

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 12th of May, 2025.

For today's call, we have apologies from Sarah Wyld. The alternate representing the RrSG is Roger Carney. Also an apology is Lisa Carter, ICANN Org. Paul McGrady will be joining us late. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. Not seeing any hands. If you do need assistance updating your SOI, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome, and will be able to view chat-only and have listen-only audio. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. 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. Over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie. I also received directly, not so much apologies but a warning from Farzaneh, saying that she, as Paul, will join later. So with this, Feodora shared the agenda last week. Does anybody have anything to add to it? In particular, there was an e-mail exchange that I saw late last week some return, some feedback on the NCSG and the law

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.

enforcement authentication process. I don't know that completely connects here. So I'll let whoever wants to talk about that add it.

I see no hands for any of the questions, so maybe we should go directly into the agenda, and that was basically to continue our discussion on Chapter 4. Now, I don't know exactly Feodora or—yeah, I guess you, Feodora. But somebody from staff had prepared some slides to go through what we had discussed before and where we're at. Does anybody want to take that?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Yes, Seb. I can take that. Just one second. Good morning and good afternoon and good evening, everyone. Thank you all for joining the call. ICANN Org is going to present today our continued work on Assignment 4 which focuses on developing the recommendation to the GNSO Council. But before we get to the main discussion point, we want to provide a quick recap on what was discussed or presented during the last meeting. For those who could not attend, that part will be covered by my colleague, Caitlin. And after that, we will look into how Chapter 4 of the RDRS SC final findings report might be structured and look like and what recommendations can be derived from that. Furthermore, we also want to review each individual SSAD, aka EPDP Phase 2 recommendation, and compare them against what has been implemented in RDRS for the SC's further review and discussion. After support staff presentation, the Standing Committee chair will then lead again the discussion following the same format as we used during last week's session. Now I hand over to Caitlin for the recap.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Feodora. If we can go to the next slide. During the last meeting, Feodora presented what Assignment 4 was, or reminded the group, which is essentially provided on the slide. And you'll see that in the Standing Committee's assignment from the Council, the Council is expecting some clarity on expected next steps for the EPDP Phase 2 SSAD recommendations. In other words, recommendations 1 through 18. In these green boxes is what is provided as a footnote to what that could look like.

So we talked about this very briefly during the last meeting, but essentially, the group could say we've learned from RDRS, we think that we should tell the Council to approve all of these recommendations or recommend to the Board to approve all of the recommendations. As noted during our last meeting, based on the conversations of this group to date, that doesn't seem to be a unanimous position of the group, but that is an option. Similarly, the opposite of that could be true, where, based on the Standing Committee's review of the RDRS over the past year and a half, it could say, "Council, we think you should recommend to the Board not to approve these recommendations because they're not in the best interest of the ICANN community." The Standing Committee could also say, "We think these recommendations need to be modified, and we recommend to the Council to note to the Board that these recommendations need to be modified." That could happen one of two ways, which we'll go over in a minute. And then obviously, four would be variation or a combination of those.

So, for example, the Standing Committee could look at the recommendations and say Recommendations 1 through 4 are included in the RDRS. This is just by way of example that those are not actually included in the RDRS, but Recommendations 1 through 4 are included. They're working. These can be recommended to be approved. Whereas Recommendation 5 shouldn't be approved. That's not part of the RDRS. We don't think it's in the best interest. And the other Recommendations, 6 through 18, need modifications.

So what we had talked about last week is that this is a very unique assignment because the group is actually looking at the policy recommendation language and its experience with the RDRS and making a recommendation to the Council on what to do with each of those recommendations. I know there had been some reticence or concerns about looking at policy language and saying this should be modified, but we just wanted to kind of go back over the roles and responsibilities that there are checks and balances in place. So this group isn't able to just modify policy recommendations that went through the GNSO PDP, or EPDP in this case. But the Council did charge this group with looking at those recommendations and providing some guidance to the Council as it approaches its dialogue with the Board about how to proceed with these recommendations. So in terms of modifying recommendations, we provided some additional context on what that looks like in terms of GNSO procedures and the Bylaws, because there were a couple of questions. So if we can go to the next slide.

Some of you are familiar with Section 9 of the ICANN Bylaws Annex A. Essentially, what happens if the ICANN Board rejects a

recommendation, believing that it's not in the best interest of the ICANN community, what would happen is the Board would explain why it doesn't believe this recommendation is in the best interest of the ICANN community. And the GNSO Council, based on that information, has the opportunity to issue a supplemental recommendation. And there's usually a dialogue involved. This happened, for example, with Phase 1 of this EPDP, and some of you are involved in those discussions. If the Board is comfortable with a modified recommendation, it would adopt that recommendation, and it's still the same voting thresholds. To be clear, the Board would reject a recommendation, and then the Council could issue a supplemental recommendation.

If, on the other hand, if we go to the next slide, Section 16 of the GNSO Operating Procedures has a different procedure in place for modified recommendations that are modified prior to the Board's consideration. So we're in this unique space where the GNSO Council did approve these recommendations by a super majority, but the Board hasn't yet considered them. Of course, we went through this ODP, we now have the RDRS, but the Council could potentially make modifications to the recommendations prior to Board consideration, and that process is under Section 16. So there's a couple of ways the recommendations could be modified. And for anyone who has additional questions about that, we would recommend going back to last week's recording where we cover this in detail. The main point here is that this group is being asked to look at the recommendations and provide guidance to the Council based on its experience with the RDRS.

And as Alan Greenberg notes in the chat, there's a big difference between changing policy and commenting on it. So this group has the

ability to comment on these recommendations and what they've learned, so that that can inform the next step, which is the Council's dialogue with the Board. And so the more information that it can provide the Council, the more helpful those recommendations will be. But as Sebastien has reminded us, there's a big difference between little P policy and big P Policy, and this group is not creating policy. It is making observations based on policy recommendations and the RDRS. So we just wanted to remind everybody about this assignment before we go into talking about what the guidance of the Council could look like. So hopefully that is helpful.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you very much, Caitlin. Yes, I give over to Alan. He has a question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Clearly, we're in a position to make recommendations on the policy that are clearly informed by the RDRS. What about other things? I mean, the world has changed significantly since this policy was approved by the GNSO, and therefore there may well be things that some of us consider no longer appropriate policy because of the changing environment. Is that within our scope also to do or is that yet another group that has to be convened to do that part, or the GNSO process itself?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Alan, if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So it is not something that we're asked to do. I think that if we can find consensus on a particular point and say, "Hey guys, this is clearly outdated," and whilst it's not directly connected to RDRS, we think you should have a look at it too. But I'd like to focus on the stuff that we've learned from RDRS is essentially the conclusions of last week is my best personal effort not to delve too much into the policy that we agreed that this group would look at the policy, not so much to go and change it again, but have enough of an analysis of it to be able to look at it on a RDRS point of view. Now, if there are things that jump at us, I think that we could find some consensus in writing it and drafting it.

On the other hand, just by agreeing that we would look into it and the fact that we are fast running into the summer and fast running into a time where things just don't operate as efficiently, we sort of extended this pilot beyond June and into possibly all the way to the next ICANN. So I just want to be a bit careful with the group. I'll do my best to try to keep everybody on the same line, to focus first on RDRS. Again, if there are things that jump in, that you'd be silly to pass next to it, but we're not going to run an overall study of the SSAD policy against all possible criteria that have changed since. Our expertise is in RDRS. I hope that makes sense. But go ahead, I saw your hand raised again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I tend to agree with your analysis. I find it rather unfortunate because I think that's some work that really needs to be done before

the GNSO can take action, and I don't know where or how that's going to happen, but I tend to agree that it's probably not our job, but it really does need to be done. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

We've agreed that our job is to look at all the SSAD policies. So again, if we can find, without having to spend three weeks arguing on it, consensually, that there's something there that needs to be flagged as a part of the to-do list, I'm happy to do it. If we tend to spend hours and hours on it, I'll ask to move on. I don't know. There's probably points that, I agree with you, should be flagged.

I want to remind you also that, again, I don't know, we haven't really looked at how much time it would take, but some of those recommendations are quite voluminous and have a lot of details. So it's not something that we're going to do quickly, and then possibly not something that we're going to agree on very quickly either. So I just want to make sure, again, we've got a mandate that covers us at least until November, the second year anniversary of this pilot, even if I was living in some hope to have this cleared before. But yeah, we can't. This could potentially be a very long process. SSAD itself wasn't arrived at in any short motion. Feodora, I'll let you finish, and then we can start the discussion.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you very much. Yes. Thank you all. Now we are going to look into based on the discussions and the scenarios, they're going to start shaping a vision of how Chapter 4 might look like, as this chapter will

bring together the main conclusions from the RDRS SC's work in Chapters 1 through 3, and translate them into recommendations to the GNSO Council. So this might include the main findings and overarching recommendations based on the analysis and the chapters and part two, which was discussed last week, an updated table from Chapter 3 and the lessons learned on the SSAD recommendations. This table would indicate which recommendations have been implemented in RDRS, which ones have been not implemented at all, and which ones align or partially aligned with RDRS. Based on that, this is what support staff believed to have heard and gathered from the RDRS Standing Committee's discussions, how some of the recommendations could look like in Chapter 4, which is continue and improve RDRS beyond the pilot, while more policy work is being done. Implement key enhancements to sustain the RDRS pilot and propose the top five key enhancements from Chapter 2. And as discussed last week, to do an individual analysis of the 18 SSAD policy recommendations, which we will start looking into today already.

STEPHEN CROCKER:

Excuse me, this is Steve Crocker. I'm on my iPhone. I don't see a way to raise my hand. I want to ask a question and ask where the point that I want to raise best belongs in light of Sebastien's dissection and other dissections of where issues should be raised. The issue is this. One of the key experiences in RDRS is that requesters don't have clear guidance on whether a request is likely to be granted. And further, the experience in making requests is quite variable, not only across registrars, but even within the same registrar. There's not a whole lot of consistency and certainly not a lot of guidance or record keeping about all that. And my

question is, where should that issue be raised in the hierarchy of different avenues that you've discussed?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Again, I would suggest to have that as a discussion for potential additional. There are the policy recommendations that are to stay, the ones that are to change, the ones that are disappear. I assume that there will be potentially a bucket of new recommendations to be worked on. Again, I don't want to preempt the discussion. Consensus is going to be arrived to, but just looking at any problem, this would you keep? Would you change? Would you abandon? And what new you do you have to add to better your system? So I would suggest that there might be a bucket of those.

STEPHEN CROCKER: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Feodora, do you want to keep on?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. Thank you very much. So yeah, just to get back, based on the discussion we had last time, support staff already started to look into how the Chapter 4 could look like. And before I go further into it... So based on what was discussed in Chapter 3, one could make a general observation, and this is the RDRS aligns broadly with 1 SSAD recommendation, and aligns partially with 12 SSAD EPDP Phase 2

recommendations, and differs significantly with 5 of the SSAD recommendation, which include accreditation, Rec 1 and 2, response timing, Rec 10, financial sustainability, Rec 14, and the audits, Recommendation 16.

And from that, the Standing Committee could have a general conclusion on this that based on the SC observations and lessons learned, the recommendations, as you will see in a second, marked in green worked well within RDRS, the recommendations marked in yellow worked within RDRS but could benefit from some modification. Depending on discussion, there might be minor or moderate or substantial. And the recommendations marked in red were not implemented in RDRS, and the SC has to discuss if that is fine or they should be still considered, and so on. Alan, I will give you the floor once I'm done, because then we can have the discussion. I just need a couple more slides.

So we will start with the one recommendation that aligns broadly with the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. This is Recommendation #8. In essence, the registrar is expected to review every request individually and respond to the requester directly. This has been similar in RDRS, except that RDRS also does not allow bulk processing as per Recommendation 8.1, no further observation have been made by the RDRS SC so far.

And then we will also go through today through the five ones that were not implemented, which is the accreditations one, they are not available in RDRS but proposed in EPDP Phase 2. As noted, the RDRS Standing Committee has made some observation on this one, and the GAC Public Safety Working Group is actually even looking into an authentication

mechanism for law enforcement, which would be considered under Rec 2.

Similarly, Rec 10 asks for SLAs, which RDRS doesn't have. But there was some suggestion that RDRS could include a pending request to input status, which could support tracking the duration requests that remain pending. But as such, no timeframes have been implemented in RDRS.

The last two ones, financial sustainability and audits that are also not available in RDRS. On recommendation 16, the RDRS Standing Committee didn't make any further observation. And on Recommendation 14, RDRS has been funded by ICANN so far, and the cost per request was around \$354. It's not financially self-sufficient as EPDP Phase 2 SSAD was envisioned. But yeah, that's for the discussion.

That's the last slide. I will go back to one, and then, Sebastien, you can lead the discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Before I pass the hand to Alan, I just want to make sure that I've been clear and precise in my answer to Steve Crocker earlier. The charter asked us indeed to look at the SSAD recommendation. I think, personally, if there is something that is gaping and that we can agree on is gaping, I would suggest passing that information on to the Council, but the question for the Council is on what to do with the recommendations that Council voted passed on to the Board, and how it should interact with the Board and whatever, not on new work. I assume, my own personal assumption, that at some point, Council will ask or convene another group to develop, to rework on the SSAD policy

in order to make it fit what we now know. And I assume also then in that same capacity that group would be able to amend and alter and add to the policy. But I don't want to preempt on any of that because it's not what we're being asked. I think that, as we know and we've learned, it'd be good to flag, but I don't want to make any promises as to the result. With this said, I see Alan's hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Sebastien, you—and I think Feodora—several times used the term “if we can agree”. Based on my very painful knowledge of the SSAD PDP itself, I suspect there are going to be many cases where we cannot agree, and there will be sides as it were or differences of opinion. And I think any document that we come up with has to be able to not only say yes or no, but present the differences of opinion or something. Because otherwise, that's lost information. And the implication of not mentioning it is either that we haven't discussed it or something or I don't know. But I think we want to preserve the fact we can't—I think we'll often not be able to say yes or no. Let's say there are differences of opinion. And that's simply information that Council will have to take into account when it decides how to proceed. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Point taken, Alan. Caitlin, you might need to help me on this, but I think that we need to be conscious, cognizant of what is been asked of us. I think that whilst I fully agree with you, the report needs to be as rich as possible and show the diversity of range of opinions, if it exists. We do need to concentrate at least in what we return in the main body of our

report on what we can agree on consensually, with the possibility of having divergent point of view in the Annex, so on and so forth. If it turns out that our report is completely void of any agreement on anything, it'll be a bit of a disaster. But again, I see Feodora immediately raising her hand to help me here, possibly. But I think that in terms of the charter, as we discussed last week, or it wasn't last week, it was two weeks ago. I'm sorry, in the meantime, I was sick on weekend and my head is not fully functioning today, but I can't remember why we do need to present something that is based on consensus. Before I pass the hand on to you, Gabriel, I hope that you can let me let Feodora answer that question. Feodora, go ahead.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. Thank you, Alan. I think it's just important to mention that in the charter, we have four assignments. And for the Assignment 1, 2, 3, the charter specifically says that we should mention where disagreement is taking place within the report and that has been done in the different chapters so far. Only Chapter 4 or Assignment 4, the recommendations to Council, need to reach consensus level or follow formal consensus procedures. So yeah, I think that has taken place only for Assignment 4 we need an agreement.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Feodora, as we're opening here, topics that are not discussed with the review of the SSAD policy topics that were not discussed in Chapter 1, 2, or 3, how should we make this potential disagreement come to light? Or

it's not the disagreement that I'm interested in, it's offering the points of view that didn't meet consensus.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Well, I think in the working document we can still make that clear, as we will share the slides and probably a working document where the Standing Committee members can provide their input, as you can see also on the table, do they agree with the categorization, or if they have anything else to add? And once we have all that gathered, then we can take it from there and see how we want to best take it forward.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. I hope that answers your question and I take your point on chat, Alan. Gabriel, I'll see your hand up now.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Completely different topic. But on the notion of the calculation for the cost per request through the RDRS, I wondered if ICANN staff were able to provide a little bit of context in terms of how that was calculated. If it was just a simple what is the total expense that we put into the RDRS divided by the number of requests? Or is it possible for us to differentiate between the sunk costs that are going to be there versus the incremental cost that would be associated with each new request. I think that would be very relevant if we could do that, and I'm just curious if it's feasible.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes. There was more details offered two weeks ago on the previous call.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: My apologies.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, it's all right. But just an invitation to go back to that recording. There wasn't full details of everything. There was no like full project P&L disclosed. But in particular, I think it's two slides later, I think there's two cost per transactions that were given here that reflect that. One was the 354, and that's the total cost of running RDRS versus the number of requests received. The other higher cost is the one that also includes the sunk cost into the development, etc.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Perfect. Okay. So already this has been considered, and yep, you're way ahead of me. So thank you kindly for answering.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, I don't know if I'm ahead of you, but on this particular point, yes, it's been discussed. With this, Feodora, you were, I guess, done. Again, my brain is a bit fuzzy today. How do we want to look at this? Yeah, go ahead.

FEODORA HAMZA: As presented, this recommendation seems to align with the RDRS implementation. No further comments have been made by the Standing

Committee members. But the question is, does the Standing Committee agree with this categorization based on what they know and based on the experience they had with SSAD, or do they have a different opinion on this?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I hope the question was clear to everybody. The registrars are expected to review every request individually and respond to the requester directly, where we're tracking the response and whatever. No, sorry, not tracking the response, but tracking the fact that the response was positive or not, and how long it took for that to be processed. Are we matching the policy here as is in SSAD? And do we need to go and change anything? I don't want to elicit any further comment, but taking Steve Crocker's comment earlier, I think that this might be something where you want to flag indeed that whatever the standards of the responses in that might be, but I'll let you defend that particular point. In the meantime, I see Alan's hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. My recollection is the SSAD had more specification on what the registrar must say if they reject it, that is give more guidance as to what was missing or what was the reason why. And I don't think RDRS is that level of granularity and information being fed back. So that's something we may want to look at, because to simply say we implemented it, I'm not sure we did at that level. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. This is a bit of a sidebar, but in terms of process, I need your help and your best judgment here. The SSAD, I hope that everybody's had a chance to read it, but for a lot of us, it's a few months, if not a few years old, going through this exercise as a group, some of the recommendations, as I was reminded by Caitlin two weeks ago, the recommendations are seven pages long, particularly that, I think the first one. And so having this on a Zoom call, going through and on the Zoom call is not going to be an exercise. That's going to be very impractical.

You're absolutely right, Alan. We need to go back into those details. We need to go back into all that because that's what we've agreed to do. What is the easiest way to do it? I would recommend for everybody to go back to those and prepare notes and etc. Again, as a group, and this is where part of my warning to the group was with vis-à-vis policy development or looking at policy and etc., I don't have that experience. I have very limited experience in these in that way. Again, I don't want to be writing policy and I don't want us to start doing that either. So opening a Google Doc with a whole policy and started putting comments and things on what we want to see changing, etc., I think is putting it on the path of spending a whole lot of time that I don't want to spend on it. But we need to find some midpoint here that allows us to look at the recommendations and analyze and bring back what we believe still is relevant in there and where we don't. Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. I think as a way forward, and I agree with you that a presentation during Zoom might be limited. The plan is, as mentioned earlier, that we provide a Google Doc version where the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendation is clearly linked, and you will be directed there to the page where you can find it in the report and where you can review it, and we would share it then tomorrow after with the notes. I think it's also important and a good exercise to one more time review Chapter 3 that I shared also in the chat and we'll share with the notes with the lessons learned, because I think that also can inform this discussion and has already, but that would also be helpful. I also think it's worthwhile to look into the four, five remaining ones that we've put on the slides to get a gauge first impressions and then take the input in written format when we can, just in terms of action items and next steps.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. In the meantime, Gabriel added what he believed Alan was referring to. I'm reading this as everybody is reading it. I don't have in front of me the possible implementation notes that were attached to this. But I mean, this is good, it's helpful, but at the same time, it's exactly a cyber statement where we can expect everything or very little. Mass communiqué can be an e-mail as simple as saying you don't meet the criteria. End of story. Is it helpful? I don't know. Again, I don't want to go into policy building, let alone implementation of something that I don't know is going to be policy in the next few years. But if there is a learning that we have from this group saying just having an answer is not in itself helpful if we don't understand what we did wrong, it might be something that needs to be informed. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, I wasn't commenting, saying that's needed and that's something we have to add. All I was saying is that when we review these, if we can't say that, "Yes, we implemented it," if we only implemented a part of it. Because what we didn't implement may well have an effect on how it's used, on how it's received, all those things. Now, our part is not to comment on whether we should have it or not. All I'm saying is we need to note those differences if we implemented something partially.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fair point. Fair point. Which draws us back to then having to look at the recommendation its entirety and being able to comment on it, highlight what we have worked on and what we haven't been able to get to. But again, as per Feodora's comment, that's something we'll get to, not now, but that we'll get to very soon with the document that we can comment on. Did you want to go to the next one?

The accreditation is indeed something that is now being abandoned. So that was the seven-page recommendation that we sort of shortened here to just one sentence. Essentially, so it's not available in RDRS. We need to go back to the recommendation and see if there is anything in there that does deserve being maintained. But in principle, the general understanding is that this accreditation model is something that we will abandon, that is something that is not going to be required in the future iterations of RDRS. Paul McGrady, I see your hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Again, I'm sorry. I keep going back to this, which is, I don't remember discussing this. There's a fact question, which is, does the RDRS have an accreditation process? The answer to that is no, but that's different than we were abandoning accreditation for the RDRS going forward. That's not the same question, and we've not had these conversations about the SSAD recommendations. I mean, if we want to do that, then I think we're back to going through the SSAD and understanding them and reacting to them and saying that we agree the SSAD recommendations should stay or we think they should go. And if they do go and Council should do nothing rather than trying to do a supplemental recommendation, or whatever our recommendation is going to be. I'm sorry to be that guy, but I keep going back. This is sort of a more detailed way to ask the same question, which we talked about last time when the proposal was very broad, like we should yay. We didn't talk about that. Instead we're [inaudible] things with the SSAD, but we still haven't talked about it. So be it, but I don't think we've talked about these things. I don't remember a big conversation about what would be baked into the RDRS. It wasn't. We were [inaudible] on how the RDRS functioned as baked. Maybe that's what we're doing. I don't know. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, I see your point. I take your point, Paul. Let me go through the queue, and then I'll see if I can answer that. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I raised my hand to say, essentially, the same thing as Paul. So in the interest of time, I'll just say plus one to what Paul said. It is basically the same comment.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII: Hi. Sorry I am late. I see that this lesson learned on the accreditation. It is true that the onerous part of data disclosure is generally not authentication, but I think that authentication is not only to facilitate registrars kind of processing the data and disclosing it, it's also to provide some accountability mechanism and checks and balances for the requester. So maybe I think that I agree with that exploring how requester validation may be best addressed. I don't know what follow-up system we are talking about, but I think that I agree. I don't want to make changes to the lesson learned. Maybe add a sentence on authentication is also for bringing accountability to the requester of data.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out I agree with what Paul said, by the way, I don't think we've had a substantive discussion on this. And without warning, this is not the proper venue to say we agree with

what's in that box or not. But I just wanted to note that there are nuances and in-between positions. For instance, SSAD said every requester had to be accredited. This is in between to say you may be accredited. If you're accredited, that gives extra information to the registrar of knowing who you are for sure, but maybe you choose not to be accredited. So there's in-between things also.

Lastly, and I cannot remember if it's under accreditation or there was a separate recommendation, but a huge part of the SSAD cost in the ODA was a verification of the intellectual property rights. Do you have a copyright on this? Or that kind of thing. And that was something like two-thirds of the overall costs. So we're clearly are not doing it now, but I can't remember if it was within the accreditation recommendation or somewhere else in the recommendations. Again, I think this whole conversation is somewhat premature without us going back and looking at the SSAD recommendations. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. On Paul's point and reiterated Marc, it's true, we didn't have that discussion and we need to have it. Basically, in order to facilitate this discussion where we went in order to produce those slides is the existing comments and what was gathered in the previous three chapters. So I think that we need to set ourselves some homework here. One is to go back to the SSAD. And I will ask Feodora, she's mentioned it, to then share a document of it, a Google Doc version of it, that we can comment on. I mean comment, not change the wording or anything. Just put comments and track comments. But I need also everybody to go back to the three existing chapters that we have. And if

somebody from staff can also—I know that Chapter 2, the link was restated above, but if we can put those three links easily accessible for those that need help to go back to it. Because these words actually came, these are not invented words. These words came from what we’ve already left in previous documents. And so if that’s the origin of the problem, we need to go back to those documents too and be able to comment them and get them the way we want.

I guess this goes also for the next points there. So maybe instead of going into the details of everything and what we remember to be true or etc., and we need to go back to it. So please, everybody go back to those Chapter 1, 2, 3, and particularly 3 as most of this document is based on it. Staff, please share a link to the SSAD. I know that we’ve proposed to speed the cadence in order to be able to meet targets that were in June. But at same time, if we’re extending our timelines like this, please tell me if we’re putting too much on your tables and you need a bit more time to be able to look at all these things, and from one week to another. If it’s not feasible, it’s not feasible. I have to accept that. But yeah, we need to go back a bit to the prior work in order to make sure that we can build up from it. Gabriel, I see your hand.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

A quick administrative question. Is Feodora the best ICANN staff person to follow up with for permission requests to access those chapter documents?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Absolutely.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay, copy that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I guess, if you don't have access, any requests to it will land on the desk anyway.

It's 24 past the hour on my clock. That means six minutes to this discussion. I don't know that it's worth going into the details of every single one of them. You can maybe flash through the slide, if it helps anybody motivate themselves to go back to the text. Thank you, Feodora, for putting those links up. Click on them to make sure that they're open in my browser. With this and unless there are any other comments, suggestion on the way we should proceed, I'm all ears. Farzaneh, I see your hand up. I assume, Gabriel, that's a previous hand.

FARZANEH BADII: I don't really have a suggestion on how to proceed. I just wanted to mention that we haven't made the decision yet. Have we made the decision on whether Gabriel is going to send the domain? I think it was at the domain level that he wanted to send to RDRS to ICANN. Have we decided that we are going to use RDRS as the system to pass that list to the registrars? And if we haven't, how are we going to decide on that one? Are we going to decide on that? Also, I generally have a better understanding of the recommendations that NCSG made, and I sent it to the list. Where can we actually see that those recommendations can be followed?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Essentially, you're asking, should RDRS be modified to be able to take the approach proposed by Gabriel on behalf of law enforcement?

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah. I'm just not clear, because last time we met, there was another portal as well that we discussed that it could be used for—yeah. So I just want to know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, do you want to answer that?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yes. As I recall, it was maybe two sessions, because I missed at least one session of the Standing Committee between when we raised this issue, but we were seeking permission to add, I guess you'd call this an enhancement request. As I understand it, a very low level of work so that when someone is logged into the RDRS to make a request, as they already have to be, that if their domain that they're logged in with matched a domain on a list we provided, that the fact that it matched could be provided to the registrar as part of the information they receive. I asked just if there was any objection to it. I have sort of lost visibility into that, because I think at minimum, Sarah wanted to go back and ask the registrars, and I hadn't heard any adverse reaction to that. I'm assuming no news is good news. But just to clarify as well that this is not the only means of authenticating law enforcement that we're trying to help with. This is just one easy-to-act-upon suggestion that we're

hoping we can move forward with, in addition to also potentially making these lists available to registrars via a non-RDRS mechanism potentially through the name services portal. So sort of differentiating there. I'm hoping that we still just have the permission of the Standing Committee to make that one of the enhancement requests, noting its low-level of effort. But I think that's the extent of what probably needs to be discussed in this particular group on that, at least to my understanding.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Given the stated discussion on this, and particularly, even though it's not connects, but with urgent requesting, etc., I would assume that you're asking if that could be an enhancement that is sort of Fast Track rather now, rather than put into a chapter—I've lost track of which one it is, but the recommendations that we would put for the longer term.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yes, sir. And this, again, only if my assertion is correct, that it is actually trivially easy for them to do, as I've been told it likely will be. Otherwise, I wouldn't even bother asking in this fashion. But it's just a check, it's value match this list.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

We haven't discussed it further. Indeed, there was the NCSG comments last week via e-mail. I haven't seen anything from the Registrars, but again, last week the contracted parties were meeting in Hanoi, and I don't know that anything has come out of it immediately. And I know that Sarah is on the phone. I don't know if she's still around. Maybe

Roger has an update on this, but I haven't seen any updates or any progress on this. So thank you for putting that back on the table. But again, yeah, I don't know that—one, it hasn't been discussed and I certainly don't know that we have any progress on it. Roger, are you able to confirm or not? I see your hand up. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Seb. I would have to say I'm not sure there was any progress made on it, so I'll have to leave it as is. I know Sarah hadn't dropped really, but I don't recall anything going on. So I would say we're in the same boat as we were. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. As Farzaneh notes there, maybe we can follow up on the mailing list, particularly on the registrar side, you can look. And, Gabriel, maybe just answer to it for the record. What you just stated works for me, but so that we have it on the record or in the chain of discussion there.

With this, we've reached the half hour. The job is done for today. I can go back to whatever. Thanks for my head, and I will be talking with you next week. Please go back to the previous chapters. Please go look into your mailbox for the Google Doc on SSAD, and we can move forward with words and text rather than impressions and our memories of it. Thank you very much, and see you all soon. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]