
ICANN Transcription

RDRS Standing Committee

Monday, 20 May 2024 at 17:30 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/SgCNEg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

All right. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 20th of May 2024. For today's call, we have apologies from Steve Crocker, Paul McGrady, Sarah Wyld, and John McElwaine. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please speak up now.

All right. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat-only and have listen-only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. Back over to you, Sebastien. You can begin.

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

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Julie. Welcome back, everybody. As you remember, we had to skip our call last week because of the Contracted Parties Summit here in Paris. So we decided this call should be the call where we review the data that was published last week, too, 10 days ago. Because we had to skip last week and because we're running into our ICANN80 decision process, we decided to mix the two sessions today and talk about the Usage Report that's spent also a fair amount of time on the feature enhancement and where we decided to go with this.

I don't need to make much more of an introduction. I think that, Lisa, you wanted to walk us through some of the learnings that we got from the Contracted Parties Summit. We ran a session there or rather Lisa and the registrars ran a session there to show experiences and feedback on how the tool was being used on the response side and what could be brought as enhancement. But I'll let you walk us through that, Lisa. Go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Sebastien. Hi, everyone. The session we had at the CP Summit was a really good one. Registrars got to share some of their experiences with the RDRS. I was hoping, actually, since Roger's on the call, that he might share what the Registrars some of that feedback directly. Roger, I don't know if you would like to do that. I have some notes of my own that I can share, but it might be good for people to hear what the Registrars directly indicated for some of their feedback.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Lisa. Let me follow up with you. I'll have you go first and then I'll follow up on anything.

LISA CARTER: Okay. Sounds good.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Sure. Just from some of the things that were mentioned on the call, I took some notes for some of the feedback we got. There were definitely questions on participating registrars and how many participating registrars actually receive requests, what that subset is of registrars, how many specifically as a new metric, potentially. Something for you guys to discuss definitely. There was also a question about if there were any duplicates in the requests that are happening. Presuming that means duplicates in the domain names that are being inserted to request data for. I'm presuming that's what that is, but maybe you can clarify that a little more, Roger. Then also there was a question about how many of those inquiries are for ccTLDs. Potentially that could be a metric you guys want to discuss as well.

There was some talk about the entire ticket contents being forwarded to the registrar to avoid having to log into RDRS. We talked a little bit about the fact that you can use the PDP

encrypted e-mail. If you provide that key in the system, registrars, that would come to you in a PDP encrypted e-mail that could be decrypted. I think the challenge there is that lots of people's systems don't intake that data in a way that's useful to them. It would basically stay in the format of an e-mail through the PDP. So there's, I think, some additional discussion that wants to happen around that.

We talked about primary reasons for denials. There were some people that indicated not getting accurate information on the requester was one of those reasons. And I think specifically related to the fact that the system that you log into allows you to put information that maybe not be your own personal information. You could include your company information instead of your actual own first name and last name. That's presenting challenges, I think, for some people getting denials because they're not providing that information to registrars.

What else do I have? There was some talk about the quality of requests from a registrar's perspective. Still needing further explanation, more detailed explanation because what's currently being provided still isn't quite sufficient. And those are also causing some denials. We have mention of barrier to participation for registrars. There were some that said obviously the work involved in using RDRS and their own systems added a lot of time to their workflow. There was also some mention of some of the conversations that happened back at ICANN79 with reactions from requesters as maybe a barrier as well. Predictability in response was actually something that was brought up from a requester side, so more explanation to requesters about how

registrars do their balancing when they determine what information they're going to be disclosing or not. That was brought up.

Then also there was something brought up related to needing more explanation on what exactly expedited means. There is explanation on what expedited means in the user guides for both requesters and registrars. Sorry, I'm just seeing Steve's question. One second. Let me look at that. It's not coming up for me. Do you have registrars at—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, I can help. There's two questions. First of all, there's a question from Farzaneh asking if there was a recording, and I can't remember exactly because not all sessions were recorded. But if there was a recording for that one, if you could share it, that would be fantastic.

LISA CARTER: Yes, there is a recording. I'd have to go onto the website and get it really quickly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It doesn't have to be now. You can share it on the list, I think that'll be good. Then the question from Steve DeBianco was, "Was there any registrars that are not participating at the summit but not participating in RDRS?" Yes, there were. There were a few voices explaining why they weren't.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Can you share some of those explanations so we can better understand how to bring them on board?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't have everything captured in the note. Roger, Lisa, please keep me honest. One of them was duplication of work. Why do I have to work with RDRS when I already have a system? There was also the fact that some people didn't want to beta test a service. Were happy to try again a bit later once the teeing was over but weren't ready to spend time doing that, which I'll appreciate the comment myself. But anyway. Let's be clear here on the recording, there were also people that were unhappy about the feedback that they were getting from the requester community. They thought it was too negative and said, "Why should I bother?" I don't think that was the majority. Certainly not very large registrars but that was heard, too. Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: I was just going to add that I think a couple of people said that they didn't have the demand or that their model wasn't allowing them to need to have to respond to those types of requests as well. Then a couple of people, I think, mentioned that because larger registrars are participating, that they thought they would just wait for the outcome in terms of what's happening with the larger people that are participating.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Just to tack on to that. Lisa touched on it when she was talking earlier. It's probably the lower the volume, maybe the more perceived overhead for registrars. If they're only getting one or two requests a month or whatever, it becomes more of an administrative task than actually a request task. The larger registrars that get consistent requests daily, it's just part of their process that gets wrapped in on a daily mechanism. So I think that it's not necessarily a huge overhead, but in a smaller situation, smaller registrars, it is to them a bigger burden when they have to go out and actually do something. And I think that led into what Lisa was talking about on the can the request just be sent to them and it can be if you sign up for the encryption. But as Lisa said, it's not very friendly for many of the ticketing systems that registrars use. So I think that something there could be worked out or figured out, but I don't know that that's really something that this pilot is going to have to do. I think that the pilot has identified an area of improvement, but actually making that happen, it doesn't seem realistic in the pilot. But a future thing beyond the pilot could easily be an API where registrars can connect to securely instead of sending it via e-mail or logging into the NSP.

Again, I think on Lisa mentioning the quality discussion, I think that one of the big things there is ICANN80, the registrars are going to have a session specifically looking at requests they've gotten and some that, "This request had the information that was needed and was approved." Then look at ones that said, "These weren't approved because of these things missed." I think that quality

discussion at the summit is leading into a great session at ICANN80 on that. I think that's about it for me. Thanks, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Roger. Before I go through the queue, maybe you can explain a bit more the philosophy of that session. This is going to be an open session for everybody, not just registrars, where registrars will look at real cases that we will have removed any personal information, I'm going to say, but re-analyzing live cases and help understand what worked and what didn't, right?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. That's the session. I don't remember what day it was on at ICANN80 in a few weeks. And it will be taking, as you said, actual examples that have already been processed, again, some that were denied and some that were approved and showing how that works. And it'll get into some of the issues that we talk about. I think Lisa hit on the predictability. If you go to one registrar, you may get a different response. That'll get pulled out. It's like they're in a different jurisdiction, they have a different rules to follow or whatever it is. It's going to be that really good practical session, looking at actual requests that have come in, and once they've been approved and denied then we can take a look at that. I think something important on the denials, I know some registrars just deny it and you don't get a lot back on that. But other registrars deny it with fairly good volume of explanation of why it didn't and what was missing. I think that if a denial comes across, one of the things the requesters need to do is not just accept the denial, but look at if the registrar did provide some good examples or good

details, look at that as well. Again, we'll go over that as well at the ICANN80 session.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Roger. Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Roger. I was going to ask more about that session, too. As you know in the last call, I had said that the CSG was going to host a session similar to what we did in San Juan. In response to registrar interest, I had said let's have prominent registrars who are participating the most sit at the table with us and be able to interact and answer questions as they come up. It sounds like having two sessions is always better than one, but I would hope that if requester community wants to participate, if it's possible, Roger, would love to sit around the table and have an opportunity to ask questions if the time comes. Thank you.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thanks, Steve. I think many registrars have marked that CSG meeting on their calendars to attend. As you said, I think the best part is the multiple sessions and getting it from a different view. I think that's the best part in seeing how the questions come up. Will all the questions get answered? I don't know if they do or not, but at least the questions get out there so people can start thinking about them.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve and Roger. Marc, I see your hand up. Marc, if you're speaking, you might be muted. You appear unmuted but we can't hear you.

MARC ANDERSON: How about now? Can you hear me now?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We can hear you now. Perfect.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. Sorry about that. I was at that session at the CP Summit and I had a couple of notes I wanted to check on to what Lisa and Roger said. First one, Lisa and Roger both touched on this, but one of the things that stuck out for me, and I think Lisa, in monitoring the session put out a question to registrars in the room, have you seen an improvement in the quality of requests? The impression I got was a little bit of frustration from registrars in general. They have not seen an improvement in the quality of requests. One of the items I wrote down was a specific example, frustration of pages and pages of explanation of a requester's trademark. And it was difficult to find what the domain was that the requester was actually looking for data about. A specific item of feedback would be to make it clear to the registrar specifically what domain you're requesting data disclosure for. That was one I heard a number of times.

Another item I wanted to share was request from companies rather than individuals. What I heard from some registrars in the

room is that they cannot accept disclosure requests from companies. It has to come from individuals. I don't have notes on why. I don't know why that is the case. I just captured that in my notes that some registrars are having to deny requests because the individual requester is not identifying themselves. That was an item that came out in my notes.

Then the last one, Lisa touched on this in the beginning. You mentioned the number of registrars receiving requests. Lisa, maybe you can make sure I have this right. But from my notes, I think only 14 or 15 of the 88 participating registrars have received requests so far. Can you confirm, do I have that right? Maybe I captured that wrong in my notes. But it seems like of the participating registrars, a relatively small number are receiving requests so far. That's a little color from my notes to share with everybody.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Marc. I think Roger too wanted to answer one of Marc's questions, and then Lisa also. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Thanks, Marc, for adding that in. Just to touch on the point Marc talked about the company versus individual. The company making the request is not a big deal. The issue is if you get an approval, the person that's receiving the data has to be known just for chain of command. I don't think anybody had a problem with a company saying, "Hey, we have this claim or whatever." In order to provide the data, that actual person that's

getting the data has to be a known person and it has to be attributable. I think that was the big thing that was trying to be said is the identification of that person requesting is also needed, not just the company. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Roger. Lisa, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: I was just going to comment on what Marc said. We don't currently actually provide the subset of the number of registrars getting requests of the overall quantity. I think we're now at 88 based on the last report. We don't provide that. But I think that we didn't speak to what that number specifically was at the meeting. But it's something I think people may want to have as a metric, and I think it was talked about maybe discussing if that was a metric that should be added.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think the way it came out from the meeting is that we've sent a questionnaire to all registrars that had received requests or process requests asked to give impressions on the RDRS. Some people raised their hand and said, "Hey, I've never received this." And it turned out that it was because they hadn't received a request by the time the questionnaire was sent. If I remember well, that's how it came up.

LISA CARTER: Based on the survey results, yes. We sent the survey to the only people that processed requests within the system. That was 29 users. Then of that 29, I think we had 15 that actually responded to the survey. That's probably the number you're thinking of.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't want to belabor the discussion about the sessions at ICANN88, but I want to make sure that we're fully clear. Both the registrar and the CSG sessions will be open to everybody. We're not doing this behind closed doors. It's not cross-community in the sense that hasn't been organized as a session that doesn't conflict with anybody else, for sure. It's individual sessions from these groups. But the doors are very open. Everybody around the table is very much invited to participate in these discussions from both groups, I've heard.

Okay. With this said, and if there is no longer any questions on the Usage Report—and I've seen briefly, I think it was from Eleeza sharing the recording or sharing the sched entry for it. So you'll find the recording if you haven't seen it. Thank you, Eleeza. With this, and if there's no further question on this, maybe we can go through the Usage Report. As you both looked at it, maybe I'll just open the floor and see if anybody wants to make any comment, has any questions about it. I see Steve's hand. Go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks. If you scroll to the bottom of page four, I will note that it says that for the month of April, the average response time was 6.73, but overall 14.09. And based on the table below and the

reporting that came out from Domain Insight, I think that's confusing. Do you believe those two numbers are transposed? That it should have been 14 for April and 6.7 year to date? That's for staff, by the way. Bottom line of the page where it says 6.73 for April, I think that should have been 14 and 6 for the total.

LISA CARTER:

Hold on one second. Just double-checking, Steve. I actually think we're going to actually have to take a look just to go back and double-check and then we'll come back to the same committee.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

If you click on the hyperlink to the bookmark of average disclosure requests right above that line, if you don't mind, that seems to indicate that the period of April was 6.73. But how would that get us to 14 if we've consistently been below that? Look at the table below where you indicate that in April, it was 14.09. Right there in the bottom line on the screen. So I think that we have to figure out whether it's consistent before we dive into, "Well, what are we doing wrong with our requests that we're getting such a long period of time?"

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Lisa, if you're looking at the same metric a month ago, it was for the month 5.29 days and on average, 5.76. And then in one month, the average blew threefold, essentially.

LISA CARTER: Right. Got it. We'll take a look at it. We'll have to get back to you guys with more specifics.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. Then whatever the number is, if it's even only up a little bit, we still want to have the dialogue that Roger brought up of what is causing a denial or, Roger, what is causing things to take longer to approve both cases.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you, Steve. Any other hands or comments about these metrics?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll just add that Becky Burr, Steve Crocker, Gabriel, a couple of us have been going back and forth on e-mail. And yet, if the data we're looking at isn't properly there, then we're out there spinning about percentiles and quartiles that we may not need to be. So if we're able to fix the data, we'll just reissue a new report.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We'll confirm on the list, either way. What data might have been there to skew that number if it is indeed the right calculation or if it was a mistake. I know indeed in that exchange that—I think it was Steve Crocker that was mentioning that maybe an average is not as good as a metric as a—the name escapes me. Not the average, but the halfway point. The median. Thank you very much. It might be a better way of presenting. But anyway, we'll

look at it. First things first, indeed, can you confirm that the data is correct and there's no glitch in the way it's being calculated? Thank you. Any other comments on it? I see Gabe's hand up. Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Speaking to this exact metric and noting that Sarah couldn't make this, I nonetheless wanted to reiterate, I believe, a position that she had advocated for previously that I think many of us outside the registrars were supportive of, but noting that when a registrar communicates back to a requester that they're lacking some critical piece of information in order to proceed, the inability of these metrics to denote that the ball has shifted back into the quarter of the requester might be doing some registrars a disservice and that their clock is still ticking when really the action has left their hands. Not sure to what extent the ongoing conversation between registrars and ICANN staff is on that point going to enable some better clarification, but just wanted to call that out, that I think that that was a very valid point that was mentioned before to make sure that we are in fact tracking the actual time that the registrars are taking to respond and not inadvertently capturing other folks' responsibilities. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabriel. I heard Reg Levy particularly mention that. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Can you hear me okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We can, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Okay, good. I switched microphones. All right. First, to Gabe's point, with this particular metric, this was always going to be a little bit of a question mark, I think, because the tendency when looking at this metric is the assumption that this is how long it takes a registrar to respond to disclosure request. But as Gabe just pointed out, as Sarah has said on the list, this particular metric is not always 100% in the control of registrars. So I think we just have to be careful in understanding what this metric is telling us. Gabe gave the example, there may be back and forth between the requester and the registrar. I think all of us on this call, all of us who have been involved in this discussion, understand that this metric is not completely under the control of the registrar, and so I think that's just something that we have to be cognizant of when we're looking at this metric and evaluating what it means.

Second part, though, is a question for Lisa or staff, is have you looked at what is driving this increase in average disclosure requests? Is there any particular outlier? Have you looked at it at all? There's been a bit of discussion. And obviously, this has drawn the attention of people within the group and in the broader community. I see Lisa's next up in the queue. Hopefully she has an answer for me. But I think all of us on this call are wondering if you have any insight into what is driving this increase in average disclosure request response time.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, Marc. I just wanted to go back to something that Gabe mentioned in regards to the data basically not providing the detail that potentially it's not the registrar that is at fault for the amount of time it's taking. It might be the fact that the registrar is waiting on a requester. I think in the past, there had been some talk about in the feedback and the impressions document asking for something that allowed a status of some sort to be shown about whose action was being taken. That's something that would actually require a change in the system, and we need to be a discussion with registrars on their appetite for utilizing the system more to have an update on status. You'd have to be willing to be in that system more frequently. I believe the lift to actually implement something like that was either a medium to large LOE.

In regards to Marc's question about understanding why that's happening, we actually don't have really visibility into what's driving it at this point. We can look at outliers and see if that maybe it, but obviously we can't share the [whose] of where that might be happening to cause that number to be what it is.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

You can't share the whole case, but if you can explain, even if you don't say who and what and where, but say yes, there is indeed a case that has so many days and that's how the data went but they would already have been clarified. Roger, I see your hand up.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Just tagging along, I think Gabe started this conversation on how this is period. As Lisa talked about, it would require registrars to once again go in and do something to the records. Again, I don't know if there's a good solution, if that's the right solution. It sounds like the most logical solution, but that does require more effort. As Lisa mentioned, I obviously develop an effort on their side as well. Again, I think this goes back a while, but the other discussion was if there is more information either, whatever it is, is that just truly market denied and say, "Hey, can you resubmit with more details or whatever?" Because then something that was brought up earlier is multiple requests for the same domain, and then that would show that as well. I think that's a tough thing that I don't know if this group can work out or not. Maybe they can. But again, I think there's several paths and it's going to be a bit of work to go down either path. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Roger. I see Gabe's hand. And then afterwards maybe we'll draw a line because I wanted to make sure that we also cover the rest of the agenda. We already have 35 minutes in. Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay. I'm being swift then. I just note that this topic is linked to another topic that I had raised about some of my law enforcement colleagues raising the issue of requesters having gone through the RDRS and part of the response from the registrars is asking them to go and create duplicative accounts or triplicative or whatever, four, five, six, dozen go to at the individual registrars in

order to get the data back to them. And I know that this is linked in the sense that we are obligated to do so because there is concern about the rate of which ICANN will be involved in. Seeing the PII that's returned back, the Personally Identifying Information, that might also be why ICANN lacks visibility here into the status request because the entire return of the information is outside of ICANN's visibility due to that concern. But we might here be noting then that while we aren't able to fix this within the pilot period of RDRS, we are nonetheless describing design constraints for a successor system that we would like to see fixed, both to enable the registrars to be able to communicate this back and have ICANN recognize that, yes, in fact, the ball is in the court of the requester to follow up with their information. But similarly, if we're doing this work, we can also design tools that enable the information to be passed back through the system itself to the requester that wouldn't involve the required creation of additional accounts at each and every one of the dozens or hundreds of potential registrars that requesters would then be forced to go to and create those accounts at.

I think that if we can collectively put down some constraints about what it is that we would see as being a necessary feature of the successor system, whether that be maintaining the absolute smallest amount of shared PII possible between only the registrar and the requester without ICANN seeing it, and whether a constraint might be that we aren't as requesters expected to go and create additional accounts elsewhere, these are the kinds of things that I'd like to see documented even if we know that it's not going to fall within RDRS in the pilot period. And that's my closing thought on that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'll let Roger answer. Maybe I'll answer to that, too. Go ahead, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks. Just to be real quick. Gabe, just plus one on what Gabe said, today I think it's difficult and let's not worry about that. Every registrar has their responsibilities. But looking forward, I think that, as Gabe mentioned, all these constraints would be good to document. If we're looking at a successor, what that'd look like? Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just for clarity, because these discussions we had early on, as long as we're talking about the successor, not within the pilot. Because with the successor presumably, we'll also have policy and we'll have all sorts of tools there to back what we're doing, which we don't have here in the pilot. As long as everybody understands that, we're now taking notes about a future product that will exist within, again, the framework of policy and other tools at our disposal to allow these sorts of things. Because otherwise, it wasn't going to flow. From the registrars, I'm not ready to share that information through a party that is not policy involved, and for ICANN's point because they weren't too keen on having the data on hand either. Okay. I guess this closes this part of the conversation and we can move to, I believe, it's point four of our agenda and talk about these system enhancements.

I see that Farzaneh has just dropped off. It was one thing that I wanted to make sure that we could maybe add briefly and we can look at it at the requester enhancement. But this was the conversation about the country of location of the requester, particularly of law enforcement requests, the jurisdiction that the request comes from. If we can add that mentally, not need to change it, I'd like to make sure that we get to discuss that. Lisa and I discussed that briefly in Paris and I wanted to maybe walk you through the thinking of that. Going back to the agenda as is on screen, registrar enhancements. Lisa, do you want to walk us through this?

LISA CARTER:

Sure. Thanks, Sebastien. Just to comment on what you just mentioned about the location for the law enforcement requests—I always mess up how to pronounce the name Farzaneh. I think she put that in the impressions document so it's there now. We just need those prioritized. Just to mention to Gabe that there is ICANN comment and note on level of effort on the items you put in the impressions document. I don't know if you want to click the link to maybe bring the document up so people can see what we're talking about. But a number priority would be good similar to what Sarah did for the registrars because we have a low, medium, and high on requester priority, but now we need it in number order of what is most important to focus on from the requester's perspective. I just wanted to put that out there before I move into the actual enhancement items. Sorry. I saw Gabe—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: To be clear, on the requester side, it's not just Gabe, there's many of you. But to decide how you want to prioritize those requests. From what I saw last time, indeed, it's mainly PSWG requests. Then this one request from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. For you guys to go and prioritize according to what ICANN is giving you in terms of effort. Okay. If you want to go on now with the agenda.

LISA CARTER: Will do. Just overall, in terms of this next set of releases, this is the second group of releases we're going to do. I just want to let everyone know we're looking to actually release this after ICANN80, so toward the end of June. But I wanted to just remind everybody what we're going to be looking at. If you can go down to the Registrar section really quickly. Priority 1. There we go. Priority one, you can stop right there, address and phone number should be mandatory. That's one of the things that we're working on. In addition to that, and I think it was listed as a separate ask, was the addition of the organization or affiliation to be provided as well as optional. But that this address and phone number will be part of what's released in this next round. Priority 1 will be focused on.

Priority 4, if you want to scroll down to that one, 4 and 5 are also on the list to release for registrars in this next round. Sorry. You add the Priority 4 and 5. I don't see it on the screen. They should be in bold. Not number four. It says Priority 4. In the fourth column, the priorities are listed. So you just passed Priority 7. There we go. Priority 5. Go back up. We'll just talk about 5 first. This one, they wanted to update the interface so that all requests

could be viewed without the need to use the filters on the registrar side. So basically, having everything open, that's going to be on the list. Then a little farther down, if you scroll down, it's Priority 4. Right there. Which is they would like to have the request date in the page with the information from the request. Right now, you can only see the request date if you're in the list looking at all requests submitted and that day will be added inside the actual request when you open it up as well. Those are the registrar enhancements. I don't know. Gabe, I see you have a hand up. So I don't know if I should keep going or if you want to—

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Sorry. It was a clarifying question on what you asked me to do previously.

LISA CARTER: Okay. We can do that if you want when I go over the requester stuff, which is right now. Go ahead if you'd like.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Sure. I'm just looking at this and I'm noting that one of the features is listed as a level of effort of very high. I'm wondering for the purposes of the group of communicating back, if there's something that's very important to us that we recognize might not be feasible within the pilot window. What's the preferred method of making that clear? So we're documenting that this is a very important issue but maybe we agree it doesn't make sense to prioritize now given that level of effort. Is this just something that we explain narratively inside this feedback document then? Just

wondering if we're all going to do that consistently because I think at some point, we have to recognize what the realities of your abilities to get the work done is, but still want to make sure that we're maintaining awareness of very important things. I'm speaking here in particular to the API issue. Noting that both the registrar communities as well as the requester communities are noting the importance of having an API to facilitate some of the features we're talking about. But that this might not actually happen anytime soon. It might end up being something only available in the successor system.

LISA CARTER:

Yes. It would be helpful to document something that potentially might not be able to be in this pilot but is something that is a constraint that should be considered for another iteration of the system. Sure. Would be helpful to keep track of that. And then we can document it on our side, too.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

if I may. Steve, I'll give you the mic in a second. But in terms of the API, it's not just an ICANN development effort. It's then also an effort from all the different players to go and plug into the API. I don't want to say the full fee developing API, but in the process of developing an API, we want to absolutely make sure that the data is not going to move. The different fields that we're picking up are not going to move. Because otherwise, it means moving the API with it, which is work for ICANN development, but also everybody else that is using the API behind. It's an important feature.

I personally don't discard it for the pilot. But I really would encourage to make sure that—and I know that these are discussions that we're still having, make sure that we have identified all the mandatory fields or all the fields that we're going to use. Everything is mandatory before we start developing that API and ask people to develop against them. Thanks. Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Sebastien. In a lifetime with developing systems, I've always understood that the customer requester would assign a priority based on how much value they perceive from it. Then in systems, we would rate it in terms of its level of effort. And if the level of effort was extremely high, it would crowd out many other priorities of similar or lower nature, then an item that was high priority doesn't get downgraded to lower priority, because the priority is just the value assigned by those who are asking for it. And I do hope that with an API that those who would agree that it's a high priority should take on account they could take on board. What Sebastien just said is that delivering an API specification is not the same thing as flipping a button and having it work. We have to then do some coding. But not every single entity. You may see that a handful of requesters would all use the same API if they were pulling things over from a Google or Excel sheet, for instance. But if it's a highly proprietary system, there's a lot of coding that has to go into an API. Sebastien's right about that.

I guess I'm really just saying that to me, the priorities should be assigned by those who are requesting it and then systems can

evaluate the level of effort. And if the level of effort is too high, then indicate that and that priority item just won't be done. It's not that if we suddenly change the priority. I will note that the registrars are using multiple levels of priority, and on the requester side, we pretty much stayed with high, medium, and low. Last week, a couple of us in the Business Constituency had our regular quarterly call with ICANN Org management. Sally and Mary were on. We talked about many things, including RDRS. I indicated that I would appreciate it if Org would give staff the resources they need to work on high and medium priority items in RDRS. It was a request that BC made individually to the current acting CEO, and Sally seemed inclined to want to do that. But I don't know whether any of that's trickled down to the staff itself that has to do the work. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. Interesting that you should say it because I've received similar echoes off the record and in just a personal discussion in Paris. I think that to a certain extent, we know it's a pilot and that we don't have the whole world yet participating in it. But the fact that there is participation, the fact that there is interaction, the fact that we're discussing and it's not something that has been dropped from day one is good. And it's also giving good reasons for Sally and senior management at ICANN to continue investing in this and giving us the resources that we need. So, let's keep it up. Lisa, did you want to continue with this?

LISA CARTER: Yes, I will. Just to go over the requester enhancements that would be released at the end of June. There was a request to increase the character limit from 1000 to 2000 is what we offered and everyone agreed. When the release happens on the requester UI, and in fact, all the open text boxes will now be increased, the limit will increase from 1000 to 2000 to allow for more explanations on both sides. That would be released. The other thing that was an ask was to better explain what—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just one second. Again, increasing the limit of characters was a request from the requesters. Please hear when the registrar say in your request use the 2000 characters if you need to, but make sure that the meat of the subject is in the first background, in the top. People are going to read everything, but if it takes reading several pages of text just to figure out what is asked, it creates frustration. Make sure that the information... If details need to be given, if further explanation need to be given, that's fine. That's why we're giving more room. But make sure that the meat of the ask is at the top.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Sebastien. The other ask was for a better explanation of what expedited means. That explanation actually does live in the user guides as well. The way it's described is that if the requester feels that the nature of the request warrants faster processing, they can use the expedited button. But that the registrar does have the discretion after review to determine or change what that status is. For this release, we're going to actually add the

language that is indicated in the user guide indicating that the requester can, if they think so, ask for faster processing. But that the registrar can change the status. That will be added right above all of those disclaimers about basically how not to use expedited and what expedited is not. That's the ask there. Then just some other user experience things that I caught that we'll fix so that it's a little bit easier to get through the form. It's also going to be included there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, can I go back to a point that you made earlier? I think it was important you mentioned the fact that we're now going to make some fields mandatory in the requester. The e-mail address, the name, these were discussions that came out also from the Registrar session in Paris. People that give the information, as Roger said, want to know who they give it to. That information always was there in the form but wasn't mandatory. They're asking us to make that mandatory. Given again the discussion that we're having with the NCSG, I think that the country field should also be one of those mandatory fields. Again, we vote—it is? Okay. So that's very clear.

LISA CARTER: Address one required. Address two, the second line, I believe we're going to have that as optional. Then city, state, zip, country, those were working out how that—because not every country has a zip, not every country has a state, etc. We have to work that out. But we're definitely capturing country as required. That might help with the request to have country data.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm sorry. I'm pushing a bit this agenda through, but we've got only five minutes on the clock left. You showed me in Paris that actually the law enforcement in country, what could be considered as jurisdiction, is a different field from the requester field. Something I hadn't understood. When the requester is law enforcement, there is a sub form that is specific to law enforcement. There is also a country of jurisdiction. Now, in the process of formulating the request, the requester would have already filled in their country of origin, right?

LISA CARTER: Yes, that's the first page of the request right where you're filling in.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It is possible to pre-populate that second law enforcement jurisdiction field to that? Maybe not block it to that, but pre-populate it with it, and make sure that that field is also a mandatory field?

LISA CARTER: I'd have to take that back internally as far as the auto population question you're asking from the country on the first page to the country if law enforcement is selected, but we can look into that as well. I do believe it's actually required if you select law enforcement to select a country, but the auto population question, I think I have to go back to the tech team about that one.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Another thing that I understood and I hadn't understood from that—and Gabe I need your help—I understand that the PSWG approved that request from NCSG or that you're able to come back with a positive on this one?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yes, generally supportive. It's hard for me to say that it is an official PSWG position, because I was informally reaching out to folks there and absent an actual discussion in ICANN. It's not like we took a vote on it but I will say that the general feedback I've been getting was supportive of it. Let's just say that all indicators, it's that it is something that we support when it's kept at that nation level or territory or economy or however it was phrased. I think that we would prefer not to go to the level of individual law enforcement agencies, but that national level then yes. That seems like a very worthwhile thing to do and to promote the transparency that the NCSG was seeking, and we're supportive of that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you very much. Maybe if you guys need to go about that. But at least in terms of collecting the data and if we need more formalism from you guys before we report it, that's another question, but at least we don't waste time not having the data.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Right. I'd say go ahead and I will take the blame. If anyone raises any objection, I'll take the heat for it. Because at this point, I think that everyone I've spoken to gave thumbs up to this and felt that it was a worthwhile thing to do.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. And this session is recorded, so we've got you on record there. The other quick one I had was—and I hadn't realized that before Lisa showed me—all these countries are actually based on a list. You choose from a dropdown of country names. In my experience, the list that ICANN uses, I don't want to discriminate or use any specific, but for example, it has things like Chinese Taipei instead of saying Taiwan. I don't know of other countries or territories where that might appear. These differences of jurisdiction and borders might appear. But I want to be also cognizant of that and to see with this group that we can allow ourselves to augment that list if need be. I'm thinking just because it's all over the news, if, for example, a territory like Palestine wasn't in the list and yet felt like it needed to have an entry as jurisdiction.

With this said, we're at time. I wanted to speak very, very quickly about the Sankey thing but we don't have time. I have another call afterwards anyway, so we can take that to the list. I've seen already a few comments and thank you for those that played with it. With this, I don't even have a date for the next meeting, but I guess in two weeks, we'll meet again. In the meantime, we can converse and keep up to date on the list. Thank you very much, everybody, and see you guys in two weeks.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]