only alluded to the first one, but let's see if Steve lets me put him on the spot here.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Glad to, Sebastien, if the time allows.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do. Do it quickly, but please do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Every quarter, BC leadership gets together with ICANN CEO. We discuss a range of topics. It was in that back and forth where Sally said that RDRS is, of course, intended to measure demand for registrant disclosure. And as such, have we learned enough to know that there's no demand? I'm paraphrasing, Sebastien. So, naturally, I pushed back on that because, Sebastien, you chaired a small team that was the precursor to the Standing Committee, where those of us other than the contracted parties said over and over again this would be a terrible assessment of demand since the expectation of getting disclosure isn't there. So as soon as people taste it and determine they don't get disclosures, or they get pointed to a privacy/proxy or that the registrar is not participating, they won't come back. And their lack of demand is a function of the fact that the toll doesn't produce what the demand is seeking. So I had that conversation with Sally, and she's the outgoing CEO. Really, it doesn't very matter very much, but it's indicative of maybe an expectation that has become baked into the ICANN

leadership and staff, and it might actually infect the new CEO and their expectations for what RDRS was about. The pilot program has a broader range.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Steve, can I cut you there, because you're getting already into the discussion that we will have there. Let's agree to put it. I understand it's on the agenda. Let's not have the discussion now, because indeed, we want to discuss the important discussion about metrics 18 and 19, and I'm already four minutes a liar here. We'll put it on the agenda for anyone. Agreed.

I do want to say, very briefly, I need to balance this group also. We've had this discussion before, between getting into the more political of what policies we're going to derive from this exercise, because I don't think it's part of this group right here. But I'll just use that as my intro to point six, the update RDRS to the Council last week. For those that follow the Council, I was given 10 minutes to give a brief update on what we're doing here. I wasn't able to completely finish. I took a bit too much time, and we're running out the clock, so I still need to send the Council a letter in the direction of the letter that I already prepared three months ago and left aside after discussions on it. But I will try, once again, to finish this letter and share it with this group this week with the intent of sending that to Greg and the Council. I want to make sure that we're not trespassing here, that we are keeping to the pilot, and if this political discussion needs to be had, which I believe it does, to see if it is for this group to do it or another parallel group to run it, which I'd love not to have to drive this particular discussion. But that's

me personally. With this, I agree. Let's take that to a discussion in Istanbul and we'll table that. Gabriel, I hate to do that to you, but can we have the discussion on metric 18 and 19 now, and maybe see if we have some time afterwards?

Okay, so point eight. I don't know exactly how we wanted to do this. I think that staff had prepared. I'm sorry. I had notes in front of me, but things are going a bit faster and I didn't read and calculate everything at the same time. But staff did prepare some follow-up on this discussion last week. We were also supposed to give some elements to staff to that, or this group was supposed to, or those that wanted to send it, we had discussed about taking the points that Thomas had put in the chat and sort of presenting that a bit better. But I see Eleeza's hand up. Please go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Sure. Thank you, everyone. This is Eleeza Agopian from ICANN Org. As Seb mentioned earlier, Lisa is on holiday this week, so I'm filling in for her. So please forgive me if I fumble anything, as I wasn't on your last discussion. But Lisa did bring me up to speed before she went out on vacation, and we've had some conversations internally. So we wanted to come back to you based on the feedback that we heard on the last call to continue this discussion. And I sent a note back to Paul regarding his questions on the outstanding action items. We thought it best to put those aside for now so that we could revisit the discussion about the metrics and data that you were seeking. We have some mock-ups to share, which I think Caitlin is going to display, but I wanted to give you a little bit of context before we look at those.

First of all, I wanted to say thank you for the feedback. It's a lot of data that we're looking at, so it's really important that we understand your ask clearly and that we're presenting our position and our presentation of the data as clearly as possible. ICANN is committed to operating this pilot and of course working with the Standing Committee to make sure you have the data and the metrics you need so that it fulfills your scope and the work that you're trying to do here. And of course, allows us to continue to operate the pilot in the best way to serve those needs and to serve, of course, the ongoing community discussion about RDRS. I have tree trimmers right outside my window, so if you can't hear me, please let me know and I will move. Sorry, it's a bit distracting.

So we went back, we looked at the ask a little more. We have two mock-ups that we're going to share that would fulfill those two metrics. So, Farzaneh, to your point, 18 is the one that breaks down requests by law enforcement type and the country code where those requesters are coming from. 19 would similarly break down the data, but it would be by jurisdiction where the data is being processed. That's kind of a high-level explanation. So basically, there are some important caveats, though, to how we can share the data. Caitlin, may I ask you to please share the mock-ups, just so that it might be a little bit easier to follow along as I'm talking?

The first, of course, is that it's important to know that the RDRS doesn't include an authentication mechanism. I know this group has talked about this, but that means when a request comes in and the type is listed as law enforcement, we don't actually know whether that's coming from a law enforcement authority. That is the requester indicating that that is the type of request it is. We have heard instances

of some requesting that, and it turns out they might be a private attorney participating in an investigation. There could be different interpretations of what that is. We've tried to clarify that. And I believe this group has worked on coming up with text to make clear what it means to select that type. But we're not actually authenticating any of these requests or the identities behind the requesters. So I think that's a really important caveat to keep in mind.

Second, as the RDRS, and of course ICANN, isn't really the recipient of these requests, but really a forwarding mechanism to the appropriate registrar. We're not actually evaluating or making any determinations about the assertions that are in those requests. So again, no authentication mechanism, and this isn't really the permanence for those requests. I think that's another important caveat to keep in mind. As I said, the information that you're seeing here is really parsed from that request type category, which is a drop-down menu within the requester interface, and that this is coming from a type of request, not the type of person or type of requester who is making the request. So I wanted to include that this is a self attestation and one that we can't actually verify. Sorry, Farzaneh, I just saw your comment. What I'm talking about here is a caveat to what the data represents. So we're not indicating whether this is coming from actual law enforcement, or in any of these categories, these individuals, we're not authenticating who the requester is. That's what I wanted to make clear.

Lastly, I wanted to propose that, while we can include this data in future reports, it would probably require the production of a separate CSV, particularly for this chart, because there's so many different categories, it's keyed one to many rather than one to one, so it would probably

come as a separate CSV, but that's something we can talk about separately.

So that was really quick. I wanted to just share that with you and allow you some time for discussion. I know it's very limited, so I'll stop here so that I can answer any questions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sarah, I see your hand up immediately.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. Thanks for that explanation. My first note or thought that comes to mind is, as a registrar receiving a request, we would have the same issue where the request is labeled as law enforcement and we have to evaluate whether that's correct or not because there is no authentication. So I would say that if the registrar needs to consider the data that's presented to them in order to evaluate a request, then this group and ICANN Org should also consider that same data when publishing metrics. I'm not really clear on how that would change things. What I recall seeing earlier is a metric that showed the top three countries, and then everybody else stuck together. When I look at the most recent report, I don't see that at all. So I think I'm not sure what's up with that. But where does this leave us? Can we get the metrics of all the countries? Did you say that and I just missed it because there's data on screen? Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, I wasn't very clear. Yes, we can share the data breakdown by country as you're seeing here in this mock-up here.

SARAH WYLD: Oh, there's countries on the left. Yeah, that's okay. I like it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, we have indeed all the countries or a bunch of countries, at least the ones that issued some requests, I assume, and then the requested types?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The data from the month of September.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, that was going to be my question. So this is specifically September?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Any other questions? Marc Anderson, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi. I guess, reacting to what Eleeza just said, there seems to be concern that this is self-reported, unverified data, right? I guess I understand the concern, and I think maybe that just can be called out in the reporting, just providing a note that this data is exactly that. It's self-reported by requesters and unverified data. Then I think, as Sarah said, that as such, it should be understood and treated that way. So I think that's fair to call out, and I think that could be accounted for in the reporting so there aren't any misconceptions when viewing the data. And then just agreeing with Sebastien, I think a CSV is fine. I think we can all make use of that. I understand how your point about the data and listing, every country code reported can make this unwieldy. So I'm sure a CSV will be fine. I thank you in advance.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Three-second rule. Go ahead, Eleeza. I don't need to invite you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. I just wanted to note that yes, I kind of went over that quickly. We can start including this data in future reports. I hadn't mentioned that earlier. We wanted to bring it to you today, just to make sure that the presentation looked okay to you, and that the caveats and explanations that I suggested including were okay for the committee as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Farzaneh, I see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Sorry. Just to clarify next steps, so the next RDRS report will include the number of law enforcement requests and the country they are coming from with no exception. There's no threshold on reporting or anything like that, those things that were raised two weeks ago. So we are not going to consider those. So the reporting is going to be similar to this sheet that you are showing us.

Another thing that I wanted to ask is that two weeks ago, we were asked to provide a letter or reason for ICANN to report on this. I just wanted to know if you still want that so we can get that. But if there's no problem and you're going to just report on the numbers in the way that I see it on the sheet in the report, then that's great.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thanks, Farzaneh. Yes, to be clear, this is what we're proposing, a report, this type of a table with all of the information. I suggested holding off on those action items because I was not part of that conversation, but from what I understand, I think there was a bit of confusion in what our request was and what we were trying to understand. What we wanted to be clear about is that ICANN is not the recipient of these requests. ICANN does not review the request, nor does ICANN evaluate who the requester is. So when the example of a transparency report for a company like Google or other large technical corporations that do provide reports on their interactions with law enforcement, that's a little bit different. We are here to pass those requests on, and because the requests are ultimately filtered, not filtered, excuse me, evaluated by registrars, and it's really their responsibility to evaluate those requests, not ICANN, that's where we

want understanding what the reference was to transparency. I think based on the information we're providing to you, and with the understanding that this information and these requesters aren't being authenticated, that's not something we're looking to discuss any further. I think we understand what you're seeking and why the information is important. So if this meets with your approval, we are happy to include it in the November report, which will start calculating data from October, and that will be published, I think, sometime after ICANN81 so you'll see it in that report.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Just to create, to set absolute expectations, I think I heard it but I'm not quite sure if I fully heard it, because this data as is right now has been unwieldy, that's going to be in a CSV. What exactly is going to be the PDF? Just so that people don't expect that to be fully in a 50-page PDF.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

No, I think we will include this in the PDF. It might require its own page. We're still trying to figure it out in terms of the CSV, because that is a compliment to this report. We think this table in particular might be its own CSV because there are so many different cells involved. But we can come back to you with that on the list with more specifics. I see my colleague, Dana, who's a lot more versed in the data than I, maybe she can answer. Dana?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Go ahead, Dana.

DANA KUEBLER:

Hey there. Hi. I just want to let you know that it may be better to have it in the PDF for the very purpose of making sure that that caveat is well understood in context with the data. If you separate it into a CSV, in a separate thing, which is nifty and nice, it then creates potentially confusion in what this data represents that we've just discussed. So I love CSVs, and maybe we can do both, but I want to make sure that the caveat is in there. Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. That's fair enough. Thank you. So we will have a PDF that is increased but it's for a good cause.

With this, we're at time. I hope that everybody that had questions two weeks ago and was left with many more questions after the discussion this good two weeks ago had their questions answered on a very personal note. This is better than what I heard last week. Thank you very much, staff, for pushing this through. I hope that the people behind this request are satisfied and we're able to move forward. Thank you very much.

Gabriel, I'm very, very sorry I skipped you. I'm still interested about your experience and your presentation, but maybe we should be able to do this next time. I guess is it already at ICANN, or we'll have a meeting before? I can't remember, but we'll see this on the list, etc.

Thank you very much, everybody. Have a good rest of your day and talk to you all soon.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Sebastien. Thank you, everyone, for joining. This meeting has concluded.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]