
TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call taking place on Monday, the 7th of April, 2025. We do have one listed apology for today's meeting, and that is Mark Anderson. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or unmute now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO Secretariat. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view the chat and have listened only to the audio. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. All chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN expected standard of behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. In one final sweep, please remember to change your Zoom chat and select everyone at this time. With this, I'll turn it back over to Chair Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much, Terry, and good evening, good afternoon, good morning to everyone. So we've got a lot of things to discuss today. I'd like to reserve as much time as possible to discuss Chapter 3, and I'll ask Feodora in a moment to walk us through what she's prepared for us. But before we dive into that, I want to make sure, well, first of all, does anybody have an AOB to the proposed agenda? So review Chapter 3, discuss the meeting cadence and the update to the GNSO Council. If I

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.

see no further hands, so I guess that we do not have an AOB. I want to make sure that we have at least a good 10, 15 minutes at the end to discuss the last two points. And so regardless of what we get with Chapter 3, I'll stop you around 8.15 my time, 8.10, 8.15 my time, so in 45 minutes, let's say. And to be able to discuss those last two points, we can finish the discussion on Chapter 3 a bit later. The other thing that I wanted to warn you, well, warn you, no, tell you, Chapter 2, there's still this exercise of prioritizing each item in Chapter 2. Given the fact that it's been standing like that for now three weeks, I want to say, at least, there hasn't been any priorities there. So I went and added my own priorities as I sort of understood from everybody. Thank you, Feodora, for putting the link. Essentially I've put priorities, the priorities were supposed to be 1 to 10. I've put, I think, 1 to 10 on the stuff that is, I think everybody agrees that we need it at some point or another, like the API and that sort of stuff. I've put beyond 10 stuff that doesn't seem to me like all that urgent or we're dependent on other things. For example, there's a few dependencies on the API itself that don't make sense until the API is done. And so I've prioritized that late. And the last priority, I've put a priority of 20, I think, on requesting for the tool to be redeveloped outside of Salesforce. And I've put that in a priority 20 simply because I, well, from discussions with the board, I understand that they don't regard that as a recommendation itself, that they want to make sure that ICANN org makes that decision, since they're the ones running it and maintaining it, they should be able to better the site. Obviously I'm open for discussion on this, not today. If you want to go and have a check, Feodora, I've put the link for chapter 2, go and put your comments. We're not going to talk about it today. And then we can revisit that at the end when people have put their own priorities. With

this said, and let me check very quickly if I'm forgetting anything. No, I'm not forgetting anything in my welcome. So if you're ready, Feodora, I will ask you to walk us through what you prepared for chapter 3.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. To avoid long scrolling, I've created an overview slide to introduce to you chapter 3. You will see there are two main sections in the chapter. The first is a table that goes through all the asset recommendations one by one and marks them in red, yellow, or green. Red means that the recommendations does not currently exist in RDRS, yellow that it partially exists in RDRS, and green that it's mostly in line with asset and RDRS. Please have a look and provide your review. And then section 2 is the specific lessons learned. In this part of the chapter, you see that we included the conclusions made in chapter 1. They just look slightly different now. Some remain to be incorporated. Each lesson learned also relates to an asset recommendations, but some lessons are also more generic, as you can see in the chapter. We also included the cost analysis that's been asked for and also the ICANN org experience in developing RDRS. Now in terms of next steps and how we are going to conduct this session, we asked for the SE to kindly review the chapter and flag items for discussions, which are going to be provided to you via slides. And I'm going to hand over to Seb to manage that discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So before this, if you can go back to the previous slide very quickly. As we've said many times, this group is not going to do a policy review.

We've worked, so Fyodor has worked on staff side. John had done already, I want to say last year, even the one before, a sort of, no last year he must have done it, a comparative between what RDRS was going to be and the SSAD policies. We were just deferring from the SSAD policies and where we were still sticking to them. This is again, not a policy review. I'm happy to have whatever discussion you guys want to have, but I just want to make sure that we leave that to the group that is going to do the proper policy review. But this is just sort of a big ticket item, I'm sorry, every recommendation, but it's sort of a brief recommendation of the SSAD. And if we are, you know, still in the spirit of SSAD, or if we moved away, red, yellow and green. Steve DelBianco, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Hey, thank you, Sebastien. This is also a contextual point. I was on that EPDP phase one and phase two, and it strikes me that there's a distinction between the phase two recommendations we made and separately, the SSAD, which came out back from staff with an operational design analysis. So our audiences will think of the SSAD when they see that acronym, they think of SSAD as that hundred million dollar, costed out staff project. And that is distinct from the policy recommendations that emerged from phase two. Those two phrases, phase two recommendations and SSAD, they seem to be used interchangeably on the slide that we're all looking at. Do you mean those to be the same thing, or do you accept my position that they're really somewhat different? Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, no, I accept that they're somewhat different. I don't know what the recommendations were called, anything else than SSAD. I thought there was already the name given in that phase two, but I'm happy to be corrected.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Think about this a second. The recommendations were for functionality. The SSAD operational design came back with, you know, implementation plans that pursued from the policy. And therein lies a complicated and expensive accreditation system that contributes to the \$100 million and the ongoing operational cost. So it serves our interests, I think, to talk about things that were or were not in the phase two recommendations and then if we want to compare to this monstrous SSAD, we can do so, but that attracts skepticism and serious objections.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see exactly your point. And just to make clear, we're talking about phase two recommendation. As I see the slides, actually, it should be recommendations with a big R, with a capital R. It's definitely the recommendations of phase two. And if we need to change and remove the name SSAD, I'm happy to do so. But we're talking about going back to the recommendation and not the ODR. I'm interested to see what Sarah has to say about it. Because again, Sarah, this is a rhetorical, more than a policy point. Sure. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I think this might be one of those moments where I'm not fully understanding Steve, and I might disagree, but it might not really matter. I think what we might both agree on is that everything we are doing here needs to tie back to the phase two report and not to the operational design assessment. Is that where you're going?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. Exactly. Exactly. So we don't want to have SSAD written on the slides like it is right in the middle of the screen.

SARAH WYLD: SSAD is in the phase two recommendations. I was just pasting in there from the definitions page of the phase two final report. So I hesitate to say that we shouldn't refer to it. That was on page 18 that I quoted.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: But in any case, we are all fully agreed that we're talking about policy recommendation, and it's a review of those recommendations in the order they were listed, and compared to where we are at now, not the ODA interpretation of the SSAD recommendations. And Fyodor, you can confirm that that's where you source the recommendations you're looking at?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes, I can confirm, Sebastien, and they're also linked in the chapter and in the table. So you would be directed to what we refer to immediately.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. So afterwards, is that SSAD or not? My recollection, but Sarah, you're a lot more thorough and quoted the actual text. My recollection is that the name SSAD came out of the recommendations, but maybe that was one step too far, and I didn't recollect properly, which happens. If that is all, and I see that Steve turned his camera off, I think that we can move on to the next slide. Thank you. That's all right. You can turn it off. You're free to have it on or off. It's all good. So, areas flying for discussion. Do you want to keep on going, Fyodor, or do you want me to take this? Oh, and just a second, because we're first going to take Sarah's question. No, Sarah didn't have a question. So, Fyodor.

FEODORA HAMZA: I think Sarah was raising her hand because she made the comment, because, yeah, that's kind of how we want to do it, like during ICANN 82, where the comment owner just presents what they meant here. So, I give it back to Sarah.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Oh, wait a second. So, I enjoyed the weekend away, and I didn't completely... Did people already put comments in Chapter 3? That is fantastic. That is a lot faster than I had seen, but that's very good. I saw Steve's hand, but at the same time, I see that he just possibly answered a phone call, so he might want to make his comment afterwards. So, we're going to go back to, indeed, the exercise that we did in Seattle. And since Sarah put a comment in Chapter 3, let's listen to her comment. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. So, the first thing I would do is actually offer to retract my first comment. The text, as you can see, I think that it's quite negative for no necessary reason, but that's okay. We can have different opinions on how to position it. I agree that there is nothing factually incorrect in there. It may not, indeed, comprehensively address questions. It can still assist in consideration. So, I'm fine with just not talking further about that first comment on the screen and just retracting it and leaving the language as is.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, for everybody's benefit, and it might actually be worth... I know that you weren't looking forward to it, Feodora, but to back and forth with the original text. That is the comment about accreditation and the fact that accreditation is not...

SARAH WYLD: This is not specific to accreditation. It's just part of the high-level overview.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Oh, yeah. I see what you mean. Okay. So, anyway, you're ready to retract the comment. In the meantime, I've seen Steve Crocker plugging in and out with a hand up and down. Steve, did you want to make a comment or you've had to move on to another call? You can always circle back. So, the first comment is gone. The second comment is regarding the participation of registrars in RDRS. Sarah, again,

comments. So, I'm not going to do the reading like that on the screen. So, about participation of registrars or not. Sarah, you wanted to comment that it's basically exactly the same in the policy or... Please help me here. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Yes. Thank you. So, this is in a section starting with the phrase, limitations in assessment include. So, this is described, this paragraph that we see on screen is a limitation of the RDRS. And so, what it's telling us is that the limitation here is that we're only going to get partial information about the overall landscape of demand because requesters can go directly to the registrar instead of going through the RDRS. And so, the RDRS is not analogous in this way to the SSAD. That's how I read that paragraph. Am I understanding it correctly or does anybody read it differently?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Do we think that under SSAD, requesters would not be allowed to go direct anymore? Is that what our recollection was, the policy?

SARAH WYLD:

That is not my recollection. We have the phase one policy, registration data policy, recommendation 18, requires registrars to have a path for disclosure requests. So, regardless of when the SSAD is built and how it works and all of that, under SSAD or no SSAD, it's the same. There's always the direct path to registrars. It does not make sense that this is a limitation because it's just going to always be like this.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, before I give you the hand, Alan, for, and I don't want to get too much into the weeds of the policy, the direct path to a registrar, that was also my recollection. But there wasn't the SSAD, there was the idea of being able to make requests to registrars and registries, which we've, that second part, which we've completely abandoned. So, is there an RDRS or a path direct to the registrar? Is there something that we need to do for registries or is this also considered to be what we're going to go with the future, what the future will be?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. So, I do sometimes forget registries. It's the same. They're together in the policy. So, under the phase one policy, it says registrar and registry operator must do these things for receiving disclosure requests. And so, it is both of them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you, Sarah's right. This paragraph, as read, is irrelevant because it's the same in SSAD. The differences in SSAD are registries, although, if I remember correctly, the final policy made it difficult to get to registries, but it was possible. And, of course, the use of SSAD, sorry, SSAD was mandatory for registrars and registries, and in RDRS, it isn't. So, as long as those other points are covered somewhere, this paragraph doesn't really say anything and isn't needed, but those other points do need to be covered. I don't have the text in front of me, so I don't really recall if they were mentioned somewhere. The text, this particular paragraph, though, doesn't really add anything.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Noted, and so the comment stays, and we'll correct the paragraph or we'll remove the paragraph if it doesn't make sense. Next slide, Feodora. So the next comment that we note is now in the, so for those of you who have opened the chapter three, and it was posted in the, in the chat. One or two screens above. And I would recommend to have it open at the same time. After the block that we just spoke about, there is a table with the recommendations that were all together, but the 18 recommendations from phase two. And so we are going directly to recommendation five, there were comments before. But I guess that this is one that we flagged for discussion. So, the recommendation originally is on the response requirements. And Sarah, do you want to talk to us about what you wanted to say here.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, thank you. This is Sarah. For item, my suggested addition is simply to add that bracketed phrase as noted in rec number five to make the whole area, to make the box more clear right so it already said the system does not provide response recommendations to the registrar. If you're just reading it. You might wonder, why do we think the system should provide response recommendations, the answer is because recommendation five said it should. So, my suggestion is just to add that bracketed text to make it more clear.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. And I guess I'm seeing no other comments so I guess that makes sense. And that makes sense to all. Thank you. That's noted. Then we go

down to recommendation seven regarding requester purpose. Do you want to walk us through your comments, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. I'm just looking at it in the other document because it's got more info. So, the expectation was that the requester will indicate their purpose in the RDRS, the purpose is a mandatory field. My question was, should somebody confirm that the purposes documented in RDRS match the purposes in the recommendation. I think they don't actually match because I looked at it, apparently, and found that in the SSAD, there would be a processing purpose for data verification requests on the registrant's consent. And in the SSAD, no, I'm backwards, in the RDRS that doesn't exist. So, we should look at those purposes and make sure, well, we should decide how we document the fact that they don't all match up yet.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, just for my memory, those purposes as listed in RDRS, are those the ones you were using or the ones that came from the registrar perfect template or where did those come from? I don't remember. It was a long time ago. Good. Okay, well, fantastic. Then I'm not the only one that has forgotten. No, well, definitely, we should match it. And by the way, not that one is better than the other, but at least have both and note the differences maybe for the policy group to decide what works best. I assume RDRS, did I understand you correctly, that RDRS has got a few more or at least one more than the policy?

SARAH WYLD: I think there was one that I saw in the policy that I don't remember from RDRS, which is the one that's on the screen.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, obviously, yes. And with also the learning from RDRS, if I may, to make sure that when we have a finite list of items to pick and choose from, that everybody fully agrees on what each of those items mean and that two different parties giving the same answer really meant the same thing. And so, Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just a quick comment. What we have in RDRS has evolved over the last year or so based on actual use. And, you know, after it was in use for a month, people put up their hands and say, but this is missing or this doesn't work. The SSAD recommendations never had that level of actual verification and verification that they were usable and, in fact, met the needs. So I think it's pretty obvious that for this recommendation and probably a lot of the others, real use and real exposure to real life will end up changing some of these things. So I don't think we should be particularly surprised that ours have evolved in a different way than the wise people in SSAD. And I say that somewhat sarcastically since I was one of them, you know, picked all the right answers at that point.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, fair enough. But then, I mean, at some point, again, we need to flag it for the policy group to make sure that they review that in light of the real world exercise. Sarah, I see your hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed, but we shouldn't treat the SSAD one as the gospel, which we have to now adjust to.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, yeah, but it is in a way because its recommendation has been voted and we're not throwing it away. So it's not the gospel, but it's the scriptures as we're left. So we do need to go back to it. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Yeah, so I agree with Alan that it's a good idea to flag areas where the RDRS has changed. And so it doesn't match the SSAD requirements. But that is specifically because the users requested a different thing. And, you know, the users of the RDRS, I don't imagine, are referring very often to the phase two report to see how it compares. But they are asking for things that make sense in terms of how they're using the system. So we should document that maybe in the chart so that it's clear for subsequent teams. Because it is useful information to know where those things deviate. Another thought that I had, and I'm not sure when's the right time for it. I don't know that we need to get into it in detail, but just I don't think that we are all using that chart in quite the same way. And so, for example, on this number seven

requester purpose row, the input on the far right column status in relation to the EPDP REC, I think, you know, it includes what those recommendations were, but doesn't really talk about how it relates to the RDRS, which I thought is what it's supposed to do. So just to flag that the chart might need some updates in that regard also. Thank you. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you for that, Sarah. We are already on the next slide. And I see, so on REC seven, there was a comment from John, who's an apology because he's got a conflicting call with the IPC right now. And another from Sarah. Was there anything that you needed to add, Sarah, as I'm looking very quickly to John's comment?

SARAH WYLD:

Yeah, thank you. So with regards to John's comment, this is part of what I was just referring to. And so he's pulled out the temp spec, which I don't think we should really consider here, but that's OK. And then the REC 7.1.1, which like, yes, that is the relevant recommendation here, but it's not telling us how it compares to RDRS. And so I just think we still have some more work to do on that one. But the temp spec, I would say, doesn't really count anymore. So I wouldn't refer to the purposes listed there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah. Yeah. And well, that's my understanding also, Sarah, the SSAD recommendations were there to replace the temp spec. That still exists

because we haven't implemented anything else. Sorry, we've implemented a huge chunk of it in the last year. But in this particular context, still trying to follow. So then the next comment, and it's still Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: I just read the whole report. That's what happened. Shall I talk about the report? That's what happened. You did your homework. Fantastic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So then we go beyond the portion. with the review of the different recommendations and walk us through it, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, so this one in the lessons learned, I found fascinating. This was a real surprise to me. 30% of the resources to build the RDRS were for PGP encrypted emails. Registrars almost entirely, I think, are not using that PGP encrypted email functionality. Maybe literally nobody is using it because it doesn't work with ticketing systems. So it seems to me like there wasn't a good discussion as to whether this amount of work time should be dedicated to this functionality. And for now, here we are, we can't go back. But we should discuss this, or I don't know if it's useful to discuss. As a team, we should consider how to avoid that kind of thing in the future. Make sure that expensive functionality is going to be used. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, and I flagged that last week too. You're absolutely right. And this is to be sort of used also as a background thought to our future or final discussions on chapter two when we're closing that. What happened for those who don't quite remember is that when we decided to go with the RDRS, the registrar community was still to be convinced to join. And we enjoyed a good participation from the registrars. But until the very last moment, the registrars weren't sure that they wanted to join. And in particular, were saying, you're asking us to go and use another, we all have a system, more or less elaborate, but we all have a system that we're using and you're asking us to use another system. And so there was this discussion indeed of having RDRS sending to the registrar, something that needed to be encrypted, something that was reminiscent of, I can't remember which other, the UDRP maybe, I can't remember which other process that existed in ICANN. We were trying to mirror there by using PGP and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I don't think anybody, staff or outside, but definitely not on the registrar side, I didn't understand until I read it last week that it had taken so much time. And I think that if people had realized, we would have said, well, no, actually, it's not that vital because the result is, Sarah, my understanding is nobody used it because it doesn't work with the ticketing system or whatever. So this is absolutely something that we need to learn from when we are, when we're deciding of future features, because yeah, sending staff on a wild goose chase, and sorry, maybe unfair, maybe it could have been a useful tool. It turned out that is a tool that took a long time to develop and didn't find its audience. And so, yeah, we need to learn from that. Steve, I see your hand up and I noted that you wanted to speak earlier. So if you want to go back to earlier discussions, you can too.

STEVE CROCKER: No, thank you. No, just apropos of this, do you remember, does anybody remember why PGP encrypted email was chosen as opposed to simply reaching out to the registrar through the registrar's API if they have one and if they don't?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So it was used because, and Sarah, help me here, it was used because it mirrored another process that is currently working. I can't remember if it was with UDRP or with other DRP, but it basically, it's a way of exchanging information that was already being used by registrars and a third party within the community, and that was chosen. The other way indeed would have been then for IDRS to go and connect it to multiple interfaces, and I don't think I was contemplating that at all. Obviously, yes, Sarah, that would be replaced by an API, but it was also knowing that we wouldn't have time to develop an API in time for the registrars to approve it and say, yes, we want to play. This again was, if I remember well, the discussion was in September for a launch three months later or something like that. Half of the development had already been done, so we're very far into the discussion process. Next slide, and I want to note that I'm giving this another 10 minutes at max before we need to talk about other things. So, in the lessons learned, and I'm trying to do on a small screen, three different moving about. So, REC5, still on the request, on the response, sorry. Yeah, this was a comment for me, and I can't remember what I wrote. So, do we need to discuss, and I guess it's another feature of this, but a lesson learned. What we've designed is something that takes the request, passes it on

to a registrar, and the rest of the conversation happens elsewhere. Now, my understanding is actually the rest of the conversation doesn't really happen, in the sense that the vast majority of tickets are taken for what is submitted, and then the decision is taken. It might be contested by the requester, but it's not like the ticket is open and the registrars are going to go into a conversation with the requester and say, hey, you forgot this or that, and can you give me more on this, and et cetera. It might happen, but it's not the vast majority of requests are actually treated and granted or refused on the basis of what was submitted the first time. So, do we need to talk and think about having a proper ticketing system where that conversation can happen, or is this overkill because it's never going to be used? Arcing back to the previous question, and I don't know. I don't have enough experience in the way this is being currently transactional. Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, one of the things that jumps out last time I looked at statistics, which was a while ago, is that there are sort of two broad categories of refusals. One is that the request was not well formed, missing something or whatever, versus we understand exactly what you want, you've given us all the information, and the answer is no. Lumping those two together, I think, is a little too broad, and I would strongly recommend, if you're going to try to compute any percentages or whatever, to break those out. The Sankey diagrams that Gabe introduced, I think, are enormously useful here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, so we should go back, identifying how many of those requests are actually opening some kind of a, should open some kind of a conversation, and if there is enough traffic there, indeed it warrants. And by the way, having a ticketing system might not be the end of the world. There's plenty of ticketing systems out there that we could piggyback on.

STEVE CROCKER: It's not the fact of the ticketing system, I don't think. It's what do you do with the data there, and if incomplete data is a source, then the way to fix that is better education, or documentation, or pre-checking, or whatever. And if the answer is that it's been refused because the registrar determines that they're not going to answer that question, then that's a whole different discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, agreed. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah. Yeah, I think really the question we need to ask is whether the phase two recommendations include an element of, or an expectation of, a back-and-forth interaction between the requester and the registrar. And I know that in recommendation eight, it's talking about re-examination requests, that it must allow for re-examination requests. That seems to me to suggest an element of back-and- forth discussion, which the RDRS does not include. And I do think this is an

important topic that we should research a little bit more. I feel like there was more in the chart that I'm not finding right now. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, but so definitely something to discuss further. Great. It'll be flagged. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alan speaking. Steve covered part of what I was going to say, in that my recollection is there were a lot of, in RDRS, there's a lot of requests that were closed because of missing data, or incomplete, or something like that. That being said, it's not clear that if we had a capability of going back and forth easily, it would be used. That may not be the preferred way of doing that. So, noting this, the problem says, has been used. That may not be the preferred way of doing that. So, We really want to try to fix it. As Steve said, maybe it's education, maybe it's something else. The other thing is, my recollection is, again, it's many years ago now, but I don't think, although SSAD contemplated that there might be back and forth, I don't think it was done through SSAD. I thought, my recollection is that would be done with direct communication with the contact information provided, not through SSAD itself. I may be wrong on that though.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, and there's, I think Steve also hinted to that, there's also the whole discussion of how much more information do you put in the system that is potentially private and et cetera. But definitely a

conversation to be had. We'll mark it as such. We won't have it today because we've got three more minutes on this and then I need to move on. Do we want to delve into the cost? I think, yeah, we'll just do it very quickly, but just to make sure that everybody's identified that for the first time, I hadn't seen it before, that staff did share the sort of cost of operation, of the RDRS operation. So far, we have been juggling with SSAD. I see that there's a comment from you, Sarah, do you want to walk us through it?

SARAH WYLD:

There was, thank you, yes. So I will just note that I left two comments in the same section of the document. The first thing I did was added suggested text in the paragraph. So it says, it already said, with 2,416 requests handled in the first year of the pilot, and then I added, and implementation costs of just under, and then I did a calculation. And the calculation I did was taking the total number of requests, 2416, and I multiplied that by the cost that was listed here in the paragraph of 354. And that's how I got 825. And then I kept reading the document and scrolled down and there was a chart. So I thought certainly the chart is gonna have to match my calculation, but it didn't. Okay, so I'm not sure, well, so it looks like Lisa explained, thank you so much, Lisa, for being so forthcoming prompt, like just answering my questions so fast, love it. So I guess the calculation in the paragraph was based off of the operational costs, and I was including the development costs. And indeed, as Lisa noted, the development costs are a one-time occurrence, but I just thought that they were supposed to be included. So the amount that I came up to of just over \$1,000 is based off of that 2,500,000 and change answer. And the 354 is if we look only at the operational costs and do

not include the development costs. So ultimately, either one of those might be useful information, but whatever we're doing just needs to be super clear as to where the totals are coming from. So yeah, thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, yeah, we'll make the math work. In any case, I think that it does raise the issue that even at the lower of the two, at \$350 a pop, yeah, it needs to be raised. Again, SSAD was supposed to be self-sustained, was supposed to be a paid service, was supposed to be et cetera. I've heard, including from my friend John, that in principle, the requester community, at least his side of the room, weren't totally against paying if they were getting a service behind it. But I don't, yeah, we would need to see if these were the figures that he had in mind or not.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Thank you, Sebastien. I just wanted to mention the ambiguity that's surrounding the term requester community. Can we be a little bit clearer? There are many diverse sets of requesters, and we have to, and I also noted this in chapter two, that when a proposal or a concern comes from this requester community that is very broad, that is not defined as ICANN, can we please mention their stakeholder group? So in this case, they're talking about intellectual property constituency. And, well, I'm not going to comment that why they don't want to pay, because if we consider costs for law enforcement is something else than like for a commercial endeavor. So I think that it's very important to emphasize and not talk about a requester community, but which stakeholder group at ICANN is asking this. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, fair enough. Just to be clear, when I said, I did use the term requester community, I also said from his side of the table, and the IPC was indicating that they were ready to pay something, understanding other parties on the requester side might not be willing to. But that's a side. Sarah, and then we're going to close this to go on to the last two points.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. So as I'm reviewing again, recommendation 14 from the phase two report, it does say that in considering costs, we need to distinguish between development and operationalization, and then subsequent running of the system. And it goes on to sort of separate out the costs in that kind of conceptual way. So it seems that it makes sense in our report to come up with a total per request price that is based off the implementation cost and does not include the development cost. So I'm like, I'm satisfied. I appreciate what you're doing in the report. I just think that it needs to be super clear as to why that's the total, which I think it is now clear with the corrected suggested addition that I have left. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Okay. All noted. We'll make sure that it's anyway as clear as need be. Did we review all the points in chapter three that were open?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. So far. Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Fantastic. We'll go back. There's a number we've already said that we would go back. I invite everybody obviously to go through the text and comment. Thank you, Sarah, for already having done. But I think that it needs more eyes. So if we can go back to the agenda, there's two items that we wanted to discuss. One briefly, and this is an issue of cadence. We would like, and there's two ways to go about it. Either we keep on having a meeting every second week like we've had for the last year, but widen the meeting to 90 minutes instead of 60 in order to be able to go through, because there's still a number of items that we need to go through before we finish this report. And I'm still wanting to have this as close as possible to ICANN 83. It looks like it's probably not going to be before ICANN 83 now. So we wanted to augment the cadence. The other option is to keep it to 60 minutes, but do it every week. And I just wanted to leave it open. Both models work for me. I might have a slight preference for the 90 minutes every second week, but it doesn't matter. My time is available. But what does a group think? In particular, what other commencements do you have on Mondays at this time every second week? Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. I'm going to disappoint Farzaneh. I would rather do it every week for one hour. I have another meeting after this one, so I would rather not make this one earlier.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: What about earlier? I'm looking at my Californian friends before they scream.

SARAH WYLD: Earlier. I have another meeting for this one. I have meetings on both sides of this, but not every other week. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. And Farzaneh says every week. No, that's too much. You've got other conflicts. Can we, because right now we've got one vote on either side. I'm still going to become the deciding vote if nobody chooses. But can we have some comments? And we're not going to spend now 10 minutes trying to wake people up. Can we have comments on the mailing list? Look at your agendas. Look at your calendars. We're going to have to put a bit more work in this before we can get it across the line. We will, yeah. My problem is this, is 60 minutes every week. It's going to be a whole lot more meetings, but I don't know that it will augment the output because we spend 15 minutes in the beginning just re-tasking what we've done the week before and whatever. 90 minutes works a bit better for me in the sense that people get in the roof and we get things moving. And I understand Sarah, I understand the limitations. So this is one thing.

The next thing is about a presentation I'm supposed to do to GNSO Council later this week on Thursday, if I'm not entirely wrong. It's time for us to give an update to the Council, that's fine. One of the items that we want or to present, I want to present to the Council is with regards to public comments. Is this an exercise that warrants public comment,

knowing that in any case, there's going to be another group that's going to do policy that will have its own public comment? Or is this an exercise that because of who's on the call, representation for every part of the GNSO is good enough for the Council to take on board? Now it's not for us to decide. I'm going to ask the Council exactly that, and see what they say. If we need public comments, obviously, all the tentative deadlines to have this finished before ICANN 83 go out the window, because the 40 day window for comment is basically is going to take us to the next ICANN. If they say, no, this is good enough, send us your report, and then we'll see, because that's also, so do we have, that's what I want to present to Council, but I'd like to hear your views also.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

In my opinion, it depends a bit on whether we're all of the same, all aligned in our opinion that is represented here, or whether or not there's sufficient or substantial differences of opinion, and whether those differences come through in a way that is satisfactory to all of us, or whether, in the end, it feels like things have been pressured to be aligned in a particular point of view that does not sit well with some minority of us, for example. I don't know where we stand on the report until I see the report, so I couldn't tell you whether or not I could say, yes, it properly represents the diversity of views, or no, I think it's been biased in a way.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So that has been discussed also last week with the leadership, a good point there, Steve. And yeah, absolutely. So we do expect that there's

not going to be full agreement on everything, but how much of it, how much of what is agreed we keep in the report, letting everybody, the option of adding a side letter to it, giving their divergent view on a given point, or, again, do we take it back to the community for these sorts of things to pop up in public comment and be re-included in the report in this form. I want to make sure that everybody also appreciates that this is a, it's a small team, we're at the end of this, the tail end of a small team here. These are not recommendations with a big R, this is a small R report, and so on and so forth. I want to make sure that we also do justice to the work and justice to the different points of view of everybody, but we're not over-engineering this at the same time. Paul McGrady, I see your hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Seb. I think you said some of the things that I wanted to say, which was to remember that this is a council, small team, it's not a PDP or an IRT, and I guess then I wanted to ask a sort of technical question, which is, is what we're asking council, should this small team run a public comment, or are we going to ask council, does council want to run one? Because I think those are two different things, right? I think we can easily say to council, here's our report, it's on time, thanks everybody let us know what our next job assignment looks like, we'll stay in contact with each other and looking forward to hearing from you, bye, have a good summer. And then the council can put out a bid for public comment if they're not comfortable with it before they pass it on to the board. That's sort of different than us running our own and then amending our report and all that, that feels more like a PDP to me, thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul, for that comment, I hadn't thought of that particular option, but yeah, that's another avenue that we can present, thank you for that, Sarah, I see you.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah, yeah, I think we need to, as I've heard, we need to focus on or think about what the public comment could cover, right? Community input is very important, but it needs to focus on whether or how we have appropriately answered those assignment topics, like, are we correctly understanding the phase two recs and how RDRS meets them and not what people think the decision should be for a long-term system, right? So I do like the idea of offering it to the council to decide if there should be public comment specifically so that we can meet our commitment deadline. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Any other comments on this? I've seen that there are comments in the chat, which we'll try to catch I'm sorry, I'm in no capacity at this time of my day to follow all this at the same time, my brain's not gone too much. Was there anything else that I'm forgetting, and I'm turning to Feodora, who helped me prepare for this, or anybody else outside, knowing that we are not going to meet before I get to present this to council, but I see your hand up, Sarah, again, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi, this is Sarah, sorry, I know I'm not staff and I'm not answering what you asked, but I want to tell you, I did find where it said that there should be back and forth communications, which was in the implementation guidance for recommendation five. So it's not fully the recommendation because it's in the guidance, but there's an expectation. Thank you. Fantastic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So on the phase two side, right? Yeah. Okay, well, we'll find it and we'll fish it out. Thank you very much for that, Sarah. So in the meantime, nobody from staff has come down screaming, saying that I forgot something major for Thursday. So with this, and having heard the different point of view, I will try to translate that into a presentation to council, and it's all recorded, so you can check after Thursday if I reflected the views of this team. In the meantime, I don't think it's going to be very long anyway, so we'll try to walk the council through the different options as quickly as possible and let them think. And I don't expect an immediate answer. With this, it is 08:29 PM, my clock here, which means that we're right on time to send you back to your own day and to your next meeting, Sarah, then. Okay, see you all in two weeks. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]