
DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call on Monday, 10 February, 2025. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the recording, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. We didn't have any apologies listed for today. Okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you can add it, sorry, Farzaneh reached out to me to say that she was not going to be able to attend. I don't know if she sent it to the list. I haven't seen it.

DEVAN REED: I didn't see it on the list, but I will note her apology. And statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, raise your hand or unmute your mic. If you need any assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. As a reminder, all chat sessions are being archived, and participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With this, I will turn it back over to Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Devan, and good evening all from the rainy Stuttgart. And well, good morning and good afternoon, wherever you may be. We wanted to start this session with Becky Burr, who is going to give us an

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.

update from the Board, but I don't see her. So, we're going to shift the schedule just to go directly to our review of chapter one of the report. But before that, I just wanted to give a bit of a disclaimer, not a disclaimer, just Steve Crocker, last week or two weeks ago, we had just received your email, which I answered last week.

We did agree to have a discussion about it. But having seen not much on the list in response to it, I just wanted to make sure that we could have that discussion maybe next time. And if you're able, maybe not immediately, but if you're able to confirm before next time that you'll be able to join us too, we wanted to be able to have that discussion all together. So, not this week, but hopefully next week, if you're able to join. And if, well, whatever, if there was a big discussion on the list. I see you've gone off, Mike.

STEVE CROCKER:

A short answer is yes. And you sent me a very content-full, substantive, and in my view, thoughtful and sober response to the note that I had sent. And I am planning to, and have just been super busy to write you a point-by-point discussion. I'm trying to untangle or tease out nuances within that. Not a rebuttal exactly, but a sort of uncovering the next layer of details on that. I was very appreciative and I'm unhappy that I haven't found the time to do that, but I plan to do that. It's sitting very high on my to-do list. And yes, I plan to be around for the next call.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much. And looking forward to it. And yes, we're all busy people. Happens. It's good that we're useful. Or at least that

we're able to keep ourselves busy. So, one last check of the list to see if Becky didn't join, and she didn't. Can I ask maybe Devan, if you're the one welcoming new people to sort of raise a grab my attention when she comes up and we can stop over or pause what we're doing and give her the mic. Otherwise, I don't know if anybody can ping her and remind her that she was meant to show up. Otherwise, she might be busy too. Sure. Thank you very much. So, without further ado, and I guess Feodora, you might be the one at the helm here. Let's go to chapter one.

So, a few things. Thank you, Gabriel. I saw that you added the Sankey graph and a text around it. I didn't review the text. I just looked at it before the call very quickly, and it seems reasonable to me. I think that there is only one bit that I may have, not issues, but other points of view are on the 3,200 and some requests that would have been successful that went through the first phase, domain names that exist that are in a TLD that we cover that are with a registrar that is participating and so on and so forth, and yet doesn't go through.

You just put a note saying that in, Feodora, if you could go back down just a little bit, but there was a note at the end of this red paragraph. Oops, you went too far. There you go. Thank you. About the rest mentioning user friction, which is possible. I had heard from, I think it was John McElwaine, and maybe Lisa, you have that in the surveys that you did, but John might be, was mentioning the fact that there was, it was part of the process to go and check what the availability of the data was for the name, often maybe to go back to a client or ask for instructions to go forward.

And in that case, indeed, these requests might appear as stopped, but really, it's only because they might start again. So, on this-- oh, Gabe, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

I think that's a perfectly fair thing to mention. This is Gabriel for the record. Sorry, yeah. If someone wants to take a pen and add that as in the same sentence, maybe to note that these are both possible contributors. I think that's perfectly fair. It's just something that I don't believe we're going to have perfect visibility into in terms of how much of one versus the others is occurring here. But I think it's fine to mention both or if other folks have other ideas as to why this is occurring. I don't think we have perfect clarity. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

In any case, and if we can go back to the graph for a second, in any case, because it's at least 50% more than the actual request that goes through, it's worth trying to find out or having maybe possibly a few possible reasons for it. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. Thank you, Gabriel, for providing the chart and draft text. Super helpful. And of course, it's always easier to criticize things than to draft them in the first place. So, that's what I'm going to come in and do is criticize. If you could just scroll down a tiny little bit, please, Feodora, a little bit more, you'll see my comment that I just left. There we go. So, I just I'm thinking a lot lately about where

we're talking about Consensus in this group, because it's not really a concept that necessarily matches up with the work of a standing committee when we think of Consensus in the ICANN policy way of thinking of it.

So, that's just a word that I'm going to bump on every time we see it here. In this context, it's not really a question of us coming to a Consensus on why these things happened. That would mean that we have all agreed. And we can't because we cannot know what each requester is thinking when they don't proceed. We can just say we could not determine why these were not completed. And we have some ideas as to why that might be. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Gabe, again, no objection, Sarah. I think that your concern about that particular word being a loaded word is something I didn't give thought to as I was drafting. But if we want to rephrase that just to note that we weren't in a position to really have perfect insight here, I'm happy to allow others to provide alternate texts.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, well, thank you. And because Sarah already put her comment, it's noted and we'll redraft that. Now, that's a perfect cue. And you know, full disclosure, Sarah and I didn't link up before, but thank you very much. Perfect cue because this chapter one, I think that we're going to

move on and second part of this call, we're going to go and start looking at the chapter two. But the chapter remains open. This is not a closed topic. We're just going to start focusing on the second phase and come back to it a bit later. Once we've got all the pieces of the puzzle together. But one last task I would like to ask the group here.

And I think that Sarah, you noted on, I can't remember exactly what the topic was, but you noted that on-- sorry, it's escaped my mind. But I remember you doing that two weeks ago. Noting a part where you say, well, sorry, we haven't reached Consensus or we haven't reached agreement. So, maybe the first question to this group is, are we here to find Consensus or just making recommendations and possibly having divergent recommendations with our names on it? Or do we try to find Consensus? And more importantly, can you individually go back to this text?

And if there is something that you really do not agree with, make sure that it is clearly commented and signed with your group's name so that we know what is, if not Consensus with a big C, what is something that people are landing on an agreement with and what is absolutely not acceptable or any variance of it. So, if you can make sure that you flag these clearly in the text, it would help us. I don't mean to have right now a final decision on it. There's no a line on the sand now, but at least to be able to raise for each other what is, what we can live with and what is not palatable, that would be helpful. And I see with this a flurry of hands. So, Steve DeIBianco, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

The Consensus that's discussed on the screen is not the Consensus that we should really be caring about. We should care about Consensus on normative recommendations. And if we cannot agree on normative recommendations, we may well have a minority report. And I'd be welcome that, or I would welcome including multiple Consensus recommendations on the future.

Instead, what you have on the screen isn't a Consensus point of view. It's really just seeing whether we can find explanations as to why the remaining 61% were not completed. And so, we can offer different explanations and show them all, but there is no need to have a Consensus about potential explanations for what happened. Much better to focus Consensus on the recommendations. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah. Sorry, I mis-explained myself and the screen is still on that, on that previous topic. I wasn't specifically talking about that point, but there were other points. Again, I'm sorry, I don't have in front of me, but other points, I think that regarding previous recommendations, how those, SSAD recommendations and how those should be integrated or not, where relevant or not. And, and on those points, I want to make sure that things that are not, again, people can't live with are clearly marked. With this said, Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Alan Greenberg speaking. I agree with Steve, by the way, that things that are explanations or reasons we should like appropriately and say, we don't understand or we understand or give

the reasons. But ultimately, somebody is likely to have to make decisions. And I think it is our responsibility to the extent we can to make recommendations on how to go forward. And if we can have Consensus on it, we should agree. We should say so. Our Consensus may not have a bylaw weight associated with it, but the fact that we have reached Consensus in this group is important.

And to the extent we can't reach Consensus, then I think we have an obligation to explain the alternatives and present to what extent they are accepted by this group or not. Because ultimately, if we who have spent all this time don't know what to do next, we can't really expect someone else to make a better decision for us. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Alan. You said better what I meant. And to that extent, again, I'm looking through the list and I don't see her yet. To the extent it would have been interesting to have Becky's point of view from a Board point of view, just to remind us where they are and where they expect us to be helping. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson. Can you hear me, okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Absolutely.

MARC ANDERSON:

All right, great. Yeah, I think I'm largely going to agree with what Steve and Alan said. To the extent, we can agree on recommendations, we should, and we should indicate as such. And I think there's going to be a fair number of things that we do agree with. I think the place for those is in assignment four, specifically, maybe three and four, a little bit, but specifically assignment four, where we need to provide suggestions for council and the Board in relation to basically next steps.

Consideration for the SSAD recommendations and how to proceed with them. And these are things we haven't actually delved into as a group yet. And I think we shouldn't shy away from it. I think we should tackle it head on. I think there are a number of areas where we're going to have broad agreement and where we don't, we can call that out and that's fine too. And we can present differing opinions. So, let's tackle that. Let's jump in. Let's make sure we're doing the assignment that we were chartered to do.

And to sort of echo what Alan said somebody's going to have to agree and, or somebody's going to have to figure out what to do next. And we're chartered to provide recommendations back to the GNSO council on what those steps are. And if we can't figure it out, I don't know how we can expect council to do a better job. So, let's not shy away from it. Let's figure out where we can agree and document that and where we can't agree, document that as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Fantastic. I think that we're all of the same mind. So, apart from the fact that the assignments were numbered and we're going through

them, not alphabetically, but they're in the order. I think that there's also a question of logic there. The assignment four should be based on basically the findings of one, two, and three. So, that's why we're also looking at them chronologically. Well, not chronologically, but in the order of the assignments. But absolutely agree, Marc. And we won't shy. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. I am also in agreement. It's so nice when we all agree. As Steve just put in the chat, how dare you? This is not a PDP. I don't think we need full Consensus in that same kind of way. We also don't, I think, need minority reports or alternate reports. We can, if there is a divergence of opinion, I think it can best be represented in our report. But as Marc said, we have four assignments and they go in a certain order. So, I do think, if possible, it'd be best to save our recommendations for the assignment four portion of the report. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

And we will do that. In the meantime, I see that Becky joined us, which is fantastic. But let's continue this conversation and then pass on the mic. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. So, I'm kind of in agreement. However, Small Teams have been criticized as stepping into the role of the community in some way. And as Steve DelBianco points out, this is not a PDP. This is not a proper

Policy Development Process. And so, whatever we do with assignment four, I think we have to be realistic that it's not like it's something that's going to go to council. Council is going to adopt the recommendations and then send them to the Board as if somehow this were a PDP or some other process.

And so, I just think we should small our recommendations. Small our report because we're a small team really at the end of the day. And if something is not developed by the group, but it's developed by a member of the group on their own or whatever, we need to be careful to mark things that way so that it's clear like this was work that was done by others outside of the process of the Small Team just for clarity for the council and they get whatever it is we're about to send.

So, all that to say this, yes, we should fulfill our assignments, but we should also be realistic that we really weren't tasked with coming up with the big thing about SSAD. Just recommendations and thoughts based upon what we learned from RDRS. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, violent agreement. I think that we're all on the same line. And again, Becky will probably clarify that for us in a minute too. I see Gabriel, then Alan, and then I'll draw a line and we'll give you the mic, Becky.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Okay. Gabriel here. So, no disagreement based off of the past conversation. I'm just wondering that as we discuss potential

recommendations that this section four or elsewhere, can we make an effort to indicate when those recommendations are in line with the original policy that was approved for SSAD? Because we're talking about the need for potential new policy. I think that's a quite salient relevant point as to whether or not that was something that was already considered as a past Policy Process.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, we'll get to it. I'm not exactly sure, but definitely at least when John is on the call, he couldn't make it because he's got a conflict with the IPC call there. I think that he went through the exercise of comparing what we've been doing here and the SSAD recommendations, at least from a requestor point of view. We may want to do that also from the respondent registrar point of view. But yeah, it's also work that we have in the planning there. Alan, and then Becky, it's you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Hi, thank you. I have to disagree with at least part of what Paul said. And I'm not worried about capital R or lower r recommendations. These are not policy recommendations as decided in the bylaw. But I would like to hope that we will make recommendations that the GNSO will agree with and pass on to the Board. They're not policy recommendations, but they're recommendations on how to proceed.

And I surely hope we will be able to make at least some recommendations on do this or don't do this. And hopefully the GNSO will agree and the Board can consider whether to take action on them

or not. So, to be clear, they're not policy recommendations, but we're talking about operational recommendations on how to proceed with the whole issue of accessing registration data that's not already public. So, I do hope we make recommendations and I do hope they are passed on. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, I confirm we will make recommendation with a big R and a small r. They will be passed on. But again, because we don't have the force of the community behind us, we're only a small group, well said. These recommendations can't legally, according to our bylaws, have the weight that this set we've spent. I want to say it's my third year on this now. We spent quite a bit of time on this topic. And I'm pretty sure that the people that we'll send it to, will consider what we write seriously enough to look at it and see. I can't guarantee that they'll run with all of it, but it will be considered. We've spent enough time on it to know what we're talking about.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. To be clear, if our recommendations are stupid, hopefully they won't accept them. But hopefully we'll make good recommendations and they will. But there's no guarantee, of course.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, thank you. So, just to draw the line on this, again, this is not a final, this is not the last time we're looking at this chapter one. I just wanted to make sure that you individually remember to go through the

thing. If there's something that you absolutely can't live with in this particular text, I can't think of anything in particular, but just have a look. If you can't live with anything, please record it clearly with your comment and we'll know to revisit it as a group when we're going through this exercise of agreeing where we're going with this. Now with this said, Becky, I'd like to give you the mic and we're all ears.

BECKY BURR:

Great, thank you. And thanks everybody for doing this. I apologize for joining late. I was extracting myself from several other meetings. But I just wanted to provide a little bit of a readout of the Board's discussion at its recent workshop in LA on RDRS. I don't think this is going to be a surprise to anybody, but the Board, because I think we talked about this in Istanbul, we think we have learned that we've learned a lot from the RDRS Pilot to date.

It was scheduled to be a two-year Pilot. It's not clear to the Board that there's much more to be learned from the Pilot. And we also think that sort of the little iterative changes as opposed to a sort of where do we want to be at the end of this process may not be the most efficient way to proceed. So, while we're waiting for the report that you guys are working on, I think the Board's feeling is that this is a useful tool. It needs some changes, some modifications, some updates, all of the things that you've been talking about.

We have the SSAD policy sort of held in abeyance, and there are some things from that that it would seem we could inform that without having to redo policy. But there are probably some other areas where

policy needs to be developed on it. Just to be clear, because I didn't say this at the beginning, we have no intention of stopping the Pilot. We think the tool should continue to be up and running. But the Board's sort of general conclusions is there needs to be some kind of authentication mechanism and with a priority on the law enforcement mechanism. And we understand that that work is underway and under discussion.

So, thanks very much to the PSWG and the registrars and others who are working on that. We do think that ultimately all of the registrars need to be participating in whatever the sort of end result is. And that is consistent with the Policy Recommendations from EPDP phase 2a.

We also think it's very clear that somehow the Privacy Proxy registrations need to be part of this system, at least the Privacy Proxy registrations managed by ICANN accredited registrars. So, we need to make that comprehensive. And the other priority that we see, although Seb tells me that maybe we got this wrong, but our sense is that we need for this to be any kind of a long-term solution. There has to be some kind of an API into the registrars. And I gather the users as well would like some kind of API to simplify and make this process more efficient.

So, I just wanted to make sure that you guys had the most current up-to-date information from where the Board is thinking. Obviously, we're not closing any doors on this and we are very much looking forward to the Standing Committee's Report. But I did want to share that. And you guys were just talking about the CCs and I just got off a Board GAC call on their topics of importance where they mentioned the CCs. And let

me just say, which I think everybody knows, obviously, that the Board is not opposed to having CCs participate.

The Board recognizes that any CC participation would need to be entirely voluntary because that is not policy that we can set for the CCs. And we also note that there are some complexities because it won't be the CC requirements, for example, may be different depending on the rules that the CCs operate under national law. So, I'm happy to answer any questions, but I just wanted to share that as an update. Seb, if I forgot anything that I told you the other day, remind me.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, no. I just wanted to make, for the record, I did not say the Board was wrong. I just met on the API that we had discussed in API. But just from our own discussion, there seemed to be more immediate interest from the requester side than from the registrars. The registrars would be happy to plug into an API, but were more interested in seeing first where the policy was going. And if I see your hand immediately there, Sarah, go ahead, you'll--

BECKY BURR:

And by the way, I was just joking that you'd--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, no, I know.

BECKY BURR: It was enlightening.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It was all good. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, this is Sarah. Oh, thank you so much, Becky. That was really helpful. That was very informative and it's useful to know like just where the thinking is going here. I want to flag two things to make sure that it's in your head, in the Board's head. With regards to those ccTLDs, I understand sort of vaguely that the concern or the difference would be that the registry needs to get their own requests instead of it going to the registrar.

And today, RDRS is only for registrars. So, that would be a big change, not impossible, just it might not sound like as big a difference as it is. The second thing in terms of perhaps making a mandatory system for registrars to use and understanding that the phase 2a recommendation was exactly that, a mandatory system, we should just also keep in mind that there is already phase one policy that requires registrars to respond to requests sent directly to them.

So, I just want everyone to keep in mind that we are necessarily making a system where requests could go through whatever we use because it's going to be mandatory or they could go directly to the registrar. So, it's requiring the registrar to do it both ways. And I'm not sure if that's what everybody thinks is best. We should think about it. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Sarah. That's very important for me to keep that in my head. And obviously, we don't want a system that creates more burdens from the registrar. So, we just have to, I don't know what the right outcome is, but as I said, we think there's going to be a mix of some policy that we can use and some policy that needs to be developed here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Sarah. Just also for you to note, Becky, as I said last week, including or being able to include ccTLDs indeed is in our mind. There's, as Sarah said, there is a path that we need to develop in the system to go from a request directly to the TLD operator in the case of ccTLDs. There's also a little detail about the fact that I think that we figure out if a domain exists and a domain and who the registrar is by using RDAP, which is all fine and good, but most ccTLDs don't have it or a lot of ccTLDs don't have it.

So, we would have to sort of mirror that with WHOIS when RDAP doesn't work. A few things, it's not major, major, major development, but enough to not to be able to welcome them anytime soon or before we've done that development. Regarding development, I've also discussed with Becky last week, the fact that I personally, but this is maybe an old project manager app that I have on. I'd like to know that this platform is the platform that we want to build from, that it was agreed as a Pilot that it was the best way to go, but is it for the long-term in the future?

And there, Becky, if I can quote you, the Board is not ready to take the decision but would actually welcome the decision from ICANN management and particularly from Kurtis that just joined who would have a view as to where his money and resources are best spent. And so, maybe a conversation that we want to engage with him even before-- yeah.

BECKY BURR:

Let me just say that's sort of not the technology, the ultimate platform and the technology is not something the Board is going to defer to Kurtis and Org on what's the best way to proceed. Is it to build on this? Is it not? Is it to do something else? That is that sort of above, I'm not sure above our pay grade is, but that is just something where we will defer to Kurtis and his technology team on the best way to proceed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay, and it's well heard. And we'll make sure that we can reach out to him possibly in Seattle to offer enough heads up. And in my view, it should be in the Final Report as such. With that said, Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. In terms of registries, remember that SSAD, for whatever that's worth, was destined to talk to registries as well as registrars. So, that it may be a change from what we have today in the RDRS, but it's not a change from what was originally foreseen or planned. I put my hand up to comment on Becky's overall review of

what the Board's position was. And I'm not sure I say this all that often, but I'm completely in agreement with it.

And it gives me a warm and fuzzy feeling that the Board does understand these issues, particularly the inclusion of ccTLDs and Privacy Proxy, which was not in SSAD. But clearly to make sense to users, it would be of great benefit. So, I think the Board has a complete understanding of where we are right now. And God knows how you make a final decision on it, but that's a different issue. Thank you.

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

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi, this is Gabriel. You know what, Alan said what I was going to say. I'll just continue that I was one of the squeakiest wheels on some of those issues and being annoying on a few of them. And so, I'm very encouraged as well to hear the treatment of those in your update, Becky. And I thank you for it. I'll let that be that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I wouldn't call it squeaky. Always constructive. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I'll just tack on to that. I'll just tack on to what Alan and Gabe said. Thank you, Becky. I appreciate that. It's good to hear

from the Board and good to hear where the Board's thoughts are. Sebastien, I also want to give you a plus one from hearing from ICANN Org. I had previously raised that I would like to hear from ICANN Org in this Final Report as far as I suggested lessons learned from them on building the RDRS, but you make a great point.

I think we need to hear from ICANN Org. Is building upon this RDRS a viable option or not? In creating this RDRS, we asked ICANN Org what they could put together on a shoestring budget, leveraging existing technologies. And they delivered on that, which is great. Thank you to them for that. But I think sometimes that's not the platform you want to build a long-term solution on. So, I think it's important for us to hear more from ICANN Org on their lessons learned building and operating the RDRS, as well as what maybe they can contribute towards a future solution. So, thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Marc. And it was definitely my intention to have that included in the report indeed. And I've already asked for that, for the information to be gathered on all sides. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. General agreement, but I want to suggest that this business of the role of the CCs can be viewed in a slightly different way. A system like this has multiple layers of complexity. The shared, the part that needs to be shared uniformly across the entire ecosystem, CCs and the RIRs as well, is the mechanics of sending in requests, getting

answers, what the formats are, what the definition of the fields are, and so forth.

The part that is specific to each of the communities is what the particular policies are with respect to what data should be collected and what the rules are for handling that data and who gets to make requests and what the risks are associated with all that, et cetera. So that, as I said, it's a multi-layered situation. The thing that will help a lot is to have in mind that the sort of the bottom layer with the mechanics and all of that is neutral with respect to whether it's contracted parties or CCs or others, and ought to be viewed in that fashion, in which case the process should involve standardizing those elements through the IETF and so forth, but should also be very clearly separated from any policy issues.

And that's a little tricky because it's very, very normal to think in terms of, well, here's what we're trying to accomplish. And that is the beginning of a slippery slope in which policy decisions are embedded deeply in the structures that are in. And so, it's tricky. I've appreciated, Sebastien, your comment about, I'll say, how did you refer to yourself as a project manager or a system designer?

That's where real work needs to be done to clearly separate those issues. And then when you put the whole system together, you have the flexibility to accommodate different Policies in different settings. And things that have been mentioned here in the dialogue about, it's a big thing to make certain kinds of changes, turn out not to be very big things because you've anticipated what the flexibilities are. So, that's a key thing that I wanted to share here.

There's plenty more to be said, but that I think is fundamental. It will also provide a great deal of insight into, well, if you really think in those terms, what should the platform look like? And the implicit bias that has existed in the past is, well, ICANN has to build this, ICANN has to run this. And all of that, in my view, is reflective of, that's because it's involved in a contractual process with the gTLDs and everything else is kind of a secondary or outside of scope. And then maybe we'll find a way to accommodate it. I think the right thing to do is to turn that absolutely inside out and say, assume we're thinking in terms of what works for the entire community and then what are the specifics that are needed for the contracted parties per se. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Steve. Yeah, there are many, many points here to answer, but, or to discuss. I think actually a lot of the discussion is going to go into the work of the chapter two. So, I'm not going to go ahead of it. I just, on a very personal note, I think that where the SSAD discussion may have gone a bit far too far is that we had well-minded and creative policy people trying to design a technical system. And I'd like to avoid that. One thing is to design policy and then respond technically to the needs of that policy. The other is to have a, again, technical design by committee, which is not always the best way to go. But that's my own personal opinion. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up. And then maybe after that, we can draw a line and free Becky again.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you. Marc Anderson again. I want to respond to one thing Steve said. He was commenting on, I guess, our tendency to talk about having ICANN design and build it. And Sebastien, I think you answered this a little bit in your email, but I just wanted to say from my perspective obviously with the RDRS, we very specifically asked what ICANN can build quickly and cheaply leveraging existing technologies.

So, that obviously was a very specific ask for ICANN. But as one of the members of the SSAD working group I wanted to say our intent was not to, or as we write in the recommendations, our intent was not to presuppose that ICANN or a third party would be developing that solution. I feel pretty confident speaking for the working group here, but in saying that our intention in the recommendations was that it could be ICANN or it could be a third party and that we were trying to craft recommendations that did not presuppose who would be building that particular solution. So, hopefully that's helpful. I just wanted to react to that one specific aspect of what Steve said. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Marc. Again, I think that we're all in agreement. Steve, I just see your hand up. Go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Thank you, Marc, for that. Let me offer an expansion of the two choices that you listed of either ICANN or third party building it, sort of building on what I was saying before about taking a somewhat broader view. Typically, in the internet environment, not necessarily focused solely on the ICANN processes, what happens is ideas are

expressed in terms of protocols, which are then documented and promulgated through the ITF.

And then if you ask, well, who's responsible for building that? And the answer is anybody who wants to and in general, multiple implementations. So, the question about whether it should be built by ICANN or a third party to my ear includes an implicit assumption that it's built by some single party and that there is a unitary control over all that. And that is an assumption that I think is worth examining because the minimum that's required is that things interoperate, not that there is a centralized control over the service. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. First of all, I want to make sure that I'll pass on the mic, Alan, in a minute, but I think that we've gone above and beyond the discussion for the Board. Becky, you're very welcome to stay with us, but I just wanted to make sure that you feel free to go if you need to. And thank you very much for your update from the Board's point of view.

BECKY BURR:

And thanks to all of you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

And Steve, I fully agree with you, obviously. I think that we also need to keep in mind that from the requestor community point of view, at least from what I've heard, they were interested in their one-stop shop. It doesn't mean that everything is centralized and guided by ICANN or anybody else centrally, but the one-stop shop was something of

interest. Their need to be able to know exactly where to go to request and not having to first spend time finding who and what.

Before I give you the mic, Alan, I also wanted to note in chat Lisa's comment about the fact that Org is indeed collecting the internal feedback from ICANN's experience in terms of building the tool, operating it, how much it costs, what was involved, and we'll integrate that in the report. I just wanted to say it because it's in chat and whoever might be listening, I read that Thomas had to go because he was having connection problems, so he'll be listening, but we don't always listen and check the chat at the same time. With this said, Alan, go ahead. And we have 10 minutes left to discuss chapter two. So, I'd like also, once Alan is done, for Feodora or whoever wanted to walk us through it to get ready for it. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. First of all, a one-stop shop does not mean there are not multiple implementations. There could well be one per country, one per continent or simply three flavors and you pick the one you want. Maybe if there's pricing, they may have different pricing. So, the one-stop shop does not remove the price or the possibility of multiple implementations. But I put my hand up for a different reason. As someone who spent several, quite a few decades managing IT resources, the concept of us discussing how do we build it? Do we use existing systems? Do we outsource the design? Do we outsource the operation? Is completely ludicrous at this point.

We need to be specifying what the system should do. Then the right appropriate technologists and business people can decide how to do it or the multiple options of that. But I think that's just irrelevant from what we should be talking about right now. So, I'd like to focus on functionality and what we need the system to do, not who are the mechanics who are going to build it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Alan, very fair point and excellent cue for Feodora to maybe walk us through then chapter two, which is going to be all about that. What we want the future of the system to be what we see on the horizon for it. Do you want to walk us through, Feodora?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Yes, thank you very much, Seb. This is for Feodora for the record. While you all have been working and commenting on chapter one, we've drafted assignment two or chapter two, focusing on possible technical updates to the RDRS. First, you see the introduction and then all the information that is used here is from the workbook, either from the requester and registrar steps where we discussed the system implementations or proposals, or also in the Final Report finding tabs where you proposed other features that might have not been discussed previously.

We divided the chapter into implemented enhancements. Here in the text, you can see some of the highlights and then we have a table giving a more detailed overview. What we would ask the standing committee members to do here is in the last column, effectiveness to enter if the

proposed or if the implemented enhancement did meet the expectations to give the reader an idea of how useful this additional feature was. Yes, so that's the column for implemented enhancements. Then we have one pending enhancement that was discussed earlier, and that is the one that Gabe included in the workbook. There's no further information needed here, but of course, you can comment and suggest if anything should be kept, removed or modified.

And then the last part and last table is proposed future enhancements. These were all taken also from the workbook. Here in text are the highlights and then we have a more granular table where we need targeted input from the standing committee members is the goal and rationale and the risk and dependencies for each proposal. You see some texts there already, but in most or almost all cases, further rationale is needed from the proposal owner or from other members who thinks something might need to be added. And the same applies for risks and dependencies.

You will see the Action Items as comments in the document so you can remember, but I will also draft the notes from this meeting where clear instructions will be kept. And then towards the end, we have similar to chapter one, a summary of everything. Along the way, I will also tag dedicated proposal owners from the workbook to provide targeted input to specific proposals. And you will see maybe your name popping up.

What does this mean in terms of next steps? This means that chapter one will be closed for review while we focus on chapter two. And then you can review chapter one when we will discuss all chapters together.

You will be able to edit chapter one until you receive chapter two, which we should share probably tomorrow with the notes and instructions. That's it from our side, and I will give back to Seb for further discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, quickly, I have a question for you because I've just said that half an hour ago for people to mark in chapter one, the stuff that they're not ready to live with or the stuff that they feel that should be discussed. Again, recommendation with a small R, consensus with a small C and so on and so forth. So maybe if we can leave room for those edits or comments a bit longer than just tomorrow.

And then just to make absolutely clear to everybody, all the elements in your table above all come from the two spreadsheets that we had in our working document, one for registrars and one for requesters. And you've copy pasted all the ones that had an owner. The stuff that was orphaned, abandoned, nobody wanted to raise did not make it to this document, right?

FEODORA HAMZA:

That is correct.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. So, again, if you go back to the sheet and find something that you want to adopt and were hesitant about up until now, but feel that is important, it can be saved. We just need your name on it. Are there any questions from the group on any of this? Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Yes, thank you. I apologize for belaboring the point, but I'm going to do it anyways. The things that were flagged as recommendations in the later parts of chapter one. Are they going to be taken out of chapter one and moved to chapter four? Is that what your message meant in the chat or did that mean something else? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, I don't know about moved out, but definitely reference and repeat it in chapter four as the chapter four will have the recommendations. Now, if there is a problem about having it in two different places because of readability or interpretation or whatever, I fully understand. And let's look into it. I just want to make sure also that chapter one is not catalyzed out of any meaning.

So, if the reference needs to exist, but I understand, yeah, duplication and at least to interpretation and all these things, I'm fully aware. So, I understand absolutely. The home for recommendations, as far as I understand it and see it and the way we've planned for this is going to be in the chapter four. And thank you for noting that, Sarah. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I want to strongly agree. The chapter one sections for recommendation and section five conclusions, I think those do not belong in chapter one at all. And having them in two places does not do anybody any favors. I also think that the content of section four and

section five is important enough and impactful enough that it warrants specific discussion by our group. I know we're out of time for today, but these are topics, many of which I think you make the point in one of your comments that they have not been discussed by the group. This is the meat of our work and I think they each deserve discussion by us in turn.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay, absolutely. Absolutely, no problem. We're also three weeks away. A bit less, no, a bit more, four weeks away from a meeting or at least a lot of us being able to meet. So, let's table that for our discussions in Seattle. It's always good to have these discussions face-to-face, even though in Seattle we'll have an hour, an hour and a half and it's not going to be quite enough for all of it, but at least we can aim for that.

With this, we're at time. There was no AOB raised. I'm not sure I asked for it, but anyway, there was no AOB raised. So, with this, look forward to Feodora's recap of our conversation. Look forward to her sharing that chapter two and let's move to that next step of the work. Great seeing you all today and see you in two weeks. And again, thank you, Becky, for joining us and updating us with the Board's thinking. Have a great day all and we can call this a day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]