

JULIE BISLAND:

All right. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 7th of July, 2025. We did not receive apologies for today's call. 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. All right. Seeing no hands. 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 for the recording.

And 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. Thank you. And with that, I'll turn it back over to you, Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie. Good evening, all. Good afternoon. So, we have a fairly short agenda today. We will continue going through chapter four in the comments that were added in last week. As a reminder, we're leaving the comments open until I believe the 9th, so that's on Wednesday. After which, Caitlin and Feodora will take the whole document, all four chapters, and will compile that into a readable document. I think they'll work on it until about mid-July even though it seems a bit short, but whatever.

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.

When they're ready, they'll share it back, and then we'll all be invited to look at it as an entire document before again it's published for public comment mid-August. So, if there are no questions before we start and get into the deep end, and I see no hands raised, we might as well get into the document, and look at what we have.

So, we had a conversation last week over the cost and questions were asked to Lisa over the cost of all this. You had, in the meantime, a call. Lisa joined too. Our questions were, I believe, heard. Staff doesn't have a number right now to give us, but they're working on parallel to produce that number, and that a more precise number will be available and published at the time of—during the window when we'll be reviewing the document, but definitely before it's published for public comment. Lisa, I'm putting you here, a bit on the spot, but did you want to add anything to it? Is there any new news that we should share?

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, Sebastien. You're not putting me on the spot, no worries. So, in terms of getting an updated number for the overall budget that is in chapter three, I think we can have that sometime next week to include—ideally, I asked for it to go through June, so there's that. And then in terms of the—and I think Caitlin will go over it. In terms of the number that we can provide that you referenced, that will be a number for maintaining RDRS as is, while the GNSO and the board have their discussions related to the said recommendations, et cetera.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Are there any question from the standing committee on this? No. Okay. Well, then looking forward to that additional information. And yeah, we'll work from that. Farzaneh, I can see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm sorry, I couldn't find the raise hand button. So, I just think that we need to reorganize the paragraph. Not to give people the impression that the—so, we have to be very clear from the start that this a million dollars, whatever, like 600,000 something includes the staff time and major part of it is the staff time. It's just the organizational kind of thing that I think we have to do that from the beginning, because people don't read, and then it will have an effect on them to see that, oh my God, this is over a million dollars. So, I suggest adding a sentence right after we give them that figure that most of this is staff time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here's the qualifier. And Lisa, correct me if I'm wrong, but from my understanding now, whilst most of the cost is human, but that's true in any endeavor, policy staff is not included in that. When we're saying staff, we're talking about people that are working on the system part of the pilot, not the policy work. Preparation of our calls and taking notes and drafting the document. To my understanding now, that is not included.

So, we need to make the difference, but the fact that a lot of the cost is staff doesn't mean that it's not cost that would be incurred in building the pilot itself. So, it's a bit late in my day here, and I'm not being very coherent. In any sort of development, the cost of developers and

supporting staff around the development is going to be the highest cost. The service is not the license of that cost, it's the developers, the project managers and the people that work around it.

And then let's not forget also that part of this tool includes reporting. Now we're going to move the reporting—instead of having a reporting monthly, we're going to have reporting quarterly. So, that's going to reduce the cost significantly, because it's about the same cost to produce reports from one month and for three months. But there's humans behind that too. There's automation to produce the CSV part, but the rest is humans, so the whole PDF explaining what is, is humans. And that has a cost too that's going to be recurrent. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. Maybe I missed something, but I thought I remembered being told that the staff cost did include the group, the people supporting this group, this committee, and that the ICANN accounting systems couldn't break them out. Did I remember that wrong?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, you didn't remember that wrong. I may have given that wrong information because that was my understanding. But apparently, and again, Lisa, correct me, as of my understanding last week, the accounting system can make a difference between the policy team, and the team that is looking after the system. And it's within the team that is looking after the system that they couldn't separate who's there on

calls or the time they spend on calls and the time they spend developing the system.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of that 1.6, even though it is staff whose job is to develop the system, we're doing it in support of this group.

LISA CARTER: Can I jump in really quickly?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do, please do.

LISA CARTER: Staff time dedicated to RDRS is included in the number that's in the chart in chapter three, but there's no way for us to break out. This much was for standing committee support versus this much was for, right? It's all sort of a lump sum. So, all staff dedicated time to RDRS is included in that number.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So, now I'm creating more confusion than I should. I'm not pinpointing anybody here, but Caitlin, Feodora, Julie, on this call, are they counted in or are they not counted in because they're from the policy support?

LISA CARTER: So, that includes Feodora and Caitlin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So, I'm back to the statement I gave last week, and not what I tried to correct today. I'm still not quite understanding, and then we really need to see the numbers, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: And clearly, Lisa's and Simon's time in support of this committee are included in that also.

LISA CARTER: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I agree with Farzi. We just have to make it really clear that this is not a clean number that people can use to identify what the system itself costs.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Lisa, let's make it super clear. Do you understand the ask of this committee to understand how much the system and not the support, the support through the policy review exercise has cost, the system itself. If we had gone outside and said, "Hey, go and build this," how much would it cost to build and to run? That's the main ask. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, I just wanted to flag that I think Steve said something really constructive in the chat, and I wanted to confirm our understanding of this. And so, I guess, this is a question for Lisa too, but is it fair to say that both this historical cost of that 1.6 million as well as going forward at the anticipated cost will include three categories. It's basically the support for the operation of the RDS. It's the category of the policy discussions and development that we just talked about, but it's also for any enhancements that have been requested or might be requested in the future. And I suppose too, just to clarify that that 1.6 includes the enhancements that have already been asked for by the RDRS Standing Committee. Is that correct?

LISA CARTER: So, the number that we're going to provide is basically not numbers for after all of the policy discussions and all the final solution is in place, or the long-term solution is in place. It's literally for maintaining RDRS as is while all those discussions are happening, right? And the number is inclusive of what's in chapter three in that chart, which was the development costs broken out separately from the cost to support operations. That's still sort of what we would be providing.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Copy. And that's for bullet two, the going forward number. I guess, I'm going back to bullet one, the 1.6 million that's happened already. Is it fair to say that that included all three of those categories of the normal

operation, the policy discussions, but then as well any enhancements that have already been put into place?

LISA CARTER:

So, that 1.6 million is from the development cost section of the chart in chapter three only, not including the personnel costs for supporting operation.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Copy. Okay. So, I guess, we're all on the same page. It seems that we want to have this be explained by text just a little bit more. I see that sentence that started. If we finish that sentence in whatever way that you feel is most accurate, Lisa, I think that's all that we're really asking for is just to make sure that any reader to include ourselves as we read that 1.6 million that we know exactly what that did and didn't cover. I think that's really the key goal, unless anyone disagrees with that assessment.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. You nailed it, Gabriel. Okay. So, that covers the figures and the figures that we're waiting for staff to provide. If there are no further questions on this block, we can go a bit further down. And then there was a discussion that started around text that Sarah added, and I believe John McElwaine commented. And in particular, if you go down just a little bit about the—no, no, no, back up. Just a hair exactly, that text here.

The value to the requesters, and the value of the entire program. So, first of all, Sarah, I'm putting you on the spot here. Are you suggesting that the overall cost of the program was too much for ICANN to fund on its own, or what is the point that you're trying to get across, and can we make sure that everybody is in agreement with it? And then we'll see how John's edits might help make it more palatable.

SARAH WYLD:

Sure. Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. So, I understand your question is, can I summarize what is the point of this page that I wrote, so that we can make sure we all agree with the ultimate point before we get into the real details?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah.

SARAH WYLD:

What I was trying to do is talk about the value of RDRS in relation to the costs of RDRS and consider where the funding comes from, because recommendation 14, financial sustainability, I think is very central to the work that we have been doing as this standing committee. So, the ultimate point of my suggested text is actually lower down. If you can scroll down a bit, there it is. So, what I'm suggesting is that we acknowledge that there is value in having a standardized way to handle requests. There is possibly value in the enhancements that we have proposed. There's not huge satisfaction, but—so, we could argue about the highlighted part, whether or not we believe that the value is of such

benefit, right? But ultimately, if the RDRS is to continue, we need to implement the recommendation that said that it should be paid for by the requesters and not by the community. That's where I'm really going with that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. That's where I understood the point to be. Without sort of splitting hairs, but would you contemplate—given the fact that right now, we've established that the cost and the usage don't match, that the requests would be completely overpriced—not overpriced. It would be too expensive for us to envision it to be sustainable. Would you consider having an arbitrary cost per request in order to fund the exercise at least partially, and train the requester community having to pay for it, knowing, by the way, that setting up a financial system behind it has its own cost. It's not [inaudible]. It's actually very expensive. But would you consider that as a step or is it in your mind, recommendation 14, whereas it should pay for itself? So, we'll calculate the price of it and come what may, requesters need to pay for it.

SARAH WYLD:

This is Sarah. I'm sorry, Sebastien. I kind of lost the thread of your question. So, would I say that the requesters should pay for the RDRS?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah.

SARAH WYLD:

Before you answer, I want to say something else because I realize, I think, some of why what I have proposed has not been as well received as I thought it might be, I think, I'm mixing together two ideas in here. There's one idea about how much does it cost and what is the value. There's another idea about who is paying, and how have we implemented this recommendation about financial sustainability. And having now thought about it for a couple weeks, I can see that I have smushed together those two ideas in a way that is perhaps unhelpful.

Maybe we need to separate those ideas out. But I strongly feel that we need to address this recommendation about financial sustainability, and we need to address the fact that we have not come at all close to implementing it, but we should. The RDRs should not be permitted to continue in the current funding model. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

And so, I've reiterated my question. There's a model where requesters don't fund at all, which is what we have now. There's a model where requesters fund all of it, and request will be each \$700 as we established. And there's a sort of half house model where requests fund part of it at an arbitrary cost per request. And if traffic and the day traffic and the number of requests increase to be able to cover the whole thing, then we've implemented recommendation 14. But in the meantime, we understand that we can't or we may not want to put the full burden of it on requester. Is this a halfway that is acceptable or do you see that as not implementing recommendation 14?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, thank you. I would need to think about that and probably take it back to the registrars. I wonder if there's a different possible alternative, which is, what if we say that the costs of building the RDRS are done. It happened, it was paid for, it came out of other money, it's fine. Moving forward from report time onward, those costs are what should be fully covered by requesters. So, not expecting to pay what was already done, but the moving forward ongoing costs maybe.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. And that goes to—I believe Gabriel can correct me, but it's in the vein of what he was thinking himself, and I see his hand raised. And Lisa, that's why we need to have that figure of understanding how much it will cost to run it. And understanding that we can't predict the cost of further development. Farzaneh, you've been super patient. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADI: I just wanted to say that NCSG throughout its advocacy and engagement with the EPDP advocated for the requester pay for the system. And this recommendation is very important for us. But what Sarah has suggested in the text, I think, that the tweaks that she suggested actually make them clearer. We can also consider, it shouldn't be that, I have to go back to NCSG and talk to them, but it shouldn't be that the requester gets the service for free. But then also we think that RDRS in some shape or form should be provided.

So it could be that ICANN pays for some of it, and I really like it that Sarah mentions in the document that, in her email that kind of when ICANN pays for it, it's kind of domain name registrant is paying for it,

and this is not really acceptable. I mean, we don't want to pay for a system that you disclose on the information side. But I think that we can come to a compromise that until we can create a sustainable system that is actually affordable for the requester to make those requests and pay for it until we achieve that system, then maybe some of the funds from ICANN should pay for it. But I have not run this suggestion by NCSG. They might say no. But let me go and ask, but this is my personal opinion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay, thanks. Clear. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I think we are conflating things in spades, I guess, is the expression. Recommendation 14 applied to the SSAD. This is not the SSAD. If an SSAD or a son of SSAD or a daughter of SSAD is created based on whatever we say and the board and the GNSOs deliberations, then recommendation 14 may, if it's sustained, may in fact be applied to that system.

We are talking about RDRS, which the board explicitly created or had staff create as a free system. The board has indicated that they believe RDRS should continue until a new replacement for SSAD or a new replacement for RDRS continues. Now, clearly the board, six months from now, can decide, yes, we're continuing RDRS, but we're going to put a price on it. But that's the board's decision. All we're doing is saying we think RDRS should continue as the board has said, and we believe certain enhancements are necessary.

I don't think it's within our pay grade to say RDRS should continue, and there should be a price on it. There may well be, but I don't think it's our decision. We haven't been asked that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, yeah, I'm not exactly sure about that, Alan. The board went to the GNSO and said, "Hey, can you look at your recommendations here? Because if we were to build what you're recommending, it would cost too much." Then we proposed to run a pilot to at least be able to sort of evaluate the usage of a tool, of a ticketing system. The board said, "Don't worry, that will pay for..." But they're also asking us, or the GNSO, and Greg repeated that three weeks ago on a call, that they wanted us to look at the recommendation. So, I don't know that we can say, recommendation 14, don't worry about it. In fact, indeed, the board has agreed to pay for the pilot, but I think that we can still have an opinion on it. And again, we're not developing policy. We're just giving opinions here.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Seb, I'm not disagreeing with you. For the new system, if there is ever one created, recommendation 14 applies, and we have been asked our opinion, should that recommendation be followed or not. That's very different from continuing the pilot for the interim. The pilot, which is not required to be used by registrars, and is very different from the SSAD and the concept of the SSAD, and that is the one that the board said, at this point, they are going to fund. Otherwise, it wouldn't have happened. So, I think we're conflating the next system, which may come

with continuing the pilot until such time as we don't need it, or we don't want it anymore.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm going to have to have consensus on this particular piece of text, and I can sense that there's a number of people that are going to want to have some appreciation of that recommendation 14 for the project at hand, whatever you want to call it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no doubt we don't have consensus.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, exactly. So, we'll have to find some way to agree. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, thank you, Seb. This is Gabriel Andrews for the record. I just wanted to call out a couple things that I think might have been lost in the back and forth of edits as well. So, just to be clear, the recommendation 14, taking all of Alan's points into context, nonetheless, it itself does make clear, there's clarifying text within it, and I'm just going to quote it, just to make sure we're all on the same page, but I'm also going to summarize it.

The summary is, is that we all recognize that ICANN gets fees, some of its money from registrants, and that the authors of this recognize that,

and did not count that as going against their general prohibition against the registrants paying for it. And the full text says, for clarity, the EPDP team understands that registrants are ultimately the source of much of ICANN's revenue. This revenue does not per se violate the restriction, but data subjects must not bear the cost for having data disclosed to third parties.

So, they knew that this was a consideration, and they explicitly said that that's not actually something you have to be concerned about when they generally say that the data registrants themselves shouldn't pay. So, just to be clear, separately and apart from that, I am aware that more discussion is occurring within the GAC on this particular suggested text. I don't have a full GAC feedback for this yet, but stay tuned. We have noted that, in general, the GAC has expressed support for developing the RDRS in a more permanent system, and even contemplating future enhancements.

In the meantime, I note that there was an email that came from my counterpart from USG that just came through essentially as this meeting was starting. And so, I don't fault folks if they missed it, but we might want to review that as well. But the key takeaway is that the US, as one voice in this room, is not supportive of this text as it stands. And so, just reiterating Alan's point that we don't have consensus on it at this time, but perhaps more discussion if Sarah has additional thoughts on bifurcating some of the points that she had made in this original text, and maybe suggesting alternate texts in the future. Open to discussion. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sarah, go ahead. You wanted to make a point probably before, but I'll ask you also to answer to Gabriel's point.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, thank you. This is Sarah. So, if we are recommending that the RDRS should be kept as a long-term system, then I think it is appropriate for us to say, if we think it should be free of charge or not. If we're saying that the RDRS will go away when something else is built, and that something else implements this recommendation 14, then maybe that is a different conversation. But it seems like what I'm hearing now is that the RDRS is going to be maintained indefinitely and will continue to be operated, paid for entirely by ICANN.

I don't think that that is appropriate. I think if it is a short-term project, a pilot project, I think it did make sense. But we're making recommendations for the next steps. We have to think long-term. And so, it is not appropriate that ICANN continue to fund the long-term system by whatever name it is. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, if I may, and I'll let other people defend their own point of view here. I'm not sure it's that black and white. I can't speak for governments, and I'll let Gabriel give more color on this. But I've heard from other types of requesters that they weren't against the idea of paying for some of it. I think that the fear is to make it so engraved in the system that should the requester not be able to fund it, because there's not enough requests on a given month, that the whole thing is going to be turned off, or if we can't find a sustainability that it's going

to be turned off. I think that people are not comfortable with that. It's not the idea of having it for free ad vitam. It's the idea of putting it in jeopardy if, for a reason or another, the requester community is not able to fully fund it.

At the same time, I was trying to read Owen's email, and I'm not very good at doing two things at the same time. So, I'll have to ask for a bit more time, maybe after this call, to digest that and then put it back in the comments. Gabriel, I believe that's a previous hand. And I'll give it to Alan.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: My apologies, it's previous.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I don't know where the idea comes from that we are talking about RDRS as a system forever and ever. We're spending an inordinate amount of time looking at the recommendations for the SSAD and advising the GNSO and the board as to whether we think that these recommendations still are sound, whether we believe new policy work has to be done. I think the assumption is, that is going to be considered seriously.

Now, yes, it is possible that the board and the GNSO in their wisdom will decide we are not going to have a future system, but it will be RDRS

with a few minor modifications forever and ever, at which case the concept of whether it's charged or not has to be revisited. But I don't think we are considering RDRS as the system forever. I thought the words we were using was this will be maintained, perhaps with some of the enhancements, until we understand where we're going in the long-term. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, do we need to add a paragraph on this? Because I do think that indeed there's confusion here and even more so outside of this committee. So, let's imagine that indeed the RDRS stays on after November as RDRS. And then let's imagine that council, the board agrees to the enhancements that we're proposing in chapter two. And so, it becomes an RDRS plus. At what point do we say that's the end of SSAD and RDRS plus or whatever other name it will take becomes the product that we're talking about? Even if we don't get our way fully, we're here to recommend. We're also here to clarify or offer as clear a view as possible of what we're talking about.

Are you saying we know that this is going in the bin and we're going to start anew and until we start anew and we have something completely new we're not charging? Are you considering, like I might be, that this is a strong basis that is going to be built upon? I've been sending a lot of signals over the last few months saying, I personally think that it should be done outside of ICANN, et cetera. And I'm getting no feedback on it. So, I'm feeling like I can't speak for them, but I'm feeling that at least on the board side, they're pretty convinced that this is the base that they're going to build from and not scratch everything and start again. So, we

need to also be clear as to that maybe. I don't know. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson, can you hear me okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Absolutely.

MARC ANDERSON: Great. Thank you. I actually raised my hand to say something pretty similar to what you just said. I raised my hand in response to Alan. Based on Alan's intervention, he seemed to indicate that his view was that RDRS, as it currently exists, would continue to operate for a period of time. And then this was the point that raised my hand until we figured out what comes next. And from what I could tell or what I thought is, we're figuring out right now what comes next. Right now, we're providing recommendations to the GNSO Council for consideration by the GNSO Council and the board.

Obviously, the GNSO Council is our chartering organization, but I think really, it's understood that we're representing the community and providing recommendations to the council. And I think the board's going to certainly pay attention. They're obviously under no obligation to do anything we say, but they're certainly going to listen to what we have to say. And so, it's our job to figure out what we think should come next and provide that recommendation. And if we're not, we're not doing

our jobs. This is not something we leave to figure out later. We need to provide a clear recommendation as to what should come next.

And I think part of what's making me uncomfortable with the report as it's drafted right now is, I don't think we've done that. It's not clear to me what we're saying should come next. And Sebastien just touched on this a little bit. Do we think RDS should operate indefinitely in its current form? Do we think it should operate indefinitely but with enhancements? Well, we sort of indicated that some enhancements might make sense. Do we think RDRS is a stopgap until a new system can be put in place that addresses the shortcomings of RDRS?

I don't think we're clear on that at all, and I think part of the reason why we're not clear on that is we're not all on the same page. And so, what I would like to see us do is spend a little bit of time and focus on what we, as a committee, what do we think should come next following this RDRS pilot?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Mark. Alan, I'm going to give you the hand, but because there's a lot of back and forth, I want to make sure also that I give time for everybody else. So, make it quick.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll be very quick. I strongly support what Marc just said. I mean, I can tell you my personal one. I believe RDRS with whatever minor enhancements is an interim. I think we should be specifying exactly what capabilities a new system should have. I can say, I believe it should

have some level of identification of the requesters, so a registrar can know who that is and not have to do their own research and justify the person. Maybe it should be identifying intellectual property rights. I suspect not, but maybe. And that system should replace it.

Now, whether that system is another lump and bump on top of RDRS, which is a lump on top of something else, is the way to go or whether we should contract for someone else to build it, I think that's a technical decision that is way out of our scope. I think we should identify those two paths, but it has to be identified. At some point, modifying systems, the lumps get bigger than the system, and that may not be the way to go.

But I don't think that's the judgment we can make. I agree with you. I think we should look at looking at a brand-new system. But whether that is the right answer or more lumps on top of this one, I don't think we can make that decision. But we should be making a statement of what we believe the system should be capable of doing. And then it's up to someone else to decide how to implement it best, and what the cost would be. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

And to your last point, I think that the board themselves don't see themselves as the decision-maker there. I've heard it from several board members that the idea is that ICANN org, its CEO should decide these sorts of things.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think they should recommend the board decide.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, maybe that way. Okay. But the board itself doesn't have any views and will follow the guidance of org. Yeah, I guess so. Thank you, Alan. Steve, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. So, Marc raised the issue of, are we deciding what the future system should look like? And sort of made the point that here and now we represent the community, we should set that up. I want to say two things very strongly. I don't think this group is constituted, I think, to take on that task, because in all of the past discussions, the focus has been on evaluating RDRS and evaluating the SSAD related recommendations, and the larger discussion of what should the future look like has been basically explicitly excluded.

I do think that it's very important to have a fresh discussion on what a future system should look like. We got into this today following the money trail, in a sense of who's going to pay. But that's only one aspect of what an overall fresh system would look like. And whether that fresh system should be a continuation of RDRS, a re-instantiation of SSAD or something entirely different. But until the question is called and organized, until we organize around the larger question, I don't think that we are in a position to specify what the future system looks like.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, just to let Marc defend his own words, but I didn't hear Marc saying that we need to decide. I heard Marc saying that we need to be clearer as to what our vision is. It's not a decision, but in order to better explain the rest of the document, because otherwise it just leaves a fuzzy image. But Marc, I'll let you say that better. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Right. I think Steve's initial thoughts were similar to what I was going to pose. But my understanding of this whole exercise is you have the original recommendations that are listed out in the EPDP phase two and phase one, presumably. And our job was to take all of the learnings that came from the RDRS thus far, qualitative and quantitative, and suggest how they may or may not apply to consideration of those recommendations. And it's those recommendations that more or less are setting the guidelines for what future tool is created, and what the requirements for that are, rather than anything that we say.

Is my understanding of that capacity wrong? Because that's sort of why I thought the whole point of this exercise was. That we're sort of suggesting interpretation of these recommendations. We're not suggesting our own policy recommendations. I mean, the whole point of the small R was to avoid that. Yes, no, maybe so.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry. Can you repeat them? It went very fast.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, sorry.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you want an answer from me.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I'm hearing some suggestion of talking about what comes next, and whether it's Sarah suggesting how things are paid for or whatnot. All of that I thought was covered in these recommendations. And if we're suggesting anything, we're suggesting potential interpretation of these recommendations. Not any new ideas of our own, but rather, how did the RDRS in its work to date provide new information which might help GNSO and/or the board read and interpret those recommendations. And so, it's those recommendations that are really the key thing. And if we're suggesting anything, we're suggesting how they might be interpreted or reinterpreted, is how I've been reading this.

And then I'll take my own thoughts a step further in saying, the SSAD as was originally contemplated in the operational design assessment document was one interpretation of these EPDP phase two recommendations. And it was a very robust and costly interpretation, but it is not the only interpretation of those. And so, part of the work that I've been so heavily involved in my own constituency and in providing sort of for identity providers to take on voluntarily a lot of the costs that was originally contemplated in the ODA. It was to show that there are other paths forward that are still fully potentially in accordance with those recommendations, but not with the operational design assessment document itself.

So, there are other ways that you can still move forward with the eventual SSAD that avoids so much of that cost. And I think us being able to highlight that is the sort of useful feedback, and learning from this real-world experiment that still can be directly speaking to those recommendations without talking about creating something out of whole cloth. Does that make sense?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, it does make sense. I don't quite know how to interpret it in this document right now, but I'll give Marc the mic and retain the right to comment. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. Marc Anderson. First, I want to say I agree with a lot of what Alan, Steve, and Gabriel just said. They made some really good points there. I won't rehash them. One thing, though about what Gabriel said, I want to say one thing we can do is we can recommend new policy work. And one of the things in chapter four, one of the things we've discussed is we've looked at each of the SSAD recommendations with the table and the annex where we talk about each of the SSAD recommendations where they keep, modify, or reject proposed treatment.

And Gabriel, you make some really good points. I'm not discounting any of those points. I just want to emphasize that a possible path forward on some of these recommendations isn't just to look at different interpretations of them. We can also provide a recommendation to the GNSO Council. Hey, based on the learnings of the RDRS, this particular recommendation needs to be revisited. It needs new policy work. And I

think we could even provide recommendations as to what new recommendations might look like based on our experiences with the pilot.

Obviously, we can't make policy recommendations ourselves, but I think it's perfectly within scope to suggest that the GNSO Council revisit some of the existing policy recommendations if we think it's warranted. And again, I'm not discounting your very valid point that there are different ways of looking at these recommendations, and some of these recommendations were very purposefully drafted to be flexible and not presuppose a particular implementation or outcome. So, there are different ways of looking at them. But I think it's also a possible path forward to recommend to the GNSO Council that they open new policy work to revisit some of the recommendations.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Marc. In the meantime, Gabriel's added a comment in the chat. Maybe you'd want to see if it fits what you had in mind or not. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi, this is Sarah. I just want to speak to the text up on screen again. So, hearing some agreement to the idea of splitting out those two ideas that I had smushed together, I highlighted a bunch of text in red on screen and then up above a little bit also, and would be open to removing that text, which I had initially suggested to add. And now I'm suggesting we can remove instead, if that would make the group happier about this section. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You're challenging my very old eyes here, because that yellow on red, I can't read, but maybe—

SARAH WYLD: But you can tell that I'm suggesting to remove it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I can tell that you're suggesting to remove a whole bunch of text. Absolutely. And I'll let the others consider. Caitlin, can I ask you to come to the mic? Because what we're trying to do today is to make sure that you had a maximum of elements needed—there's a thunderstorm starting out. Maximum elements needed for you guys to take this document to the next step. Are there gaping questions that you need us in the next 10 minutes to enlighten you with about?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Seb. This is Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org for the transcript. So, we'll take a look at what Sarah just did here. And we also took a note of the request for the first section that was added by Gabe and support staff will propose some edits based on this text. But moving into the actual recommendation text, if we may, just to get a little bit better clarity on some of the objections that have been highlighted or concerns highlighted.

So, I think recommendation one is, there have been no additional comments, and Sarah and Marc seem comfortable with the edits here,

which was essentially to separate out continue and improve. A note on recommendation two. This is the list of key system enhancements. There were two enhancements that Marc Anderson had noted these really appear to be additional policy work rather than actual enhancements to the system. So, those have been removed to a separate recommendation, which I'll show in a minute.

I had a question here, which was on 2.2. This was the authentication challenge. And I believe the group had at least discussed a potential enhancement with the successor system would be to allow for authentication starting with law enforcement entities. Gabe had added some text to the rationale, but Marc has a concern here and thinks perhaps this is not an enhancement, but rather should be separated into a separate recommendation. And I'd like to better understand how that could be addressed. And I see Marc's hand is raised. And Marc, I don't know if you could also address whether this text that Gabe added helps, but I'll pause and let Marc speak to that concern.

MARC ANDERSON:

Marc Anderson. Thanks, Caitlin, for raising this one. I guess, in my view, I support more work on the authentication challenge. When I read 2.2 address the authentication challenge in phases, what I struggled with is I tried to imagine myself as the GNSO Council reading this recommendation. And when I did that, I couldn't for the life of me imagine what a GNSO Council reading this expects to be done with that. I think this really needs to be flushed out more as to what we expect to be done next with authentication.

Gabriel provides a possible path forward, right? This approach could involve ICANN establishing standards for requester groups. I think that's a valid possible path forward. But as it was originally written, the recommendation doesn't really recommend concrete next steps. It recognizes that hey, we have an authentication challenge. Authentication was the cornerstone of the SSAD recommendations. It was not an accident that those were recommendations one and two of the SSAD, but in the RDRS, we ditched authentication altogether.

And where we came out of the RDRS is I think, as a group, we recognize that even though RDRS operated without an authentication piece, there would be value in having authentication in some form. But I think where the report right now comes up short is, I think we're a little fuzzy on what we think should be done next. What are the next steps? I could talk more, but I see there's a queue and we're limited on time. So, I'll stop. But I think I'd love to see this conversation continue more, because I'd like to see us flush this out further.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you, Marc. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I think the key point here that's being made and that Marc made was, a system can exist with authentication, but not everyone is authenticated. And we can decide along the way who is going to be authenticated. For instance, there may be value in authenticating United States or European intellectual property attorneys who make certain promises. That doesn't mean every request

from an IP attorney is authenticated, but that may help do that. And the concept of the original SSAD is everyone must be authenticated. The fact that we may operate with partial authentication is a key change that may make the system a lot more viable. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. Gabriel, I see a hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, I just wanted to call that out. Yeah, I more or less agree with what's all been said here. The key hope that I have as one of the requester constituencies here is that we do get ICANN to take a proactive role in creating the standards, which could be both technical and administrative, right? You might have the technical standard of this is how we need to receive your authentication token as it's passed to us. This is the format it has to be. These are the data elements it has to be, et cetera, right? I'm hoping to collaborate with ICANN to come up with a good standard for that. I'm really hoping that our work is able to help do this, but we need to make clear, if that is the path that we're all comfortable with, that there's an expectation for ICANN to continue conversation with that, with these requester constituencies that are so interested.

Further, the administrative standard might be, and we expect you to sign this kind of MOU or this kind of expected rules of behavior or whatever that is. This could all be potential future policy work, too, if it really deserves it. I really don't care so long as we really make clear that

ICANN needs to be an active participant in helping the development of such standards, whether they be technical and/or administrative.

Secondly, part of what I've come to develop as an opinion, having done this work for some time now, is a recognition that there is no single entity in the world that will be trusted by everyone else in the world to act as an accreditation authority. All that we can do is say this is the entity that makes the promise based off of these attestations that they're making for their individual members. So, if it's Interpol saying, "Hey, this is how we accredit all of our agencies that operate under the Interpol umbrella, this is how we're authenticating, this is what we can attest to if you trust us," and then it comes down to, do you trust them when you're the receiving registrar, et cetera, et cetera.

That'll hold true whether it's the US government making those attestations, whether it's Interpol, whether it's FBI's CJIS and Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal that I'm hoping to employ. All of these will still hold true to that extent. And ultimately, I think, that is also why it enables other identity providers to step up, such as those intellectual property folks. If they want to self-organize under a banner and make certain attestations, this is how we will always behave. It is only by adhering to your own promises about good behavior that you can establish trust that will then enable better results and success down the road.

And so, really what I'm looking for is to sort of trail blaze the path here to show that this can be done this way to enable other identity providers in the future to do so. But ultimately, nothing about this says that if there's a small identity provider that wants to stand up and

follow suit from a small village in the middle of nowhere [inaudible], there's nothing that says that anyone that receives such attestations has to trust them, right? So, there's a difference between the authentication element and the trust element. Just calling it out. Just make sure that we're still tracking that. Cheers.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. Thank you for the good point. And Steve—and I see that we have two minutes on the clock, and I have two hands up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'll try to be extremely brief. So, a couple of things to recap and try to position this a little bit. I think one of the strong statements that we can make is that, almost obvious, is that authentication is going to be a very important component going forward. The challenge that we're having in this discussion is, is that something we want to say about a future system or is that something we want to just bolt on to the RDRS? And I think the answer may be both, in the sense that we can use RDRS. It's a pilot, and we could experiment with some authentication on that, but do so in the spirit of getting more information that informs what a future system would look like.

Second thing I want to say is, if you listen carefully to what Gabe just said about different authentication or identity providers and so forth, and that there cannot be a single provider, that is an important point that I think was not clear when SSAD was being discussed and it's one of the important learnings that we should flag and call out explicitly in this report.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, good. Thank you very much. Marc, whatever. Go ahead quickly because we need to wrap up.

MARC ANDERSON: Much of what I was going to say was already covered by the previous interventions. So, maybe this goes back to Caitlin. Is this enough to help you turn another draft, or is this a conversation that needs to be continued?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Marc. We will go back and revisit all of the previous comments, and try to turn another draft for this recommendation. And if not, we can continue the conversation at the next meeting. But it was helpful context, and I think we have what we need to turn this into the next iteration of the recommendation. And because we're at the end of the call or the top of the hour, what we'll do is, staff support had a couple additional questions. We'll put these in chat. I'm sorry, in response to comments, because in some cases it's not clear whether the standing committee at-large supports the comments or the concerns.

And since we're trying to get to consensus on some of these, some will require further discussion, but some, if it's objectionable, will just be relocated to other parts of the report. But as Seb noted, everyone has until Wednesday to keep putting comments in, and that includes responses to others' comments. So please continue doing that. And then support staff will work with leadership on turning this into the next

draft of the report, that the group will have more time to review. So, back over to you, Seb. Apologies.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, thank you very much. And sorry for dragging this a bit longer than I should. Farzaneh, I see your question. Can I ask you just to make sure that we track it properly to copy-paste it to whatever part of the document is raising your concerns? And we should wrap this conversation. We are still scheduled for next week. Please put all your comments before the 9th to allow staff to start working on compiling all that. And in the meantime, yeah, comment, comment, comment. Look at everybody else's comment, and we'll be back talking next week. Thank you very much, and this is a wrap.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]