

JULIA BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone, and welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call taking place on Monday the 13th of October, 2025. For today's call we have apologies from Sarah Wyld, and Roger Carney will be representing the RrSG in her place. 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. Okay, seeing no hands.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking and as a reminder, participation in ICANN including this session is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy and the ICANN Community Participation Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. With that, I will turn it back over to you, Sebastien. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julia, and good evening, everybody, from Stuttgart. Good afternoon, morning, depending where you are. So, we have an agenda for today that is, one, to receive or listen to Becky Burr giving us an update from the Board on RDRS, but Becky hasn't joined us yet, and so we might move that until she actually joins us.

And the second part of the agenda, which might now be first, is a review organized by I guess Feodora of the 11 Public Comments that were

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.

posted and to see where we go with that from here. At that point or rather towards the end, we can look at the amount of work that we have and the schedule that we have.

As Steve Crocker mentioned just before we started the recording, we do have four sessions during ICANN which seems like a lot to Steve, but you're not the only one. Steve, I've heard the same from others. So maybe something to discuss if not immediately today but before ICANN, definitely to make sure that we have enough room to do what we need to do but don't overcrowd the schedule just for the pleasure of it. Does that properly encapsulate the comment you wanted to make about it, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. I mean, there's competition for time and on the one hand and the other hand how much time do we, independent of competition, how much time do we actually need to spend on this?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That's definitely what I'd like to estimate before I decide to forego any time there. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you not related to what you asked but I guess a housekeeping thing. I've been trying to find the agenda for this meeting on the web and all of the agendas for RDRS seem to have disappeared off of the wiki. If someone could look into it or at least give me the URL

for this agenda. I'm not quite sure what's going on. It may be something I've done but at this point, I'm sort of lost. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay, somebody will put the link. Feodora just put the link in there, in the chat for you, Alan. With this, and unless I hear anybody suggesting any further AOB, so AOB we will discuss the sessions or the upcoming calendar. I still see no Becky Burr, so I'll give it to you, Feodora, maybe to review what you prepared in terms of comments.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. Thank you, everyone. Good evening, good day wherever you might be. What we want to show you today and it's going to show on screen in a second is, as many of you know, the Public Comment review tool for the RDRS and income defining report. Many of you have been through this before, but just to give you an introduction for this version.

We have received 11 comments on the Standing Committee's findings report as many of you have seen, and yes, we want to... staff have prepared this overview to help the Standing Committee in its deliberations when it works or when it reviews the Public Comments received.

This working document has been developed and helps the Standing Committee to update the recommendations if needed. However, and we need to add this disclaimer as you also see on screen, this does not replace each Standing Committee's members obligation to review all

input received in full and to indicate if any concerns in this overview have inadvertently been mischaracterized or left out.

So today we are not going to go through any comments, it's just for you. We will share this tool after the call with you so you can go through the comments and come prepared to the Standing Committee sessions at ICANN84. As noted, in total we have scheduled four sessions. The aim is to make the best use of the face-to-face time and go through all the Public Comment as needed.

So we have on the first day on the 25th of October a back-to-back session; then on the Sunday, one session, and then on Wednesday, another session. So if the Standing Committee gets through all the comments in time, they can always decide to cancel the last one if they need to or any other session for that matter. But just to note that it's quite difficult to schedule these meetings and we've heard from Standing Committee members previously that the face-to-face time is the best one for discussion, so we wanted to make sure there is ample time for the Standing Committee to do so.

Now back to the tool. So as you see here, there is a tab where there's a link to each and all of the submissions. Furthermore, staff has developed a tab for each recommendation made by the Standing Committee. So here's the recommendation and here you see the sections of the comments made by the individual groups or people. So, staff has divided the tab into three sections. Support for the recommendation as written, support the recommendation's intent, concerns noted or recommendation not supported. So, this looks different for each recommendation.

For recommendation five, we have two tabs where we focus one tab on the recommendation itself, but another tab on the comparison table which the Standing Committee included in the report and how to potentially modify or keep the asset recommendations. And last but not least, there were also other comments that were not directly related to a recommendation. For this, we have other comments tab included as well. Something for the Standing Committee to review and look at.

So just to summarize what the next steps would be. Staff will share the review tool with the Standing Committee and the Standing Committee members are to go through all of the 11 Public Comments received. Standing committee members ideally would indicate if any concerns in this overview have been inadvertently been mischaracterized or left out. Standing committee members to suggest if edits or minor editorial comments that have been made in the comments can be kept or they can live within the report.

The Standing Committee also to suggest if the comments are substantive and if new information or insights have been provided by the commenter and if the Standing Committee needs to incorporate them and how. And furthermore, if some concerns have been raised in the comments and potentially already has been discussed in the Standing Committee previously in their meetings, how can the group strengthen the rationale to show that this has been either discussed or addressed or looked into by the Standing Committee.

So yes, for the first session as mentioned earlier on October, I will also share the dates and times in the comment section in the chat in a

second. We are suggesting to since it's a back-to-back session so I think it's two hours or two and a half in total with the break.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Feodora, either you went quiet, or we lost you.

JULIA BISLAND: Yeah, I think we did lose her, but good news Becky joined.

BECKY BURR: Apologies, I was deeply distracted.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, welcome, and we had just inverted our agenda to let Feodora explain the process of going through the Public Comment, and we lost her just as you came in. So, nimble as we are, we're going to go back to the item two to our proposed agenda, and Becky is going to walk us through ICANN Board Updates on our topic. The mic is yours.

BECKY BURR: Okay. So, I don't know what anybody has told you, but I just thought it would be useful for you to sort of know where the Board is on all of these things. We do plan to adopt a resolution during ICANN84 asking ICANN Org to continue our DRS operations for up to two years until related Policy Work is completed and that Policy Work includes the PPSAI IRT that's going on, the registration data policy IRT that's working on urgent requests and the GNSO's SSAD comments.

So it's the resolution is going to talk about desired outcomes for ongoing community collaboration and Policy Work as we've been seeing. So, we just wanted to let everybody know that. The other thing and I don't think this will be a surprise to anybody, we had asked Org to prepare a policy gap analysis for Public Comment concurrent with the resolution. What we want to understand are what the RDRS policy gaps are.

As you know, the Board has made a couple of has said a couple of things. One, that it believes that participation in this should be mandatory for all registrars. Two, we talked about the Privacy and Proxy that basically you should be able to get Privacy and Proxy data through this or you should be able to request Privacy and Proxy data through the system. And three, there is a need for APIs certainly for registrars but also, we understand perhaps for users. So, those are the things that we wanted to understand, to what extent do we have policy that will work for this? To what extent do we need to develop policy to accomplish those goals?

So that policy gap analysis is going to be issued for Public Comment and the Board is going to defer consultation with the GNSO council on the SSAD recommendations until after Public Comment on that gap analysis closes and everybody has had the opportunity to review these.

I don't think that there should be any surprises here. I hope that there are no surprises in this but we wanted to make sure that the IRT was aware of the Board's discussion and where the Board has come out on those issues.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Any questions for Becky from the Standing Committee?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I have a question. I just can't raise a hand. Put me in the queue, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Gabe.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you, and thank you, Becky, for the update. I just hoped to clarify because the phrasing might be interpreted different ways I think for your point, too, about that the RDRS should be capable of enabling requests for Privacy Proxy data. I interpret that to mean that you mean the RDRS should be capable of allowing for the customer data of the proxy services to be returned when the RDRS request is made. I just wanted to make sure.

BECKY BURR: That's correct. I think you don't need RDRS to get the Privacy Proxy data.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you for the clarification.

BECKY BURR: And you don't need to call me ma'am.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think Gabe likes to. Steve Crocker, I see you, and then I had a request from Farzaneh, whose hand I don't see, but I know she's in the queue. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Thank you, Becky. What are the parameters of this gap analysis? I understood each of the points that you raised. There are some larger points that I've been concerned with from day one, basically. For example, to make the system really usable from my perspective, it would be good if the decision processes and the criteria that the registrars use for making a decision were made clearer and more visible to the requesters. And that's sort of the basic functionality.

And then the stretch goal, to use an HR term, would be if there was consistency across the registrars for similar kinds of requests. Do those fit in the parameters that you have in mind for gap analysis policy?

BECKY BURR: So, the gap analysis that we asked the staff for was basically focused on the points that the Board has made with respect to mandatory participation by registrars and access to Privacy and Proxy registration data through this and the APIs. I don't think, Steve, that that precludes anybody from commenting in the gap analysis to say, there are also these gaps. So, people should be encouraged to.

The Board had focused on these four things. We've spent a lot of time talking about those four things. But comments in response, I think, should encompass what you think the gaps are.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. And there'll be a start date for those Public Comments at some point.

BECKY BURR: Yes. And staff on the call, Eleeza, may be able to tell us when we think that start date will happen.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Actually, Eleeza, I just see your hand up. Maybe you want to answer that, and then we'll go to Farzaneh.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. Hi, this is Eleeza Agopian from ICANN Org. Since I was called out, the intention is to publish the paper on October 30th for Public Comment through the end of the calendar year. I believe I can't recall the exact date. So it'll appear on the same date that the Board adopts the resolution that Becky mentioned. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Eleeza. So, Farzaneh, it's all yours.

FARZANEH BADII:

Hi. I'm sorry, I got a little bit late, and it's a holiday in the U.S. So, I wanted to ask; is this paper that you're talking about, what is this? Is this like the Board has asked staff to come up with a gap analysis and policy? So that's my first question.

The other question is that these requests that the Board has, like requiring registrars to opt-in and API and also Privacy Proxy, has any consideration to accountability and privacy and data protection principle been done before asking to require RDRS? I just feel that it's a little bit of like the decision is a bit, I might be wrong. You might not have made a decision, but I think that it's a little bit premature to ask for all that without having considered Transparency, Accountability, and Data Protection Principles. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Farzi. So first of all, privacy issues and human rights issues have been sort of part of this discussion from the beginning of time, including through all of the SSAD work. RDRS is a request system. In the end, the registrar has to make a determination about whether they can release data consistent with the law that applies to them and with respect to human rights, their policies in that regard.

So there's nothing about the Board's request for this gap analysis and there's nothing about the policy that we would like to see that alters that in any case. I think the bottom line is that while, and this was part of SSAD, for example, the SSAD recommendation was that all registrars should be required to participate in it.

Now, that doesn't mean that if you get a request for data that would put you in violation of the data, the laws that are applicable to you, that ICANN is requiring you to do something that would violate the law.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. I see Farzaneh's hand again, but I'll go to Alan, and then I'll circulate back to you, Farzaneh, if that's okay. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two comments. First of all, I'll make one similar to the last time you presented to us. Sometimes when I or we, I'm not sure which, hear reports from the Board, we wonder if you live in the same dimension, the same world we do. In this case, you do, and I'm delighted. Thank you.

The other comment I wanted to make is, has the Board at all considered the financial aspects? No matter how good you make this system, if it's too expensive to use, and especially for groups like cybersecurity people, then it's not going to work. It's not going to meet their needs.

There's some question to what extent ICANN can fund, obviously it depends on what the system costs to actually build and run, but there's also the issue of how much ICANN can fund it. Has this been discussed at all and is there likely to be any discussion? Because I think the financial and cost aspects are a critical one that I don't believe have really been addressed in a real-world environment. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

So, Alan, very good question. The policy recommendation that came through was that it would be self-funding. I think the Board has pretty clearly asked questions about whether that's realistic, about whether that will create, how you calculate this. Are we talking about recouping the cost of building the system? Are we talking about the cost of processing an individual request?

I think that there are a lot of questions about it. The Board hasn't taken a formal position, but I can tell you that the Board has questions about the funding model.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Becky. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hi, everyone. Marc Anderson. First, Becky, thank you so much for coming and giving us this update. This is great to hear and very helpful as we get to ICANN84 and are planning out our sessions. It's really helpful and useful to hear what the Board's thinking and get this preview of the Board resolution and this upcoming Public Comment period on the gap analysis, which, incidentally, I think is great. That's a great ask and I think that will be very helpful to us as well as we continue our work. So, let me just first say thank you for this update and for joining us.

To my question, and I think you've maybe partially answered my questions in responding to Steve's question earlier, but I'll ask them anyway. First, on Privacy Proxies, one of the items you'd like to see

Privacy Proxy included, are we talking about just affiliated Privacy Proxy providers affiliated with registrars, that is, or is there an eye towards somehow incorporating unaffiliated Privacy Proxy providers, having a way for them to participate in the RDRS as well?

And the second related, what we're talking about unaffiliated, one of the items that came up as part of our pilot is there's a demand or at least an interest in having ccTLD operators able to optionally participate in the RDRS. And is the Board considering that? Is that part of what the Board's looking at and considering? Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

In reverse order, yes, absolutely. The Board is quite open to having CCs voluntarily participate. It's obviously emphasizing voluntarily to the extent that some CCs want to.

There're some complications that have to be worked through with that, but I think in principle, the Board is quite happy with that. The Board has primarily focused on Privacy and Proxy providers affiliated with ICANN accredited registrars. We understand that we will not capture the entire universe.

We won't get, for example, the lawyers in law firms that register a bunch of names for their clients as they're working through a merger, for example. I don't think in this case, it's let's not let the enemy, the perfect be the enemy of the good. If there were large unaffiliated Privacy and Proxy providers that wanted to participate, I suppose we could figure out, we would not be opposed to that, but the focus really is on registrar affiliated Privacy and Proxy providers.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I see Farzaneh now for a second question.

FARZANEH BADII: It's not a second question. It's just a follow-up. I mean, I understand, Becky, that human rights were considered and data protection was considered. However, I wished as much as the Board insists on providing like streamlining triage of requests and especially including Privacy Proxy, which we are at the moment discussing, we have an IRT on Privacy Proxy and we are discussing and we are talking about like implementation.

So I find this request from the Board a little bit premature and I hope that in the future and whatever communication you send us, you also discuss how when registrars, if it's mandatory for registrars to opt in, how they should all do fundamental rights balancing and because we cannot ask them to opt in and forego fundamental rights balancing.

I think an emphasis on that from the Board would be very much appreciated because the kind of like the game has changed a little bit now, I have said it in chat. It's one thing to have a voluntary triage system. It's another thing to have a triage system that we require the registrars to opt in. And we also like, we are also going to come up with authentication of law enforcement through which they are going to receive law enforcement requests.

And what I'm worried about is that like, if we don't emphasize on the matter of fundamental rights balancing for every registrar that has to

opt in, we are going to face that hasty decision on disclosing the information. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Farzi. Let me just say to your point about prematurely, the Board has been saying, if we're going to have a request system for registration data, it has to include a way to ask for Privacy and Proxy for the data behind Privacy and Proxy registration, given the extent to which, registration data is now behind Privacy and Proxy. So, there's nothing new or surprising about that.

The Board's been really, really consistent. We think it's a fundamental feature of a successful process. But again, that does not, it is a request system. It is not a mandated disclosure system.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Steve Corker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Three things. I'll start with the most important one. Becky, this is your swan song on the Board and you've been absolutely pivotal in this particular area. Has the Board chosen your successor for this role?

BECKY BURR: Yes, well, Steve, you know that the new Board when it's seated, will make final slating decisions, but the BGC has asked Wes Hardaker to take this up, and Wes has agreed.

STEVE CROCKER: Excellent.

BECKY BURR: And if I've outed Wes too early, I'm going to apologize deeply in advance.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, understood. For the benefit of those who don't know the ins and outs of these kinds of decision processes, the Board meets ahead of the ICANN meeting at a Board workshop a while ago, where most of this is sorted out. But as Becky has said, the formal decisions are not final until they presented, I guess, at the double Board meeting, actually at the tail end of the ICANN meeting.

BECKY BURR: Yeah, it's the organizing meeting of the new Board. That's for committees. The caucuses and those kinds of things are actually done at the BGC level and the BGC has endorsed the slate for the caucuses and Working Groups.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you for the correction. Actually, reflecting on it, I don't recall that there was ever a specific schedule for the BGC announcements aside from the population of the Board committees. Second thing, the point that Alan raised about costs, is the Board, to the extent that the Board considers costs, is it considering only the costs out of the ICANN budget or is it considering costs that are also implicit in the operation of the registrars?

That is, the registrars could, can, probably should say, hey, this costs us money to respond to these. And what is the, that has to be reflected somehow. It could be reflected in simply raising the costs to the registrants, or it could be reflected in some other mechanism.

And the third point to this point about human rights, I was thinking about this. The force of Farzaneh's comment was trying to impose a requirement on registrars that participate in RDRS or any subsequent system to be in line with human rights and presumably the formal conventions about all of that. But that, it seems to me, actually should be tied to a much larger picture of ICANN.

Does ICANN have any such requirements on registrars, never mind the disclosure process? And if not, then it would seem to be somewhat awkward to try to tie it in. Suppose a registrar who's not bound by those rules wants to sign up to use RDRS and to participate, but if the answer were, no, you can't participate because you're not bound by these conventions, they'd say, okay, that's fine. People can come to us and get the data directly and we'll proceed according to the rules that we have. And taking note that they haven't signed any agreements and

they're not in a jurisdiction that requires it. So, it seems to be the wrong place to institute that requirement.

BECKY BURR:

So, Steve, you know this as well as anybody, ICANN has a limited mission. It can create policy within its remit, which is preservation of a secure and stable internet.

In carrying out its mission, ICANN has made certain commitments. And it has elucidated, it has articulated some core values. And with respect to human rights and subject to some limitations, the core value says within the scope of its mission and other core values, I guess let me start at the beginning here, in performing its mission, the following core value should also guide the decisions of ICANN. And that is respecting internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law.

This core value does not create and should not be interpreted to create any obligation on ICANN outside its mission or beyond obligations found in applicable law. The core value does not obligate ICANN to enforce human rights obligations.

So, it mostly would come up in the sense that if we said you must disclose, you must disclose registrant data, even if you know that you are disclosing it to, for example, a state actor that uses this kind of information to violate human rights. That's the kind of thing that I think we couldn't do under this. But I think it would be very hard for ICANN to say, you must comply with some specified human rights statement, articulation of human rights in providing data.

Now, lots of registries and registrars are actually subject to legal requirements with respect to human rights. So, that will be left to individual registrars. And I don't see how ICANN could say in other than an aspirational way, you must comply with human rights.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me just take one small step forward channeling, Farzaneh. Has ICANN ever considered or thought about setting a requirement for registrars for accredited registrars, contracted parties, that is, that they must be operating in a jurisdiction that requires conformance with human rights?

BECKY BURR: No.

STEVE CROCKER: So, there you go, Farzaneh.

BECKY BURR: I mean, our job is to make these services available globally.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, we'll circle back. I saw Farzaneh's hand going up immediately after that. So we'll go to Alan, Roger, and then Farzaneh. I just want to note also that we have 15 minutes slated for this call. I might need one or two minutes for Feodora to finish at the end, but let's have that discussion. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I'll try to be brief. In terms of, Steve mentioned the cost to registrars. Registrars are going to bear a cost whether you come directly to them or through the RDRS. Now, they may not be identical costs, but clearly there are costs regardless of the path.

In terms of the financial aspects that Becky commented on, I'll note that the SSAD did have some, what I call weasel words there, saying ICANN itself, ICANN org, could fund part of the operational costs. It wasn't specific on percentages. And noted that even though ICANN ultimately gets most of its costs from registrants indirectly through registrars, that doesn't cost, that doesn't count as registrants paying the cost. So, there already was an allowance even in SSAD for ICANN bearing some of the operational costs.

Lastly, on Privacy Proxy providers, I'll note the PPSAI did ask, who are the non-affiliated Privacy Proxy providers? And the answer we got is, we don't know of any significant ones. So, although there may well exist non-affiliated Privacy Proxy providers, perhaps through resellers or who knows where, they're not a major presence that we're even aware of. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Thanks, Becky. And just to follow up, I didn't know this was coming up, but Alan said that we didn't identify any non-affiliated,

but we know there's thousands of non-affiliated Privacy Proxy providers. Every attorney that puts his name in there, every web developer that puts his name in there, every friend that puts his name in there. So, I mean, there's tens of thousands.

We didn't identify a company that does it, but there's tens of thousands of registrations that are done that way. But just to be clear on the privacy, I think, Becky, you said it a couple of times. Obviously, the disclosure comes down to the registrar's judgment here, and it's a request system, not a disclosure system.

The one piece of that I'll add on, and I think Gabe and I have talked about these multiple times is to get to Privacy Proxy data may take additional information from the requester that a normal registration may not have. So, it's not going to be the same ask in getting it if it is proxy provided, just so people understand.

The other thing I wanted to hit on, because it was brought up early, I guess, and I kind of, I missed it. Becky, you mentioned that the Board is thinking, or maybe already has said, the RDRS is going to be mandatory for contracting parties. Is that true? Is that what you were saying?

BECKY BURR:

The Board has said that it believes that it's important for it to be mandatory for ICANN accredited registrars.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay.

BECKY BURR: The policy gap analysis is part of what we want to know is, is there a policy needed to make that happen? And if so, what is the policy that's needed?

ROGER CARNEY: Okay. And did the Board have a discussion? Because I've heard people say this, it's picking and choosing certain SSAD recommendations because council already approved them. There's been discussion of people saying, well, we can take recommendation four, recommendation seven, and use those going forward. Did the Board discuss that breaking, picking individual ones, breaking the multi-stakeholder model?

BECKY BURR: Well, that's a loaded statement there, Roger. Tell me how you really feel. The Board, it has not made any final decisions other than it wants to understand sort of the policy gaps. I expect that, I don't know this off the top of my head, if you're telling me that the policy, the SSAD policy said it was an all or none policy, you have to accept all of it or none of it. I don't know the answer to that.

We have had extremely, so setting that aside because I don't know the answer to that question and I don't know how it would work. We have in the context of the Next Round had extremely productive, constructive conversations with the GNSO council on including

recommendations that the Board accepted, but then later on deeper dive realized that there were concerns about.

So, we have some experience in recent times with sort of parsing these things to the extent that's permitted by the policy. If the policy really says it's all or nothing, then that's a different matter, bridge we'd have to come to.

ROGER CARNEY:

Okay, great. Yeah, and again, I think it's a great step on the gap analysis part. So, that was all for me, thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Roger. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII:

So, I think Becky and Steve had a great conversation among themselves and solve the human rights applicability. The problem is that we are not really asking for these days, it wasn't a these days matter. It's a matter of, it's not, it's a human rights standard. It should be global and it should not be based on the jurisdiction you are in. It's a set of standards that looks at, okay, is this request legitimate? Is this request proportional? Is this request legal? And then the registrar decides.

And we do not put that like, we do not relate that to any treaty these days. And we hold every country to a higher standard, to a human rights standard, a universal human rights standard. Doesn't matter which country it is. And so, I totally understand, but that this is just

respecting human rights and ICANN shouldn't and doesn't have to. But what the Board does in these instances is that they pick a few of the recommendations, but then they kind of like ignore our request for more transparency in the triage system, more transparency in the disclosure, in how registrars come up to the, let's just not talk about human rights, if that's problematic. Let's talk about like price. Let's talk about transparency. Let's talk about accountability.

How can we actually-- so if we are asking for a mandatory system that will have to ask the registrars contractually to opt in, then we respectfully ask for, I don't know, we don't even have to do like contractual best practice. It doesn't even have to be contractual, but it has to be like a set of best practices that they follow and that we actually have some sort of a way that's just to see if these registrars follow these frameworks or not.

I'm not saying that ICANN should enforce human rights. I'm not saying that ICANN's mission includes that, but I'm saying that if you are coming up with a mandatory system, have the transparency and accountability in place.

We have brought this up as non-commercial stakeholder group for a few times during our Board meetings with the ICANN Board. And I look forward to a solution and I look forward to seeing any document that talks about mandatory opting in and API and stuff like that, talks about measures that increases transparency and accountability on almost all parts. It's not just registrars, law enforcement and all that. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Farzi. But let me just say, so I think your transparency point is fair and I want to come back to that. And I think you and Steve would agree on this. What's mandatory, it is already mandatory in every registrar accreditation agreement that registrars provide access to accurate and up-to-date registration data in accordance with applicable law. That is, that's the requirement, but we don't say, we recognize that different laws apply to different people.

We recognize that in many, many, many parts of the world, privacy is a human right. And in the RDRS, we're not requiring registrars to opt in, in the sense that they must disclose. It's a process for making a request.

Now, having said that, Steve and I have talked about how it would be very useful for the rest of the world to know sort of how a registrar thinks about a request when it comes in, what do they do? What are the things that they look at? How do they make their decision? That would be quite useful, but I think that is something that every registrar could elect to do for itself.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay, we've got three minutes left on the clock. John hasn't spoken, so it's all yours. And Feodora, I might need to ask you to send us all an email with the wrap-up comments you need to make. John, go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Well, thanks. John McElwaine, for the record. Becky, your last statements are music to my ears, because I love to hear discussion about better ways that we can improve communications between

requesters and registrars and can better understand decision-making so that data requests and more predictable, transparent, to Farzi's point, determinations can be made.

But my question is a little bit more simple. We've been talking a lot about a gap analysis, and I haven't quite been following. I know that on one side we've got the RDRS, but what are you comparing the RDRS against? Is it the EPDP? Is it just mandatory participation? I think I've heard PPSAI. What is the comparison to develop that list of gaps? Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Well, so I think, and I don't know the answer to this question, John, so one question is we have a recommendation as part of the EPDP, I don't know what phase it was, but as part of the EPDP, we have a recommendation that says that all registrars should participate in the SSAD when it's stood up. I don't know whether that is a policy basis for saying registrars should participate or required to participate in RDRS if that turns out to be sort of where SSAD ends up. I just don't know the answer to that question, and that's the kind of question we're asking.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Last thing, really quickly, I encourage the Board, when you look at the final report from the RDRS, I know it's a little bit further back into some of the appendices. We do, as a group, kind of go into some of the gaps between the RDRS and EPDP, so you might find some useful information there.

BECKY BURR: I'm certain staff is using that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you all for a great conversation. Feodora did send the dates and time of our sessions during the prep week and after, but I'll ask you also to send it to the list and make sure it's in the list because the chat is not always easy to access. Farzaneh, we're at time, so I'll give you 30 seconds. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, I just don't think that we should have four RDRS Standing Committee members. I mean, a meeting with Becky might have changed the necessity of those, but I think three is enough, and the last one collides with NCSG's Accuracy Session, and I would very much appreciate that all of you head over to Accuracy Session. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That would be fantastic. I then suggest everybody to go back to what Feodora presented in the beginning. Please put your input in the working sheet there on the comments, see how we progress. I'm more than happy to have only three sessions if we're able to do the work in three sessions, but I do need the work done. So, we'll see what we can do. Thank you very much and talk to you all soon.

JULIA BISLAND: Thank you, Sebastien. This meeting has concluded. Thank you. Have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]