
DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call, taking place on Monday, 13 January 2025.

For today's call, we have received apologies from Sebastien Ducos and Thomas Rickert. The Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or unmute your mic now. If assistance is needing updating your Statements of Interest, 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 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.

All chat sessions are being archived. 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 you, John. Please begin.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. I guess to start—I just tried clicking my video button and it's saying it's been disabled by the host, but I'm still happy to proceed without everybody having to see me. Firstly, let me wish everybody a happy new year. I think this is our first meeting since the new year began and so excited to see everybody. Also, let folks know that there

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.

are a few people I think that are attending the GNSO Council's Strategic Planning session. That's why they couldn't be here, including Sebastien. I'm filling in. With that, we can move on through the rest of the agenda. There we go. Thanks for getting the video on. The first thing we have on the agenda is to talk about the continuation of Quarterly Survey Reports. I'll turn that over to Lisa.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, John. Happy new year, everyone. I wanted to bring this to the agenda again because we ended last year with a brief conversation at the end of the last call about the surveys and what might happen. I think Gabe expressed interest in continuing the Requestor Survey while I think—and correct me if I'm wrong, Sarah thought that the Registrar Surveys wasn't really producing any additional information beyond what we'd already learned. I wanted to address that a little bit for what we would do going forward. Seb and John and I had a conversation. Well, you can express your opinion now, Sarah.

Seb and I had a conversation about potentially continuing to collect the data for Requestor Surveys. However, putting a pause on producing quarterly reports, as again, that is taking up resource time. But we would still collect it with the idea that at the end of the second year, we could produce a report that indicates what the feedback was for requestors. Then on the Registrar side, since those are also done quarterly, we thought we could pause the quarterly send for those in favor of something similar. The Registrar Surveys actually have to be created and sent quarterly, whereas the Requestor Surveys are automatic with the closure of requests. We would do again the

Registrar Survey maybe at the end of the two-year period to get a final view of what everyone thought of the RDRS pilot at the end. I just wanted to put that out there and see if there are any people that have questions or comments. Does that work for everyone? Looks like everybody's... No news is good news, I would assume. Great. We'll do that then. This survey that's going to be published in January toward probably early February will be the last quarterly report from 2024. Then we won't do any more until the end of the pilot.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Okay. Thanks, Lisa. I don't see any hands up or any comments in the chat. Okay, now I do. Gabe, over to you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Hi. I just want to make sure I understood what Lisa was saying. The surveys are still going to continue to be collected, but a report on the surveys will be done at the end of this calendar year rather than quarterly for this calendar year. Is that a correct rehash?

LISA CARTER:

That's correct for requestors. Because the Requestor Survey link is automatically going out with the closure e-mail that happens once the request is closed by the Registrar. On the registrar side, that is not an automated process in terms of sending out the surveys, so that wouldn't happen at all. We would only send that out at the end of the two-year period. The list of registrars is a finite list. It's pretty much been at 93-94 this whole time. Everybody's getting that survey. The

same people are getting the survey over and over and over every quarter. That one, we were going to pause all together and just send it out again manually at the end of the second year.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay. Clear to me. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Lisa, is it correct that requestors and registrars could request essentially a one-on-one meeting to do what we did similar at ICANN81?

LISA CARTER: Yes, absolutely. There's language and links in both the UI for requestor and registrar, indicating that if they would like to provide feedback to ICANN, they can do so by requesting a one-on-one. That's ongoing and available in the user interface. We'll do those at ICANN meetings as well.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Great. Marc, I see you have your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi. Thanks, John. I have no concerns with what Lisa is suggesting. That makes sense. I just have maybe a request that we immortalize this decision somewhere. I'm not sure what the right place for that is, and maybe it's appropriate just to make sure it's captured in the meeting minutes for this meeting. I think that sounds like a decision for

leadership. But I just want to make sure that's captured somewhere so we have a record of that and can look back and be like, "That's what we decided."

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Great point. We'll make sure that it's in the meeting minutes. I wanted to look back. We will be able to document that it was paused. Any other comments or questions on this topic? I'm not seeing any. Okay. I'm going to move on then in the agenda. To the third point, which is a discussion about the final report and how we are planning about going to put that together. I'm going to turn it over to Feodora who's started on this work and can give us an overview.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, John. Happy new year, everyone. I have two main documents to share with you today. First of all, it's going to be the outline of how the final report is going to look like and then a preview of the first chapter. I will also share all the links and the needed documents with you in the comments in a second, but also in the meeting minutes.

As we are entering the final report drafting phase, I want to thank everyone for providing their feedback and comments into the RDRS workbook. We've made sure to capture everything that's needed. But now since we are moving into the drafting phase, no further comments should be made on the workbook. All comments and feedback should be provided into the Word documents we are going to share with you.

As you can see here in the first document, the outline, this is just to give you an overview of what we want to include in the various sections. Leadership had already some further suggestions and what we will be focusing on is going to be Assignment 1 today. I will get to that in a second. Then as you've known and discussed before, we've divided the report on the four assignments. Assignment 1, the trends. Assignment 2, the technical updates and system enhancements. Then later on, the lessons learned for SSAD and the suggestions to the GNSO Council. You can have a look and provide any comments you think are necessary for this. But more importantly, I'm going to show you now the first draft chapter. Sorry for all the scrolling. We've been going through the documents.

Everything that you see in this document in black is from either the metrics or the workbook. This is all input provided by the RDRS Standing Committee. We've divided it into an overview. We've included here some of the current metrics. But ICANN Org is preparing a one-year RDRS Usage Report, which we will then include into this chapter and adjust the numbers and then also adjust the graphs. For now, this is currently a placeholder, but it includes the data or the current numbers from the one-year RDRS usage, but it will look differently in a couple of weeks. But for now, this is what we have.

Further down, you will also see text in green. We've included this text that was not part of the RDRS workbook. But for the audience that might have not read all the metrics and to make the report more user-friendly for non-Standing Committee members, ICANN Org has provided some more context and high-level statistics and derived from the metrics that could be considered to stay in the report. But the Standing

Committee can decide to change it or completely remove it. It's totally up to you. We included the metrics and here are also the results from the survey reports. Of course, further down, as you can see, the observations made by the Standing Committee in the workbook and also the recommendations derived from it.

We have here direct communication, PPSAI privacy. Some of the recommendation or observations made by the Standing Committee included certain numbers or percentages that I kept here for completeness, but we might need to check as it might be certain estimations. We would need to verify if those numbers are correct compared to the metrics or if we would need to reframe. But I left them here for further comment and completeness at this stage. I'm going to share the links with you now in the comments. I'm also happy to take questions. What the next steps would be for the Standing Committee to have a look at the documents, provide their feedback and for the suggestions. ICANN Org would implement those. We would then also move on with Assignment 2 of the report. If there are any questions at this stage, let me know. Otherwise, I will hand over to John.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks, Feodora. I see that Steve has his hand up. Steve, over to you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. This is very helpful. This report is going to wind up being, I don't know, some number of pages hard to guess, but I'm thinking about how it's going to be received and processed. One way to think about reports like this is people are going to look for the key

messages. So they're going to read a few words at the beginning and maybe a few words at the end and try to get the gist of this without necessarily trying to process all the numbers or think through what conclusions they would have come up with given the data that's here.

I think it's important that we look at this report in terms of what actions is it recommending and be comfortable with whether or not those are the actions that we really want to recommend. Or what's more likely, I think, is that there's probably some diversity among us in terms of what each of us would choose to recommend. I think it's important for those kinds of messages, whether we're all agreed or whether we're not all agreed, but to be presented in a clear fashion with all of this details acting as supporting material to the extent that it is supporting, or in some cases, some of the opinions I would imagine that some of us have would be outside of what's presented here simply because the focus has been on measuring what we can measure as opposed to understanding what we couldn't get access to.

I want to put a marker down here that we want to work over probably the beginning and the ending, the introduction and framing of what RDRS is and is not, and what recommendations we're including. I haven't had a chance to read this carefully, but given what's on the screen here, it's interesting that 2.2 Recommendations starts off with usage trends. Right away, I'm confused because I don't see how usage trends are a class of thing that fits under recommendations. It's an observation, but it's not the kind of thing that I would expect to see in recommendations. I'll stop. I made the point. I'm babbling on about this, but I think you get the idea. The key thing is what's the process for us to be able to shape the key parts of this report as you draft it. I know it's a

lot of work to put all that together so I'm very appreciative of that. But as I say, getting into what the impact is going to be will be what our concern is.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks for that, Steve. I'll take a little bit of it because I have the advantage of having worked in the document. I know that we're hitting you with all this out of the blue. There is, to the first point you're making, the outline of the final report is—if maybe Feodora can scroll up, there's an executive summary. We definitely intend to have the high-level summary that you've requested up front and center just like any final report would do.

A really good point you did, which is, "Hey, this usage trends looks more like information than it does a recommendation." What we'll be doing, if you see that Feodora has put the link to these documents into the chat, and I'm sure we can send out an e-mail with them as well. You'll just go into the document and put your comments in, like we've been doing in, again, also the PPSAI group, which I know you participated in, doing that same sort of exercise and putting comments into the document. And I recognize that it will fill up. But that is how we intend to do it for right now in terms of getting comments in. Then also I think I'll go too far out on a limb here and say that to stay on track, we would need all of those comments, etc., done before the next meeting, which is the 27th. I'm going to hit pause there because I'm going off script.

STEVE CROCKER:

Is there a B3 or does it just end there?

JOHN MCELWAINE: No. There's a lot more.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. Here's an opportunity to make the point that I've been trying to make. If you look back at just item B... Maybe C is in there too. When I was looking at B1 and 2, which were the only thing on the screen, I was thinking, "Boy, that looks like the focus is on how do we continue with RDRS. That's the scope of what we're going to talk about." But I think it's important to be able to talk about things that are outside or beyond or successors to RDRS. That's why I was asking whether there was a B3. Although, I think what I'm just what I'm pointing at might be in C. But I can imagine wanting to be explicit about having a section in this in that speaks beyond RDRS as opposed to just improving RDRS.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Absolutely part of the recommendations that you can suggest, Steve. Absolutely. I see a couple of questions in the chat. Let me address this, Steve. We're only going to be able to do comments so no editing the document.

Feodora, because I missed last meeting, am I correct that the Assignment 1 that needs to be completed before the next meeting on January 27 would be to go through the first part of this final report? Can you come back on and make sure that everybody's clear to what the first assignment is?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. I will include all the instructions and what I explained earlier in the meeting minutes for everybody to have at hand. Indeed, the deadline would be before the next meeting for Assignment 1.

JOHN MCELWAINE: The good news is that it's not tremendously lengthy. I know it's not short, it's not like a page or two, but it's not like the PPSAI where it's a very large document. And we're breaking it up into several chunks.

Let's see. Any other questions or comments on this? I think it will make more sense once you see Peter's e-mail and you can actually look in the document itself. Then once that happens, feel free to, if you have any questions, send it out to our list or directly to me or Seb then we can get those answered. Sarah, your hand is up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. I'm excited about reviewing this document because I love nothing more than document review. I do notice that some of the text in here looks like it's green instead of black. I just wanted to confirm, is it ready for us to look at everything or is that green text still in progress? Thank you. Sorry, I was looking at the other one. Not the outline, but the Assignment 1.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Green is ready to be looked at. Yes.

FEODORA HAMZA: Can I just add to this? Sorry, I cannot raise my hands when I do the screen share. The green text, as explained earlier, is ready to look at, but it's not directly out of the RDRS workbook. It's more from the metrics and that ICANN Org edit as additional context for outside readers. It's for the Standing Committee to consider if it wants to keep it or completely toss it. It's up to you. But just to explain why green and black. Black text shows the text that comes directly from the RDRS workbook.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks for that explanation. Okay. Any other thoughts on this or questions on it? Not seeing anything. Okay. Well, everybody, get ready to jump into the document and drop some good comments and suggestions in there. I appreciate everybody's hard work in the future on that.

The next aspect of the agenda here is to learn a little bit more about future RDRS webinar. Lisa, over to you for that.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, John. I just wanted to bring up that the Global Stakeholder Engagement Group is working with the Coalition for Online Accountability to do a webinar sometime probably after ICANN82. It's still in the works, so this is very preliminary, but I did want to put it out there to the Standing Committee. The presentation would be for the USPTO and the Motion Picture Association. As in the past, if there are volunteers from the Standing Committee who would like to help in presenting for that audience, that would be great. I did already ask John

if he would join the roadshow for that one, but it might also be good to have a registrar representative as well. I know that was a big hit in the last presentation that we did to have Reg there as well. That was for, I think, the Prep Week session. If there's registrars who would be willing to participate, that would be great.

Yes, Farzaneh. The Motion Picture Association and USPTO had an event where it was discussed, and ICANN thought it might be a good opportunity to present on RDRS there. It was a combined event with those two people together. The event potentially might also include, I think, the US Chamber's IP Group as well.

Does anyone have any questions or do we have any potential volunteer on the Registrar side? We don't have dates yet. It's still in the early planning stages. I just wanted to put it out there that it's coming so people can kind of prepare. As I get more information, I'll share it with you guys. Then when there's a date, you'll definitely know and we can go from there, if that works. That's it for me on that end. We could probably move to the next item, which maybe is me too.

I just wanted to provide an update on the last requested enhancement on the Registrar side, which was to have the ability to update the request category that's selected by the requester. That is on track to be released the week of January 21st. We're good there. We'll also have updated user guides on the requester and registrar side published during that same week. That is the latest and I think last enhancement that was approved for going forward by the Standing Committee. I just want to let you guys know that as well.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Okay. Thanks for those updates, Lisa. With all that, we've made it through the agenda pretty quickly. But there is two AOB that Steve had. And if anybody else has any AOB, either drop it in the chat or raise your hand. Steve, I'm going to turn it over to you to cover the two issues that you have.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. We've been working on a broader framework for WHOIS and brought us into a number of conversations, many of which are like this group and other parts of the GNSO policy process, but some outside ICANN as well.

A recent conversation, I had focused on Interisle document with Dave Piscitello, and it featured or highlighted the number of domains for which there was no response as to who the registrar was. That caught me by surprise. We interacted a bit with him. Let me see if I can present the table. Not quite. Didn't organize this right. Give me just one second. Sorry about—

All right. In the interest of time, I won't press into it, but I can send the information. But the net of it is that the work that he and his colleagues at Interisle have been doing, they try to find out information about various registrations to try to combat malicious behavior and identify trends and so forth. But they run into an interesting roadblock of not even being able to find out who the registrar is for certain domains. The report includes some tabular information about the number of domains without registrar, which is what confused me when I read it, when

discussing with them. I think the correct reading is they obviously have a registrar for each of these domains, but that information is not supplied upon query.

I realized when I thought hard about this, that I don't know exactly what all of the policies are regarding disclosing registrar information. Clearly, everybody does have—every domain in the G space is registered through some registrar. For thick registries, in principle, I suppose, one could get all of the relevant information from the registry. It's not quite true, but it's good enough for current discussion. For thin registries, if you don't get the registrar, then you can't go anywhere. I see Sarah's hand up, so maybe some enlightenment is coming.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi. I'll take that as my turn. Thank you so much. The question is, why is the registrar name not showing up in the WHOIS output or in the registration data response? That would be wrong. It has to be there. I just put a link to the RAA. If you go in there, it should take you directly to a section called the Registration Data Directory Services Specification. In that specification, Section 1.4.1.2 is the response format. And that tells you... Here's the top section of the response. I've just been pasting this in the chat. You'll see it's not the very first thing on the list, but the registrar name is there. Registrar. Example, Registrar LLC, along with their URL, their IANA ID. If anybody is doing any kind of registration data lookup and the registrar name is not returned, then there's some kind of problem with that response. I guess that should be reported like any other registration data problem. I hope that helps. That has not been

overridden by the new Registration Data Policy. That policy still requires this part of the output to be as it is.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much for that. That's a clear statement about what should be. I'm not deep enough into this to have everything at hand, but the people who are doing that work are pretty sophisticated, pretty competent and thorough and know their way around all the available systems. That's a good starting point. I see Gabe's hand up. Gabe, do you want to add anything to this?

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

I don't want to speak on behalf of the authors of the entire report nor on anyone else, but I will want to refresh recollections that there was a logistical issue surrounding this, in that if any security researcher wants to find the registrars associated with a very large list of potentially abusive domains, they must nonetheless run queries and those queries themselves might encounter rate limiting, whether by registry or some other actor. I wonder if that's not contributing to the unavailability of data that may actually exist but is just out of reach due to those administrative or logistical hurdles. That makes me wonder whether or not a service like RDRS contemplates that in the future and whether or not it should. If there was a smaller subset of data where you're not seeking the full registrant data, but rather just seeking a subset like just the registrar, whether that might be a way of logging into a system and passing that request without hitting those rate caps. But that might be a bridge too far for this conversation.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I think it's very helpful to frame the question that you've just asked and get the answer to whether that does or does not account for it. Because just saying that it hasn't been available leads, quite obviously, as you've just demonstrated, that somebody can say, "Well, they probably ran into this roadblock because of the bulk or whatever." Let me ask a question about RDRS. Sarah, you said WHOIS query should respond. What is the status for RDRS if you ask for information for a registrar that is not participating? The system comes back and says non-participating registrar. Does it also tell you who the registrar is for every registered name in the G space?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I think Simon knows the answer to that. Simon, you want to take that?

SIMON RAVEH: Sure. The way RDRS works is first, it's doing WHOIS against the registry to figure out the registrar based on the answer. We actually get the registrar name and IANA ID from the output of the registry. If it exists, we'll be able to say the registrar name and IANA ID even if it's not participating. We don't really go to the registrar itself WHOIS. We stop at the registry level.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Okay. This is good. I see the questions about what Interisle is using. I'll forward a pointer to the Interisle report. I didn't have it handy. And I'll engage in a little bit further discussion for clarity and try to bring

that back into this just to close the loop on that. But I appreciate the crisp answer that it absolutely should be available, so that if it's not being made available, then something is broken there, at least in principle. That's the first of the two items that I wanted to take up. I still see hands up so maybe we should discharge those first.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Sarah, do you have anything you want to—

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I had just a tiny little logistical thing unrelated to the content of this conversation. But the e-mail that Steve sent, from the address I see is just the RDRS e-mail list. I didn't know which Steve sent it until we started talking about it. If we could all please just put our surnames on the e-mails when we send them, I would greatly appreciate that. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: How do you do that?

SARAH WYLD: Well, you signed it with Steve. So you could just say Steve C.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay, I'll look. Thank you. Confusion among Steves I've run into before. More than once. Second item is separate. We've been working on developing a much richer framework for Registration Data Directory

System. We're going to have a pair of webinars. These are not repeats. The first one will go at a certain level of depth and the second one will go into more depth. These will be on the 6th and 27th of February. There'll be a public announcement to be done with CircleID is hosting. I wanted to make a point of mentioning it too so that it doesn't come as a surprise. I'll do the same with other ICANN components that might find it interesting. Mainly, I just wanted to not have it show up in public without having mentioned it to you directly. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks for that, Steve. All right. Any other business for this call? No hands up. All right. I'm not seeing anything which means I'm giving people 20 minutes back. You've got 20 minutes now to hop into the Final Report document and get a head start on providing comments because you have this time all blocked off and nobody's going to be bothering you.

Okay. Well, thank you, everybody, for your time. With that, I think we can conclude the meeting. Reminder to have all the assignments done by the next call on the 27th. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thanks all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]