TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday the 4th of August, 2025.
	For today's call, we have listed apologies and some alternates. I will say their names. So Sarah Wyld from RrSG is an apology, and the alternate today will be Roger Carney. We also have apologies from Farzaneh Badii and Steve DelBianco.
	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.
	Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted on that space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording purposes. As a reminder, participation in ICANN including this session is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.
	With this, I'll turn it back over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Terri. Hello, everybody. Good evening by European time. Good afternoon. Good morning. So today is probably not the final but the one before last call before we send our documents (I'll take my watch off; it'll be more comfortable) for public comment.

We've reviewed most of the comments. There's maybe one or two salient ones that still remain. One of them is with regards to the financing. But I think that we might find a way to go around it, simply to remove the specific recommendation in the sense that we can't find wording that is matching for everybody. But I think that people can live with the fact that we just leave recommendation 14 of the original as well. So we'll get into that in a minute.

There was another one that was in discussion between John and Farzaneh, and I understand from the emails that I read that they found some compromise last week, which is fantastic take.

And then we'll just go through a review of the one or two that are still open this week, and possibly we might even be able to have something ready by the end of this call. Let's see. Well, no pressure, but it would be great if we did.

But before that I wanted to take you on a short tangent. I don't even know if it's really that necessary anymore but because we went through it with staff over the last weekend and over the

weekend, I just wanted to relay that and this is in relation. And I think that unless anybody else has any change to the agenda they want to give, we can start point two with the comment that I wanted to make.

So I see no hands. So let's go with this. So the discussion was with staff about what was going to happen with RDRS in the coming months, and I think there was a bit of a misunderstanding (I misunderstood), essentially that staff was saying that as long as we've got a new set of policies that are agreed, their view is that RDRS should stay as was/as is, that it should be maintained and so on and so on and so forth, but that no further development should be given on it.

In the meantime, over the last few days and following a discussion that I had earlier with Feodora, I understand that that has slightly changed (and I like it a lot better), which is we're gonna return a report to the GNSO Council that is going to share it with the Board, and the Board and the GNSO Council are going to decide how they want to proceed and how they want to go forward. The recommendations that we put in, in what originally was Chapter 2 for further enhancements, will be part of our report, and it is expected that the Board with the GNSO will pick and choose. They might not choose and pick all of them, but we'll pick and choose a number of recommendations there and will ask staff to further develop this project.

My initial (maybe we can go to the next slide) fear … Thank you. So we've had (just a very simple graph here) a concept where we developed this idea of RDRS. We've run a pilot for two years until November, coming in a few months. Then there's this post-pilot RDRS period where nothing is going to change. Staff is going to keep the lights on. And my original fear last week was that that was going to last for several years until policy is actually agreed. But as I understand it today, that's going to last however long the Board and the GNSO Council need to decide together what they want to do. And then afterwards we expect the GNSO Council to be tasked with new policy work. And I specifically didn't put PDP or anything like that because I don't know what that's going to look like. We'll let the council decide what shape and form that needs to take. But in the meantime at that point too, we can expect that the Board in particular (because that's their role) may instruct staff to go and develop a number of features.

I'm saying all this because I just want to make sure that then in our report these things that we see as a priority come out salient. And I'm saying this (this is no criticism of the Board) because I've heard, for example, Becky Burr, who was probably still thinking the way we were thinking, [say that] we're trying to, between quotes, sell the RDRS to the registrar community, that an API for registrars was vital and they really needed it [(]two years later we realized that actually there's no particular demand for an API that would be great on the registrar side[)], that it would be great the

day the dust settle and all the policies agreed and we have a final successive system to have an API for it. I think at that point there'll be registrar buy-in. But in the meantime, they're in no hurry of having something that they need to keep on chasing and and following and etc.

We've also had, for months, discussion, particularly between Gabe and Steve, with the possibility of developing an external API, something that is not directly coming from RDRS but may work with RDRS.

So we're not going to review them right now, but I do want you to have this in the back of your mind. There will be a review of those enhancements that we're looking into. We haven't looked at them for a while. I just want to make sure that they're still relevant and that they can be prioritized later.

The other point I wanted to make also is to maybe establish a bit of a vocabulary, at least for ourselves, but also in the report possibly. We've used, interchangeably, RDRS, the SSAD, the pilot successor system, et cetera, and I don't know that it's always helpful in a conversation. So if you're agreed, this is just a nomenclature that frankly Feodora and I came up with. So it's not set in marble quite yet, but I think it would be useful also for people to understand what we're talking about when we're talking about the different phases to use something that is consistent.

Next slide. There's not much in it, but might as well go through it. Of the enhancement, I noted 4, 5, and 6 here, and I may have forgotten one or two. It's the ones that I had in mind frankly when I was doing this table. But if it's of use at least for us to understand what will happen in the post-pilot RDRS before the Board instructs staff to go any further, I think that they've earmarked your work, Gabe. If you are able to provide lists or access to list of recognized law enforcement, I understand the staff will include that in the work that's already in process, and they're happy to include that.

The rest won't. The rest is going to be put on hold again. Again, my fear was that that could last a few years, but things like the ccTLD participation, which, again, in my cursory analysis of the problem, seems to be not just an easy fix; it requires further development in particular because it requires to change the logic of the name check from an RDAP-base logic to a back to a WHOIS-base logic …

The links to non-participating registrar forms. Again, this may be my baby, and I'm putting too much focus in it, but I think that it will make a big difference convincing to have at least half on board registrars that do their own thing and are already providing.

On this, this is my own personal thought, but I think it might be also an interesting way, a useful tool, to make sure that registrars all do have proper request forms, being it exactly the form that

we use or another equivalent form, to start getting rid of the poor versions of it, which are basically an open email that more often than not get spammed through which things may fall through.

And the last one is the one that we heavily discussed in the last few weeks, which is a potential payment facility. As you know (I've said before), I think that if, in fine, we need to have a system that is paid, at some point or another we're going to have to test the water with it even if it's not fully financially sustaining, etc. But a payment facility is one not an easy add-on to put in, and it's potentially not only an expensive exercise but it will require substantial payments to even get back into any reasonable financial position with it. So this one again I'm not sold on personally, and I think it could be a recommendation but it may not be the first priority. But it's not for me to choose this for you guys.

Do I see any questions on any of this? Any comments, any thoughts you may have? Again there's not going to be any consensus call on those recommendations. They're not part of it. So next week, we may not go back to it, but I do really invite you to go back to how they were prioritized because we called your attention on it several times a few months back before June, I guess, and I don't know that everybody has had the detailed look on it and have had an idea that works for them on how these

things should be prioritized before it goes back to council and the Board with this.

I see Steve Crocker's hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Roll back to the previous slide. Good. So thank you very much for the thought process that went into this. I think this is essentially correct, but let me offer some extension of this or so forth.

We're in the period, as you say, of post-pilot-RDRS RDRS, and the mindset is, "Continue this. Don't take it down." But the only very limited extensions (in particular, what you alluded to with Gabe about authentication efforts for law enforcement agencies, but not a wholesale set of extensions leading to unbounded work) and then a decision process (and that decision process that you've labeled there as policy work) probably has a couple of different pieces to it, and I think it's useful to identify them.

One will be setting the broad direction: what are we going to do here? Are we going to go build the original SSAD? Are we going to make a qualitative change? Are we going to continue RDRS, etc.? Once the outline of that is set, then two things merge into each other—maybe three things.

The first is, where are we trying to go? What is the eventual design going to look like? A second thing is, what is the pathways from where we are to how to get there? And that may bleed back into the set of enhancements for an RDRS or may have some other path. But in any case, what's that transition process, and is there a positive benefit in thinking through the compatibility, if you will, as opposed to "Well, we'll build the new system and then there will come a day when we'll just switch over," a rough, hard change? Almost certainly that won't be what people want. So there'll be a fair amount of work into that transition process.

And that's what comes to mind when I look at what you have here, which I think is the right mindset on this. But it may be helpful to subdivide those orange pieces and make it explicit that there'll be a large decision about what direction and then a substantial and important transition process to be worked out there. And in that, there may be some enhancements that actually affect the current system or there may be a different pathway. And I can't tell, but I think it's helpful to that.

And the amount of time that's involved will be very much related to those decisions. For example (I'll just make this up), one could imagine that the big decision about what direction to go might be relatively fast. One could hope, say, (I'll just make up a number), it'll be three months. And then the consequences of that will then be a design process and perhaps some implementation process,

[inaudible], et cetera, happening to lay the foundation for getting to the eventual system.

That's enough. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I took notes. All good points. Indeed, that (what is it, the fourth arrow there?) is very short. There's a lot of things happening there, and I'll try to put more descriptions around it.

Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Since my name was mentioned a couple times, I just wanted to point out that obviously the Standing Committee has discussed and drafted a whole chapter 2 discussing the system enhancements and even provided a recommendation where they think of which ones are the top ones or first-ranked ones to be considered first in terms of timeline. Obviously the chapter two will be considered by the Council once it has received the report.

And just to clarify, while Council and the ICANN Board have their discussion or dialogue, no other enhancements will be done as mentioned—only the LEA authentication efforts. And once ICANN Board and Council have concluded their dialogue, new things might happen. Just to clarify it a bit more.

And in terms of the other slide, that's just my personal opinion. The Standing Committee can do what they think is appropriate. But the last two parts were not discussed in chapter two. And it might not be the best timing to open this discussion here, but I understand this one is one recommendation,[rule] and comment which will be discussed later today.

So back to you, Seb. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Did we not manage to put the link part in the in chapter? I'll have to check again then. Sorry.

Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of points. If I understood what you were saying properly, you are suggesting that the first two items on the screen are items that we definitely should do in the post-RDRS system, but probably not the others. And I don't want to debate whether that's in fact true or not, but—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no, absolutely not. I just put those enhancements as the [full fight] that I remembered as I was developing that slide. And I'm not suggesting anything. I was just trying to make sure that you

guys understand that we're entering as of November, a period where there will be several months when no further activity is going to happen. RDRS lights are going to be kept on. Staff is going to look after and make sure that the servers are [milling]. The reporting that has been happening monthly is going to happen on a quarterly basis. But apart from the LEA authentication, nothing else is going to happen if and until the GNSO Council and the Board agree to indeed ask for some of those enhancements. I haven't put any qualifications on those. Chapter two is already in there. That's why I'm asking you guys to verify that it's still exactly what you wanted it to be. And that's it.

ALAN GREENBEG: Okay. Sorry, I misunderstood, but that's fine. What I was going to say next anyway is "But presumably this group will be going over it before the report is published and we'll decide whether the other four items are indeed going to be included as recommendations or not."

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's why I'm asking you guys to make sure that chapter two is still to your liking, because we're not going to go back to it. We're going to work on the recommendations because that's what we need to finish for the 11th. And so I'm asking you guys to have a look by yourselves. But we're not going to …

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but I'm talking about the recommendations. Clearly we need either agreement on that or to clearly identify that we are not in agreement on them.

The reason I put my hand up, though, is in response to Steve's comment. And if we can go back to the slide .. Sorry, the next one. Okay. What Steve said or implied is (and it's something which we completely ignore in ICANN almost all the time) we always show these paths going from left to That is, we do something and progress to the next one. There's never any feedback and loops in it. And as Steve pointed out, once we decide whether we're modifying RDRS or building a whole new system or whatever, that may well influence what the details are, and we may well want to go back and adjust things because of those decisions. In the normal ICANN processes, we have no ability to do that. We go from recommendations to approval to implementation and it's only under the direst circumstances that we will ever go back and change something because it's impossible or something like that. Any rational design process that I've been involved with over many decades involves some sort of loop and the ability to make changes. So somehow I think we want to at least mention that going forward. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. Again, maybe we're spending too much time on it. We spend more time on these slides than it took me to draft them, and I challenge you to find one of those graphs that comes back [circularly] in a timeline on the Google-supplied PowerPoint [inaudible].

But apart from that, no, of course there's no process that is purely linear like that, particularly when we're developing a new system/product.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. To be clear, Sebastien, I wasn't worried about the chart. I was saying the ICANN processes do not necessarily allow for loops, and that's something we may want to at least mention.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure.

Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I just heard you lamenting a little bit about the amount of time we're spending on this, and I want to say I think this is time well spent. I think you did a good job of level-setting here and making sure we're all on the same page, and I think

that's really important, especially at this stage of our work. So first point: time well spent.

Two other points. First you mentioned the link to non-participating registrars. I was trying to check while other people were talking, and if that's not in the report, I think it should be. I support that. I think it makes sense. So I'm just adding that note. We should get that in there if it's not already.

And then the last point I want to make: Feodora, in her intervention just now, I thought, did a really good job putting words around what the current state is and what is and isn't being worked on and what will come next. That should absolutely be in the report. A reader of this report should have the same understanding that we have as far as what work isn't being done, what work we're recommending be done, and what the process for that work being initiated is. And so I think we should make sure that that is captured. I don't think it is currently. I think we all on this group share that understanding now, thanks to the time we spent on this, but I don't think a reader of the report will necessarily have that understanding. I'm not sure what the correct place to put that is, but I think it needs to be captured so that a reader of the report has that same understanding.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. And I wasn't lamenting the time spent on this. It was just flagging that these slides are imperfect.

Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Thank you, Marc. I wanted to say something else, but if you have language you can provide that we should add, that would be ideal so staff can accurately reflect what the Standing Committee wants in the report. And same for the system enhancement.

I just wanted to point out that this … I'm not sure if this was discussed at the Standing Committee level, but we can include it. But it just would take some time. But chapter two doesn't need consensus so there can also be disagreement reported. So there's no issue there.

And in terms of recommendations (maybe that's what we will go to next anyway), I'm just wanting to point out in recommendation 2 that currently we have the API, the user experience redesign and the optional ccTLD participation which are just a sample or the highest ranked ones from chapter two. But chapter two lists much more system enhancements. And of course it's up to the Council and the Board which they will ultimately pursue. But this report will help them make their decision. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So as you're discussing or showing this again, when we say user experience/UX redesign, there are, from memory, things that will require development. There were things that were not cosmetic where rewording help guides and online instructions and that thing [helps]. My understanding (and Lisa, correct me if I'm wrong) is, if we are able to provide alternative wording, that's not a major task to change. And that is something that can happen earlier than any formal decision. I see a thumb up. I hope that it's Lisa's.

And so, for example, we're putting this in a number-two position in our list of enhancements. Maybe it's worth putting it as a 1.1, at least for the stuff that can be done without any major decision.

Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thanks, Seb. One other thing I wanted to note is that, in the RDRS Standing Committee charter where the Council lists the assignment, while of course Assignment 2 was considered as important as the others in terms of report, their ideal report would focus on the Lessons Learned and the recommendations. So of course the Standing Committee included work on all assignments, and this one informs, also, the Lessons Learned and the recommendations. But just for the [charter's] sake, the

system enhancements were not the highest priority, as such, [for the reader.]

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm not saying they are. I'm just saying if we're presenting enhancements, we may want to present first the ones that are easy and quick to do and, later, the ones that feel important.

But anyway, yeah, the wall of text is the one that I was thinking about—indeed, an enhancement that we can do sooner rather than later, [Gabriel].

Now, with all this said, and seeing no further hands, Feodora, can I pass on the mic to you so we can go to those recommendations that you wanted us to discuss that are remaining? And then we can go back maybe to the two that were … Sorry, I'll let you figure out which ones you want to talk about first. Go ahead.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. So as you seen here, just a quick update. Staff has updated their report with the language agreed and provided in the last Standing Committee meeting—so for instance, this part.

And then also on recommendation one, just clarifying what Marc suggested, you see here in suggestion mode what has been changed, but what remains to be discussed is still

recommendation five on financial sustainability. And there were last time some (sorry for the scrolling; I'm just trying to find the comment where it was made) agreeing with the text as it was written and some saying that this could not reach consensus.

So I hand it over to … And I think Gabe also provided additional language to the current draft. And John made also some edits, but Sarah indicated that she doesn't agree with the additional language provided by Gabe. So I hand over to Seb to lead the discussion and for the Standing Committee to provide clarity on what should happen to this recommendation.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. So let's have the discussion. I just want to note for fairness that neither Sarah nor Farzaneh, who were providing one angle on this, are here. So let's have the discussion. I know from them (I had a private discussion with both of them late last week) that they'd rather see no recommendation in that direction at all (so no recommendation 5 at all), rather than the language that is currently proposed. But let's discuss it. Sarah, anyway, has nominated an alternate who will do a great job defending her position. I shouldn't. And the NCSG hasn't. But it's okay; we know what they're thinking.

Go ahead, Gabe.

GABE ANDREWS: Hi, guys. Not to bury the lede, but I think that no text at all for recommendation five, rather than text that we all seem to disagree with, is probably the best way forward.

That said, I'm going to take just a moment to explain the text that I provided, if that's okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please.

GABE ANDREWS: The attempt was recognizing that we didn't seem to have consensus on the initially proposed tax, nor even necessarily consensus about what to do about all of the topics discussed, which were numerous. I wanted to try to at least capture some of the concerns that any future party that would want to potentially explore the implementation of fees on the RDRS in advance of the successor system might have, because Marc, I think, was the one that called out that this is a very important distinction. We're not talking about how all the other recommendations are being applied to the successor. This was specifically about how it might be done to the RDRS in advance.

So I tried to capture all of the comments that have been brought up on the call last week, and if we scroll down just a little bit more, you could read this at your leisure. But just to articulate

them: there's whether the application of the fees or charges to the [RDRS] would prove fatal were they to be applied before it was fully complete. This I think came from Alan.

Going down three bullets, there's whether the absence of such fees would place too much burden on ICANN as an Org. That was Sarah's primary concern.

And then I think, from Steve Crocker, we had the concern about the logistics and cost of implementing. The fee for request system as non-trivial itself. And that seems to be worth capturing as well.

And then finally a couple of points from me, my constituency, as to whether or not requester groups on, their own accord, are self-organizing as an identity providers and taking on the majority of the anticipated expense of a successor system like SSAD; whether that would constitute the expectation that the requesters primarily shoulder the burden of the ongoing operation of an RDRS or successor system.

And all of these seems like salient conversation points. I have since read the feedback from Sarah and the Registrar Stakeholder Group that this is not necessarily a straight recommendation, and yet it is in a section of recommendations. And I think that's a salient point. So I have edited the text over to the right in the blue. If we chose to keep any of this text, you could make the edit I suggested, which starts with that strikeout, saying that instead of

saying such concerns, et cetera, et cetera, you could just have it read, "The Standing Committee recommends that any party subsequently seeking to implement"—scroll down please; just a little more; thank you—"recommendation 14 upon the RDRS. consider those various things we covered."

All that said, returning back to the initial point, not bearing the lede, if the party, the Standing Committee, wants to just strike all the texts as opposed to having this, that's also fine. But I think my goal was to capture the points brought up by folks and to not present any position as being a consensus view of the Standing Committee when it's not. And I felt that that was really the biggest concern I had with the prior text as proposed. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabe. And yeah, I agree with you. Good job. I don't know if it'll survive, but thank you for doing it.

Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. This whole business of financial sustainability is tied very tightly to what the overall concept of operation is. Implicit in almost all of the discussions that we've had is an ICANN-operated system at the center of everything. Suppose you take that out. Suppose you just say, "Well look,

there's no reason for ICANN to operate this system. ICANN should make policy. ICANN should manage relationships with the contracted parties." But if you go back to WHOIS, WHOIS operated without anybody in the middle. Requests went directly from requesters to the data holders, and there is no direct reason why when you add the rules about who gets access and so forth, that ICANN itself has to be in the middle of all that. ICANN is definitely an important player in the policy related to the contracted parties, but mechanically operating such a system can be done in a completely distributed fashion.

I recognize that we're not going to make any decision or even necessarily a recommendation about that, but when it comes to looking at what the financial model is, if you imagine that you have a distributed system without ICANN operating in the middle, the whole discussion about who pays becomes a different discussion. It doesn't go away, there's still costs involved, but it really changes dramatically. Thank you.

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

ROGER CARNEY: I think that when you look at this, the phase two EPDP spent a lot of time discussing this and came to a conclusion. And we don't need to relitigate those and come to a different conclusion or

maybe the same conclusion. I think I'm going to jump back to Gabe's first maybe sentence or two and say the registrars prefer just to remove this text, and we don't need to hash out any discussions about. It can be removed, and we'd be happy with that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just for clarity, if we remove any further recommendation here, basically what we land on is what used to be Rec 14 of SSAD. That still exists, that still is there, and we just do not comment on it, right?

ROGER CARNEY: I would say so, but Gabe has got his hand up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, Gabe, do you want to react to that? Sorry, Marc, I'll have you wait for a second if Gabe can't react.

GABE ANDREWS: Yeah, yeah, I think that's a two-finger thing. I forget how it goes. But yes, to answer that question explicitly, there is still something I want to call out that I think needs to be discussed for recommendation 14 in the table that we can return to. But I think that there is at least one piece of Rec 14 that needs to be

"modify," not "keep." And we can discuss that later. But it's not explicitly with this topic. But, over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, If it's not specifically on this topic, I'll let you bring it later. Don't let me forget that. I'll note it. Marc, thank you for your patience.

MARC ANDERSON: Oh, good. And listening to this topic, I heard Gabriel's point about capturing the discussion. I agree that it doesn't make sense to put this as part of a recommendation section. That may be misleading since there isn't actually a recommendation included in this. But my inclination from listening to the discussion is to find a place to include the pros and cons as discussed, maybe in one of the later sections where we talk about our deliberations. There are a lot of factors pros and cons that weigh into this, and we discussed them at length, and it would be a shame to not capture that in our output, even though we aren't coming up with a recommendation.

The other thing I raised my hand for—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, before you go to the next thing in Lessons Learned, is that where you would see it live?

EN

MARC ANDERSON: Well, even a Lessons Learned implies that we're all in agreement on what the lessons are. And I think if anything, we've seen that we're not in agreement here. I skimmed through it a little bit. I'm not sure what the right place is. Maybe an appendix. But my inclination is to capture some of this discussion with the clear understanding that we did not come to agreement on this point.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: [Go to your next point then.]

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, sorry, I'm just looking at Gabriel's point in the chat. I think it'd be best to keep this separate from Rec 14. But that's my thoughts on this.

So I did want to give Steve Cracker a plus-one on his point in. I thought it was a really important point that when the initial working group was developing SSAD recommendations, our vision, if you will, was that the SSAD could be operated by multiple parties. And I think we made that clear in our recommendations that we envisioned different components that could have different providers, and that those providers might be ICANN Org, but they might not be. And we tried really hard to be agnostic to that in our recommendations.

EN

As we've gone through our work, we specifically asked ICANN Org to implement the RDRS pilot. And so we went into this pilot with the understanding that would be ICANN Org operating that pilot. But I think there's a risk (and Steve is calling this out a little bit) that our mindset, that the fact that we have ICANN operating this RDRS, causes us to assume that it'll be ICANN Org operating it. And I think we need to be careful to avoid that assumption, both for us and the readers of this report.

And so to Steve's point, I think we need to be clear that components of future system could be operated by ICANN. Org, but they could also be operated wholly or in part by not ICANN Org but independent third parties. So I thought Steve made an important point, and I wanted to give him a plus-one on that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. On that, I'm happy to have it in our report in some way or form. I wanted just to make sure that everybody understands that my conversation, albeit private, with Becky and other Board members that are on that caucus was that their view was that, say, an operation and ICANN decision, rather than one they would want to weigh on, doesn't impede us from having a point of view that we want to share.

Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. So my understanding is that this recommendation will be taken out of the report. But if we look at the Lessons Learned, as you said, some part of this discussion should be covered there. Some of this is already included in the Lessons Learned input that Sarah provided. And if you think more is needed, please have a look and provide additional language that we can consider. That would be very helpful—also having in mind the timeline that we are working against.

With regards to the comment on considering alternative systems, I think there is, even in chapter two, not a recommendation but some text on this as well that Seb provided and is also ranked and listed for consideration.

And on the comment that Gabriel made earlier regarding recommendation 14, I think if the time has come, it would be good to discuss it now in relation to this point if you can.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure.

FEODORA HAMZA: So I would go to the report. And it's going to involve a bit of scrolling. Sorry for that. So I'm going to go to recommendation 14. And so here we have proposed treatment as keep. Before it was "modify," but then I think it was Sarah (I'm not sure, but

definitely was a Standing Committee member) saying that we are recommending financial sustainability in the sense of Recommendation Four. So that's why it should be kept. And then we change to "keep." But Gabe is proposing, based on a text that is provided, that this should state "modify."

So I hand over the floor to Gabe (I think that's best) and for the Standing Committee to agree if it should be kept or modified in this case.

GABE ANDREWS: I just want to make clear that it's not that I find that the majority of the text needs to be modified, but I think that a particular portion of it caught my eye as definitely wanting special attention. And I call attention to recommendation 14.5 that first caught my eye as I am contemplating how law enforcement stands up to serve as identity provider for its own constituency members.

And I'm going back and forth between the windows here, so I'm going to lose visibility for a second to what you all are looking at but I'm going to see if I can copy and paste 14.5 from the original EPDP Phase 2 Final Report into chat because I don't think it's easy. I don't want to have everyone else do the same. Oh well, there you go. She can pull it up on the screen as well. So yeah, same thing. Actually easier to read there. So thank you for that.

The concern I had is 14.5.1, that accreditation applicants must be charged the to-be-determined non-refundable fee proportional to the cost of validating the applications, et cetera, et cetera. All of this seems to presume that ICANN or their contracted service provider would be doing accreditation. It does not make sense to say that Interpol must charge Interpol members fees in order to then allow Interpol to serve as identity provider.

And so at minimum I think that the whole notion of fees for accreditation needs flexibility in order to be able to accommodate what we're considering. And so if for no other reason than that piece alone, I think we need to consider modification to … I don't know how we want to call it out, but I think it's just noting that this point … We've already in other places in the report talked about how we'd like to explore other entities operating as their own identity providers, so this is just in support of that notion. I think that makes sense.

Pausing in case there are questions, reactions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Marc, go ahead and then I'll put myself on the list.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Gabriel. That does indeed make sense. I agree with what you just described and support that point. I think the language

here, yeah, is unnecessarily restrictive. And so I don't think that that was really the original intent either.

So I support your point, and I think we need to capture that and include that in the recommendations.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I don't want to be a wordsmithing here. I think I agree with your point, Gabriel. It makes full sense to me. It could be just simple as starting by, "If accreditation is provided by ICANN or something like that, then it must be" … But lets' not wordsmith here. Let's have your point here, and we have another week to discuss it again when Sarah and Farzaneh are back. It's not that I'm solely focused on them, but they have their very strong point of view on that Rec 14, and I want to make sure that they have a better eye than I do to see how we unbalance these things by adding words. But otherwise, yeah, I think you got a good catch there. That's good.

Just one extra question. When you are saying, Gabe, that you will provide authentication for other parties, you only mean other parties that are law enforcement, right? There's no ambition, what you're doing to provide that for [all of us]?

GABE ANDREWS: No, the ambition I have is to work with ICANN Org to basically come up with a replicable model that then others might be able to follow in the future in much the same way that we're doing now. So even if it's that law enforcement initially that says, "Yeah, we think it makes sense to use this protocol. These data elements that will always be in any attestation, et cetera, et cetera," we'll try to document all that, and then others can maybe stand up their own identity providers for their own constituencies in ways that are very similar to how we do this. I view it as trailblazing, but I'm absolutely not making the assertion that Interpol is going to validate, like, intellectual property lawyers and so on and so forth. Way outside our skill set.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, cool, cool. That's good. I assumed it, but I just wanted to make sure that I heard correctly. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to note that the SSAD PDP ran for … I don't remember how long. A year? Two years? A fair amount of time. There was a huge amount of discussion. Assuming we are going to for some future system revisit the policy issues because we know at least some of them will have to change just due to the changing environment that we're living in, there's no way that our

discussion in these meetings for a few hours is going to capture all of these in sufficient depth.

So I think we can assume that there will have to be a review of all of these things going forward. Even if we say the recommendations will be followed, by the time the son of or daughter of SSAD comes out to being, there's going to be another couple of years from now, and we have to assume that somebody will be looking at all of these to make sure they're still rational. I hope. Maybe it won't happen, but I'd like to hope.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no, we have to assume it, but at the same time, because we're nose-deep into it and looking at it or whatever, there's no reason for us not to mark it when we see something.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no, I'm not saying we shouldn't be doing this. I'm just saying to keep in the back of our mind that someone else is likely to be doing this over again. And what we don't capture, hopefully someone else will. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. Feodora, I see you hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. So my understanding for this item is that we propose modification and that we then we add in the rationale: that, in essence, financial sustainability should be kept but that … 14.5 …

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that we should keep the comment specifically to [vote on:] 14.5.1, if I remember well from the screen, specifically that article where that if authentication is provided by a third party, the "must" is no longer requirement.

FEODORA HAMZA: Okay. So I will probably tag Gabe just to confirm the language or for him to provide the final one. But that seems—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'd be in favor of something that is as bordered as possible, that doesn't permeate anywhere the point of Rec 14 because otherwise we're here until December discussing just that.

FEODORA HAMZA: [Great business]. Maybe the wording we should find the middle ground. Thank you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. When I initially raised my hand, I thought about making a similar point to Allen. The SSAD report was published in July 2020 (so over five years ago now), and I think we should be clear what we mean by "keep" in that we're not saying (or I think what we're not saying; sorry for the, the imprecise language here) is that a future policy work may not revisit the policy language from the SSAD recommendations. To Alan's point, a lot of time has passed, and we are recommending changing other recommendations which we have previously noted were intended to be an interdependent package. And so I think we should be clear that a recommendation of "keep" is not a recommendation that it may not be touched or modified by future policy work.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, I think that any problem you throw a group of humans, they will look at it in their entirety. Again, my ambition here is to be able to guide or give an impression to the Council as to how much work we think needs to be done in the SSAD recommendations. I don't ambition to tell the next group what to look at and what not to look at. I think that they will and should look at it holistically but again if we can offer them (and I expect them to be a lot of us) the learnings that we learn here, that would be good.

Roger, I see your hand up.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks. I think Marc said the obvious but at least it was said, so that's good. The one thing … And maybe Gabe and Alan can jump in on this. And we'll use Gabe's LEA authentication process it's going through now. When that's complete, it still would have to be integrated with whatever system is there. So there will still be a review process that someone has to do to say that the LEA authentication process can be integrated into this process. So say it's RDRS as an example. There would still have to be some approval process to use LEA on RD[R]S. So I think that there would still be a fee or at least an evaluation of: can we integrate this authentication mechanism into our system? I'm just throwing out RDRs now, but I think there's still a process that has to approve it. I mean, if someone comes up with authentication process, it can't just be attached automatically. Someone has to look at it, approve it and say, "Okay, it has to be integrated." And then integration discussions have to be how it gets used.

So I think there's still going to be some kind of a review, and if there's cost, then I don't know. But I'm just thinking that there is a review somewhere. Thanks.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So Roger, on this (and I see Gabe raising his hand immediately), my recollection is that at this stage before any policy is done, law enforcement was going to provide a system that allowed responders (registrars right now) to obtain some kind of a flag that somebody who pretends to be law enforcement is indeed recognized by law enforcement as such. That leaves then still a complete open door to the registrar to decide what he does with that or what he or she does with that information. That (and I see Gabe's thumb up here) … Again, because it's just a flag informing the responder/user that indeed that information has been corroborated by law enforcement, that in itself is from my point of view not a policy work. There's no obligation behind it. It's just an additional piece of information that has been given there. Do you see that as needing …

ROGER CARNEY: [inaudible]

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And I'm saying this because [as per the] conversation that we had before, is this something ICANN should implement now or should wait for until policy has been done?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah, and maybe it's a simple flag, and I think that that was the whole goal of the LEA. It was a two-step process, something easy, quick and then something more involved. But even the simple thing [is that] ICANN has to somehow consume what LEA is saying. So there's got to be a process that consumes what LEA is saying. And maybe it's just that LEA provides a list. I don't know but maybe it's an active list or whatever it is. But there's still a process that has to be agreed upon that comes in. And whatever this great LEA group (I'm part of it, so it is a great group) is doing, in the end it still has to get approved to be added to … Again I'm using the RDRS, whatever it is. So—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, my panic flag here is, what is that approval? If they approve this all the way to policy, then it's yes. If their approval is the committee that you participate in (and so do I, by the way), and all agree to pass it, then it's a completely different bar to pass.

But I'll pass on the mic to Gabriel, who's been super patient and may want to add to this.

GABE ANDREWS: Yeah. It's to detangle a couple things. One, I just want to plus-one what Seb said with regards to that this is information that is being provided, and ultimately the information is being provided to the registrars, and they're ultimately the ones that decide

whether or not the information is even worth anything to them. I think it's important to recognize that there is no single authority in the world that every person in the world will trust implicitly. And so ultimately it's going to be left to each data holder as to whether or not they trust any attestation they receive from Entity X. So if someone receives an attestation from the FBI saying, "The FBI says this is Chicago PD," and we recognize that, and we're willing to put our name on the line to say that, that may or may not mean something to GoDaddy. And that's fine.

All that aside, I viewed the conversations that we've had thus far in this Standing Committee here, the RDS Standing Committee, to be what has justified the creation of that touch point because you're quite right, Roger, that the attestation still has to arrive somewhere. Like, if you're sending an attestation package, whether it's [SAML or OAuth] (I think that's the right way to say it; I'm not an engineer), it still has to be directed to someone's IP address. And so the fact that this is being directed, yes, right now, to ICANN, [for] ICANN to incorporate that as a data packet alongside an RDRS request? I think all of that is what we've been talking about supporting here and by ICANN Org as part of their ongoing work. But none of that means that there's any policy requirements then about, like, what a data holder must do when they receive it. It is very much providing additional information about someone that presumably might be credible to a large enough number of registrars and data holders to be worthwhile,

like whether it's Interpol or FBI or etc. They make that attestation about their own numbers. And I think that this neatly avoids the trap that I just referred to before. The more I've been involved in these conversations, the more I'm personally becoming increasingly convinced that there is no single company or country or whatever in the world that can or should operate as a single authority for what is or is not a credible attestation. Over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I just wanted to note that, as you can see on screen, the Standing Committee has already included some wording saying that depending on what is proposed in terms of authentication, some additional policy work might be needed. But in terms of what is being currently proposed by, I think, Gabe and his colleagues from the Public Safety Working Group, ICANN is, of course, doing a feasibility check, and other processes are in place to see how that can be integrated or not. And I'm sure my colleague Lisa has more information on this, as I'm not the most familiar, but she can add more if needed. But just to note in the recommendations that the Standing Committee already has considered some language. If more is needed, then let us know.

And I just wanted to note that the comments that Marc and Alan made earlier actually relate to the next comment that we need to discuss. So whenever we can, I would move to that one.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I was going to suggest you should. Oh, I see Roger's hand just before. And then we'll see.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Thanks, Feodora.   And again, my point was specifically on 14.5.1, and it sounded like Gabe didn't want that in there anymore. And to me it sounds like there could still be an instance where there could be a fee. When you're looking at some authentication provider trying to integrate with whatever system it is […] And to me, 14.5.1 still makes sense because it says "maybe a charge." It doesn't say there is a charge—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, it says "must." It says "must be charged." And that I think that's the issue that Gabe has.

ROGER CARNEY: "Except under certain circumstances."   It says "except under certain circumstances." So to me, the "must" is already a "may" there.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay.

ROGER CARNEY: But anyway, to me … And maybe it's not LEA. Maybe it's the next authentication provider coming down the line that wants to jump in. Again, ICANN may have to look at that. Or whoever's running the system may have to look at how they get that integrated and if it makes sense or not.

Now, whoever uses the data at the end of it doesn't matter to me because as Gabe said, that's going to be a decision someone's going to make. But from a policy standpoint, to me, I think that 14.5.1 still makes sense in the fact that I could realistically see another authentication provider coming in and wanting to integrate. And that would have to be looked at by somebody on how to integrate it. So there would be work to require that. So just my thoughts.

GABE ANDREWS: I'll be super fast.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, Alan, I'll give the mic quickly to Gabriel because it was on a point that he made. And then I'll send it to you.

GABE ANDREWS: Just very quickly, I think that there's value here if ICANN Org could set a standard. "You must be this tall to ride this ride." "Here's the technical protocol that you'd have to do if you want to connect to our systems. This is how you do it. And here's the agreement you have to sign." And then once that's established through the work that we're doing, I see that as being relatively trivial to follow through with by others. But maybe I'm being overly optimistic. I don't know that that necessarily needs to incorporate fees from there, but I take your point that there is this other carveout that I didn't fully understand the circumstances around. And so I'm still cautious.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And I think that the point that you raised initially, which is that you, FBI, can't be made to go and charge other law enforcement for service, is still a valid point, but I see Roger's point of view here. Again, this is why I'm so hesitant to touch on this particular recommendation because, because any comment has value, and I, I'm not good enough of a chess player to know how these things will evolve. So anyway, noted. And we haven't closed this discussion.

Alan, I see your hand up. And we have gone through the first hour of this call. We still have a bit less than an hour, but I want to

EN

make sure that we do go through recommendations that Feodora wants us to have dealt with before the end of the call. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll be very quick. Bottom line in my mind is if some outside organization is providing accreditation or identity facilities, their business model is their business, not ours. If they want to set a fee for it, then obviously the amount of business they get will depend on what their fees are. And that's standard business. ICANN shouldn't be in the business of telling them how to run their business. Obviously we set the rules up for how they interface with us and if they need to meet certain standards but not how they run their actual business. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I agree. But again, as per Roger's point, if their business implies a high cost for ICANN, then that should be covered. But let's not belabor it. Feodora, back to you and where you want us to (thank you, Alan) focus.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you very much. Thank you, Seb and the whole Standing Committee, for this discussion. Earlier there were some comments regarding what should happen to the whole package.

And as Marc suggested last time, staff has updated recommendation 6 where the Standing Committee recommends that as a package the SSAD recommendation should be rejected, and the path of supplemental recs should be considered.

In general, I understood there was quite some agreement within the Standing Committee, but I noted a new comment from Gabe in the review document that he wanted to address some concerns with this, and I would like to give him the floor to do exactly that.

GABE ANDREWS: So this is going to be fast because we don't have the full comment back. But the short of it is is that as I said on the last call, this seems to be a sensitive enough issue that I wanted to float back with GAC colleagues to ask if there was concern. There's indication that there is feedback that they'd like to provide but that they were not going to be able to provide it by today. And so we're going to try to get it as soon as we can. But I don't want to put words in mouths, so we're not ready yet. But I did want to flag this for awareness; that this is not text that we should just assume is completely agreed-to just yet. I know it's not the most constructive thing possible, but I hope to get you more constructive feedback soon. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's fine. Thank you for the heads up. They said if we do not have that feedback by next week (and this is no punishment), it'll have to come in the form of public comment. So [the effort is still worth], but it's just question of timing. And I'll, yeah, be curious to see what that comment is.

Again, the main concern was for the Board not to feel compelled to start agreeing to some of it and not all of it. But let, as Alan said before, another party look at it, and look at it holistically, rather than pick and choose.

Feodora, next one.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. So these are all the big comments that were planned from the final review document. But we received an email earlier from Steve Crocker relating to privacy proxy. And my question was to Steve. Maybe he can just one more time explain what we should consider from that email and if we should at all change the recommendation in relation to this in this process report or where it would be best placed. So I give the floor to you, Seb, to clarify.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, are you able to take the mic and explain this?

EN

And I'm not sure if Steve hasn't stepped away. Whilst we wait for Steve to come back, is John still around? Because there was another one. Yeah, John is still around. Sorry, to shuffle these things. Maybe we wait for Steve to come back in. Can you walk us through what you discussed with Farzaneh on those points that were left open last week?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Sure. And I don't know if we have … Let me wait till we get to it. It was a very minor revision to … Yeah, I put in a recommendation that essentially the process in the EPDP recommendations concerning disclosure of what laws were applied in making a disclosure request … And there'd be certain documentation of that exception. So it's a bit more clarity in the whole request process and then in a denial or even an acceptance, all under the theory that if I know why my request has been accepted or denied, it's going to help me put together better requests.

And Farzi had an issue concerning whether there would be a situation where, when personal information was being requested, there must be at least some sort of human rights assessment of that request. And I think it's actually a really good idea so that in situations again where it's personal information (let's say it was a dissident that had information that government was trying to get to), there would be a human rights analysis done of whether that should be produced so that if [there were] a law in, for instance,

some country that said criticizing the government is against the law, even though they were applying the law, you would also have to do a human rights assessment to produce the information. It was much more narrow than what I was concerned she was getting at before, and so I came up with some language to take care of that concern. She reviewed it and said it looked good. So that's the explanation of what we were discussing on our call.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that. Feodora, can you confirm that that was captured in a way that is clear to you.

FEODORA HAMZA: So to me, yes, I know what to do with the suggestions provided but Sarah had a comment, I think, where she says she's not sure how this is providing a Lessons Learned, but I think we can address it with her via list and in the comments as she's been very responsive. But since it's not a Cannot Live With and it's not necessarily part of the recommendations but more of the currently Lessons Learned, this should not be a show-stopper. But for now I'm very thankful for the additions and comments made, and I think the changes can be implemented fairly easily.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, thank you then, John and Farzaneh, for resolving this. Perfect.

I have in the meantime written to Steve, and I don't see his answer. Steve Crocker, are you able to speak or still not?

And I don't see him moving. He must have stepped away. Oh good. Feodora, do you have more for us to look at?

FEODORA HAMZA: So I would just like to note that the comments all made related to Cannot Live With have been so far addressed, which is a very good outcome.

There is next to the privacy proxy one, which I'm not sure what is expected of in terms of report, one last one also related to a conversation that Gabe and Sarah had and what Sarah provided clear instructions on for what she think should be changed. It relates to this part, but I'm not sure if Gabe agreed with those or not.

So Gabe, you don't have to reply during the call, but maybe you can just have another look at the comments and just confirm that the proposed language is fine. I have not included it in the report yet, but it's in the chain of comments.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabe has his hand up, but it was a hand up before so I assume that it's not about that. But anyway I'll let you comment on that and maybe tell us what you wanted to say in the first place.

GABE ANDREWS: Oh sorry, yeah, I had just a clarifying question. If you go back to page 19 because I was trying to—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, on this particular aspect you'll answer [even though you haven't looked at it yet.]

GABE ANDREWS: Yeah. Well, so on that particular aspect you just spoke of, I will look at page 15 where that comment chain is and respond offline in text as just suggested by Foedora. Happy to do so.

On the prior point that you're now looking at, back on page 19, this was the discussion I think with regards to human rights, and I just wanted to clarify, for those that were involved in that discussion, that on the suggested text here that's underlined, right where the cursor is provided ("However, the human rights of the registrant, if applicable, must be taken into account in the disclosure decision"), just because it has the word "must," is this something that we're suggesting is to be considered? Where?.. Where is this recommendation being suggested to apply to?

Sorry, it's a horribly phrased question. Do you understand what I'm getting at? Is this saying that the Standing Committee wants this to become a potential additional policy point for consideration to be inserted in amongst all the others with the EPDP phase two, or are we not saying that, or what are we saying there?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: John, go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE: So it is obviously a small-R recommendation. And a suggestion is … It's why I actually labeled them as suggestions. So a suggestion would be that when there is a disclosure request, if it involves personal information (so an individual's information), even when undertaking a disclosure analysis, if applicable, if it were a type of website[/]domain name use that would involve a situation where human rights need to be taken into account, then human rights must be taken into account. I actually think it's probably already built or baked into ICANN bylaws anyways. But it is a compromise I thought made sense. Does that answer your question?

GABE ANDREWS: I think it does. I'm going to proceed to the next part of this because … I'm just thinking in terms of actual logistics and action

EN

flow. You have a request come through. I presume that any analysis of human rights can be done preemptively. You might even have in your mind that there are certain nations that we have more concern with than others. There's certain requester groups who might … All of this might already be done prior to any request even coming. And then if it fits a certain collection of facts, then those facts apply.

However, go down to the next part of this. I see that there is a further piece of text. I want to highlight: "A denial with the documented reasoning (i.e., the applicable law prohibiting disclosure) and the human rights assessment analysis is required." The reason this is striking my eye is it seems as if you're almost obligating all registrars to publish human rights assessments as part of any denial they do, which would seem to be administratively burdensome. But maybe I'm misinterpreting that.

JOHN MCELWAINE: You're not misinterpreting it. All we've really done is added into the suggestion that there be. Since there was going to, in certain cases, need to be a human rights assessment, that human rights assessment is documented. So, for instance (and I don't know if it says denial or acceptance), there would be a requirement that that assessment be disclosed, just like there was supposed to be an explanation of why a request was denied, what law you didn't meet.

GABE ANDREWS: Okay. So part of the explanation as to why a request is denied may include the fact that a human rights assessment was conducted and impacted the decision. Okay. But if there was no human rights relevancy to a denial, it may not though yet. Okay, that's not sure that the word "must" there quite conveys the fact that it might not include that. But just flagging it for awareness and chewing on it. Yeah, let me chew on that more. But please continue.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Feodora, if it's about the same point, I'll leave it to you. And if it's not, then I'll authorize myself to go first.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you. It's related to this point.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, please go.

FEODORA HAMZA: So where it should be placed in the report is in the Lessons Learned. And this means that disagreement can be noted in those paragraphs. So if you do not agree with parts or full Lessons

Learned referenced there, Standing Committee members can always include that in that particular chapter. So that shouldn't be an issue. So that's just an additional note to Gabe and the others. But, yeah, back to you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Roger will stop me if I'm talking out of place here, but when a request is received by a registrar, to my understanding of how it works, they're looking at the request without looking at the data. It's in a second step that if this disclosure is going to go forward, they start looking at the data. But it's not like the person is looking at a John Doe's profile and saying, "This is good (or this is not). I'm going to disclose this (or I'm not.)" They're looking at the request for disclosure, and then, when deciding that it's valid, will look at the data and transmit it.

So I don't know how that completely works in that process, but, I mean, it's not for me to say, but I just want to make sure that people understand that. And I see that Roger is plus-one on this one.

In the meantime, Steve Crocker came back and is able to speak to Feodora's questions. So, Feodora, are you able … Sorry, as long as we've closed this particular topic. But I think we have … Feodora, are you able to bring back to screen what you wanted to ask Steve?

FEODORA HAMZA:	Thank you, Seb. I will stop screen sharing for a second and find the email that Steve shared. But my question is, what is Steve proposing for the Standing Committee and support staff to do in terms of report? Should we amend this recommendation, and, if so, how?

STEVE CROCKER:	Thank you, Feodora. So I have to apologize that the note that I sent gives a mindset, my mindset, as to how to deal with policy proxy and policy and privacy providers. I did not yet look at what changes to make in the report or where this should fit. I was simply offering up where my thinking was. And there was a question hanging from before of what do we do about privacy proxy providers? And as I say, I didn't go match that up with where in the report [the recommendations are]. So I appreciate you asking. And I apologize. I don't have the direct answer for you but the picture that I presented is in my mind a nice clean straightforward view, and it has consequences. And then the question is okay, with respect to this report, where do we want to (assuming we want to) say anything about that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Go ahead, Feodora, if you want to answer.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you very much, Steve. So just for my current understanding, it's this wording or it seems that the Standing Committee agrees that in this area more policy work is needed, and there's a gap that could be closed with that. But I think any other in-depth discussion on this topic is maybe better placed in the PPSAI IRT. I'm not sure (and this is for the Standing Committee to discuss further) that going too much into detail in this one is the scope of RDRS, but I may have misunderstood as well. But if you have concrete suggestions to the text in the recommendations, the Standing Committee is of course happy to consider it.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I'll attempt to take a look and see if there's a natural place for it, and let me invite you or indeed anybody, either staff or in the committee, to have an opinion about that and offer it up.

And your comment about PPSAI is of course directly relevant. I will make the same comment in that group. This meeting was coming up now, and I wanted to offer it up here. But I'll also feed it into PPSAI.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. I saw there was a hand. Oh, they all disappeared. Was there any other comment? Roger, was it you that had your hand up?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, yeah. But I'll just wait if there's any additional language coming up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thanks. Cool. Feodora, I'm assuming that this answers your question for now.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. Correct.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So we've now covered the questions that you had, the things that we're still pending. I see your hand up. Go ahead. Maybe you want to take this over.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yeah. Maybe it's easier if I just summarize. Thank you very much. As noted earlier, the Cannot Live With comments have been all addressed. It was a big success of the Standing Committee.

There are some small ones pending in the Need Clarification section which we will address via list and in the comment section of that document. And I think that should be now after discussing today also done quickly.

Just noting that as you said earlier, next week is officially the last Standing Committee meeting, and then a consensus call should take place, and then shortly after the report should go for public comment. So if the Standing Committee has some substantial comments on the recommendations, then please make them now and provide alternative language if not done so. But I think many things have been addressed already. And also consider that there is obviously, as stated by Seb earlier, a public comment period.

But just pointing out that, if there are any other comments you feel have not been addressed properly, please raise them with staff as soon as possible. And don't wait for the meeting to occur. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to note that, next week, I'll be traveling and will likely not have connectivity. It may be sporadic during the meeting, so I'll try to attend. But there's a good chance I will not

be here. But I'll try to make sure my comments that I leave in the documents are as clear as possible. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And noted. And in case you don't show up, then you would be an apology. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you for this summary of where we are. I think we're in good shape and in a good place heading towards public comments.

If I could maybe recap where we are and provide a little bit of a suggestion here, on page five of the report, we've got recommendation one: to continue RDRS beyond the pilot period. I think this is in good shape.

On Rec 2 though, we're implementing key system enhancements to sustain the pilot, our stopgap. And as we heard at the top of the call, this is additional work on the RDRS that currently ICANN is not planning to undertake but would undertake at the direction of the ICANN Board. So we're suggesting that GNSO Council initiate dialogue with the Board in order to undertake this work. And so at the top of the conversation, we suggest maybe a little explanatory text, and I think here at the top of Rec 2 would be the place to put that.

Now taking this back in further context, if you scroll down, we've got current Rec 4, which is to allow partial authentication of interested requester groups beginning with law enforcement. What we heard is that this is work underway (we have the small group that Gabe and others are undertaking) and that this is work that ICANN Org is planning to undertake and will be part of future efforts. So with that, it would make sense to move this recommendation, this current Rec 4, up ahead of the current Rec 2.

So we've got Rec 1 (continue the RDRS) and Rec 2 (undertake this effort on authentication). Rec 3 would then be to implement system enhancements to improve the RDRS as a stopgap. Current Rec 3 is to consider further policy work in additional areas. That would move to Rec 4. What is currently Rec 5 is going away. That's the financial sustainability, which we don't have consensus on, so that we're maintaining some information as a lesson learned but removing that from the recommendation. Current Rec 6 which would become Rec 5, will be considerations regarding next steps. This some might view as our key recommendation: what to do with the SSAD recommendations. And then finally we have Rec 7, not to be forgotten at the end of this long table, which is to maintain a modified form of the Standing Committee to provide advice to Council.

So, yeah, that's where I think we are. I'm suggesting a slight change in the ordering and adding a little, as we discussed, bit of additional explanation to currently Rec 2, which I'm suggesting be Rec 3 as far as what work is or isn't currently being considered to be undertaken. I hope that all makes sense as a big-picture summary of where we are and some sort of tweaks to make it more easily presentable and consumable to somebody reviewing the work. But overall I think we're in good shape heading towards public comments.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So what I was missing is a camera on Feodora's face to see how panicked she was as you were describing all those changes. But they make sense to me. Thank you, Marc.

Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABE ANDREWS: Separate topic to return to page 15. But if it's not appropriate time, I'll stand by.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please, we still have time.

GABE ANDREWS:	All right, if we can jump back to … Actually it was in the table, not this document, to clarify. Correct. And page 15 on this table. You called my attention to it. And just for the benefit of the group as to why this is so messy, there was a long comment/thread of Sarah, myself, and folks at ICANN. I find it hard to respond in line in that margin comment thread. So instead I have just now made a suggestion to modify my initial text to I think address what Sarah was saying. I invite Roger, if you want to review, to make sure this makes sense.
	This whole topic dealt with the fact that inside the RDRS now when you make an expedited request, it specifically calls out that this tool, RDRS, is not appropriate for urgent requests and to instead use this page. And if you click the link where it says "this page," it goes to the list of registrar contact info that I believe Sarah and I are both in agreement on. We've both heard that most registrars say that's not the best contacts for this purpose. So there was a risk associated with that.
	I wanted to flag that risk and then to support I think what I'm hearing from Sarah and from the rest of those who have been involved in this part of the conversation: that we would support it if ICANN were to actually get a list of contacts for each registrar that they, the registrars, designate is a better contact to use, and to maintain that, but not to make that list public because making

that list public might risk its misappropriation for other purposes and render it useless.

So that's the thought. I'm trying to capture that in this comment here. If there's additional feedback though that comes from either Sarah or Roger Ray or anyone in the Registrar Stakeholder Group, if I'm getting it wrong, please call it out. My initial assumption that the 318[.]3 contact information would be better seems to have been a wrong assumption, and it was not intended to be anything more than just trying to be helpful. So I'm happy to modify the language in a more helpful way. Over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And I see Roger plus-one what you just said. Okay. The registrar will look at it then. Thank you. I'll let … Is that you typing, Gabe? Okay, cool. I'll then give back to Feodora when more time … Do we actually believe that we've gone through the whole document and all the same points?

FEODORA HAMZA: Don't sound so …

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm questioning. I'm happy.

FEODORA HAMZA: No, indeed, for today we've actually achieved quite a lot. So now it's with support staff to implement. We will share tomorrow the action items and the notes and also update the document accordingly. And if you have any other pending comments as said earlier, please provide them as soon as possible. But if you also, based on today's discussion, can provide any additional language that we could not go through today, please do that as well.

But yes, I agree with the comments made earlier. We seem to be in a very good shape. So for the next step or closure of this meeting, I hand it over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, well thank you very much. We don't need to belabor this much longer.

So next week on the 11th, I believe, which is this time next week, we need to take a consensus call on the document that we will have by then finished [preparing].

From my point of view, we've ironed out most of the issues.

On the very last one, Gabe, I have to be honest. I'll have to look into it because you caught me a bit by surprise. I'm not quite sure where we're at, but it sounds at least like Roger knows exactly what you're talking about, which is your targeted audience here.

On the other ones, again, I was bit more worried on not finding agreement on the finance but I think that we're good. I think that we're good, and we'll just need to look at how we can input your concern, Gabriel, without breaking the whole Rec 14. But yeah, we have a week to do that.

And then, evidently Gabe, you mentioned the fact that the GAC might want to put a comment. If we can't make it by next week, they'll have ample opportunity to put it in public comments. Alan, you said you won't be here next week, but there'll be still plenty of time after this to comment on what we're doing here.

So good job. Thank you very much, everybody, for your attention and everything. I see Terri's hand up. Go ahead, Terri.

TERRI AGNREW: Quick question. I may have missed it, and apologies if you addressed it. Are we leaving the meeting on the 11th for one hour or should I extend it for two hours?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Let's live dangerously--no, not dangerously. Let's move it for two hours but for all intents and purposes, I think that will be finished way before, and I'll let people run away as soon as I no longer need them for this task. So I'll block two hours just to make sure that we have all our ducks in a row. It's an important deadline,

but I'm assuming that it will take us a whole lot less than two hours to get that completed. Is that fair?

No answer from Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:

To me, I was like, sure, that sounds fair to me So. I didn't know if you were trying to quiz the others.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, it was your question, so I'm asking you. Good.

Any other questions, comments? Thank you. And well done, us. Yeah, I'll take full credit. Don't worry. Thank you very much, everybody, for this great work. I'm feeling a whole lot better than I did three/four days ago about it. It's fantastic. Thank you very much. And talk to you next week.

In the meantime, get back to the document, make sure that it's all square and what you want it to say, so we can sign it off and send it away next week. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]