

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 14th of July 2025.

We received an apology from Steve delBianco. He expects to join late. He's traveling.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand. All right, seeing none. 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, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. And with that, I will turn it back over to you, Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie. Hello, everybody. As I said before the recording, today is Bastille Day, so I've been trying to find a [inaudible] to play for all you people, but I didn't find one. So we'll keep on looking. Maybe next year. Hoping that we're done with this way before. No, don't make me work on a holiday. I happen to be working in Germany where, sadly, they don't celebrate the 14th of July. They have other celebrations. Anyway.

So we're back on to Chapter 4, as you can see for today. I'd like to focus us on making sure that Caitlin and Feodora have all the elements they

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.

need in order to pivot what we're doing now into the final document, because we're well into that time window that they had to finish it. And so what I will do is actually give them the baton to walk us through those open questions. You will see that Rec 5 and Financial Sustainability is still on the agenda because we think that there might be other—sorry, I'm looking at the chat at the same time. I'll find you an answer later. There might be other discussions, but I definitely want to put it at the very back of our discussion for today. And if we don't make it, we don't make it, because we've already spoken about it numerous times. There's always possibilities of adding comments on the list. And finally, of course, the document that Caitlin and Feodora will prepare will be open first for your comments, and then general, for the community comments, starting mid August. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I just want to raise a little bit of a red flag. The document right now, with so many comments in it, makes it really hard to understand where we are in the final position. So once staff does the reconciliation, I wouldn't be surprised if we had to go back to some of the areas, and at least no disagreement, if not change the content. It's just really, really hard to follow. It's very tempting to put a long comment on something which has already been discarded, but we don't really realize it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I appreciate and I have the same difficulties. Again, we're pivoting this into a clean document, Caitlin and Fedora, and we've looked also at

those comments and trying to interpret the best way we can in order to pivot that into a cleaner document. There is no doubt that that document itself is going to be commented, hopefully not as heavily as this one. And again, it will be also open to public comment anyway. Good. With this, Feodora or Caitlin, I don't know exactly who wants to take the mic first, but it's all yours.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Seb. I will take the mic first. As the agenda notes, we'll start with Recommendation 3.1. As a reminder, this is the recommendation about recommending further policy work on privacy/proxy data within the RDRS. There were a couple of comments about if we could have some language noting that there are currently registrars that use the RDRS that offer disclosure of privacy or proxy data already, and that this recommendation isn't preventing that, but noting that's not currently mandatory.

So, the reason I bring up this recommendation is that bracketed text was added by support staff in recognition of some of the comments we heard, both verbally and in writing, in the doc. And Sarah had written a comment that, while she doesn't object to that bracketed text, I think she has a problem with the recommendation as written. And so we'd like to better understand what that is and see if others have the same issue, and if so, if this needs to be removed. So, Sarah, if you don't mind explaining and enlightening us.

SARAH WYLD:

Sure. Hi. Sort of more broadly, including recommendations in our report that relate to work which is in progress somewhere else can be duplicative or can be contradictory of that other work that's happening which would make the recommendation difficult or impossible to implement. So we don't want an impossible recommendation. And so if we think about, here on screen, what we're recommending is further consideration.

So what practically would that include? What would actually be useful to implement? This is how I think about it. So it cannot be a recommendation to disclose the underlying data of a privacy service customer because we cannot tell the registrar what disclosures to perform. And it doesn't need to be a recommendation to allow the submission of requests for domains with a privacy or proxy service because that's already possible. So what it could be is a recommendation to update the RDRS to better track and manage requests for domains using a privacy or proxy service, because that is practical, that is implementable, and that lines up with current requirements without conflicting. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Sarah. That makes it very clear to me, but I see a queue. I'll let Alan Greenberg make his point.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm not quite sure what other work Sarah is referring to. If it's the Privacy/Proxy Implementation Review Team, my recollection is the privacy/proxy PDP explicitly did not talk about release

of data by privacy/proxy providers. I may be wrong on that. But I think the recommendation we have is reasonable here. And it could well say we recommend policy work if it is not already ongoing or something like that, but I believe that we do need consistency between release of data by privacy/proxy providers using the same rules as registrars have, and right now, that's not there. So I have no trouble conditioning it on to make sure it's not duplicative of something else. But I think it is a reasonable recommendation to make that notwithstanding. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sorry. Follow-up question here, Alan. We can't make any recommendations for privacy and proxy providers simply because they're not—at this stage, I don't know in the future—but they're not contracted party. They're not part of our ecosystem. So I like to make sure that we pass on the two messages, but personally, one is indeed that we recognize that there is connects work that is being done within other PDP, and we want to make sure that the connection is taken into account and given to whoever will have the mandate to continue this work in terms of policy.

And second, as Sarah has already noted, to make sure that everybody fully understands that there is nothing in RDRS that impedes the practice of disclosing privacy and proxy data if that is legally possible by the responder. Afterwards, I don't know that we can tell anybody to do anything on that side of the table. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, everyone. A couple of comments. First, I am okay with the bracketed text. I think this is fine. It's a fine clarification. No objection to that. Moving on from that, I've always been kind of bothered by the text in 3.1. I think "recommend further policy work be considered," I feel like that's kind of a nothing recommendation. There's no substance, like what policy work are we looking for?

Sarah gave a concrete example of something we could recommend. I'm fine with what Sarah recommended. But I guess my point is if we think something more should be done around privacy/proxy data, I think we need to be much more explicit than just saying we recommend further policy work be considered. I think we need to put ourselves in the shoes of GNSO councilors a little bit and give them more to go on than just, "Hey, you guys should consider more policy work on this."

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Gabriel?

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Hi. I have a different perspective, and I know some of what I'm saying I fully anticipate is not going to be in alignment with positions of Sarah or possibly others, but I feel it's important to articulate the viewpoint regardless. But we recognize that privacy and proxy services predate legislation like GDPR, right? They serve similar functions, and that GDPR sought to make a more globally, well, not even globally, originally applicable default expectation of privacy in a way that was previously accomplished in some circumstances by privacy and proxy services, to the extent now that I'm not sure, frankly, what privacy and proxy

services even truly accomplish if GDPR were to be applied and redaction made for that purpose, it seems to me to be duplicative.

However, the intent of the RDRS from the perspective of requesting agencies like my own and public safety agencies, the intent is to provide a mechanism to seek the data that is behind that that default expectation of privacy that now exists. And it seems to many that I've spoken to, confusing at best and sort of obstructive at worst for data holders who are participating in this mechanism, in this experiment, to simultaneously turn on privacy and proxy services by default for their customers without customer action, sometimes entirely preventing customer action to decline such services being turned on, and to simultaneously say that they're participating in the system, and then saying, "Well, we're not going to ever point to the actual customer information. We're just going to point to ourselves." We've heard from the PPSAI IRT conversations ICANN has looked to see if there's any identified privacy or proxy providers that are separate, independent of the registrars, and they found that, at least in their examination, all of the identified privacy and proxy providers that they've been able to come up with were always affiliated with the registrars. So you have sort of two hands of the same being affiliated, meaning controlled or controlled by, same controlled interest.

So if it's the same controlling entity over the registrar and the affiliated privacy or proxy service, I think it is quite reasonable. And in fact, even what most people would expect would happen if the registrar or their affiliated privacy or proxy service were expected to follow the same sorts of expectations for disclosure. If, in fact, a request justifies piercing that veil of privacy, then it doesn't really matter whether it's the

affiliated privacy or proxy service or the registrar making the disclosure. It's either meeting that sufficient standard of public need or lawful ability to pierce that privacy, or it's not.

This is sort of where the frustration has been coming from, from those that I've been speaking to. I just wanted to share that viewpoint. I hope it's phrased constructively, but ultimately, that's the challenge that we're seeking to address with this. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I definitely understand your point, Gabriel, here. But the issue is that we can't make—well, we can whatever recommendation we want. But what do we expect from a recommendation that says resolve privacy and proxy?

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

What we can flag is that some of the participating registrars are themselves running affiliated privacy and proxy services and simultaneously turning them on by default for their customers, and then simultaneously choosing when they disclose to their own proxy service, pointing to their own affiliate proxy service, as opposed to the customer, and noting that that has been flagged as a challenge. Now, we can't solve that challenge necessarily ourselves, I agree, but I do think it's important to flag that because that has impacted user's willingness to return to the well on this tool. Once encountering that one time, I've spoken with cops who just don't ever want to come back and use the tool again if that's the outcome that they've experienced. That's worth flagging.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely, in that sense. Okay. Thank you. Farzaneh, I see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm going to ask a question that reveals that I know nothing about privacy/proxy services. At the RDRS, at the moment, if a disclosure request is made that is for data that uses privacy/proxy service, the registrar will not consider that disclosure request, or cannot consider it?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: What we've seen happen is the registrar will say, "Yes, we agree that you have legitimate purpose to access the data," and then they point to their own proxy service. So they're saying, "Yes, we agree that you have lawful need," and then they point to their business affiliate, their affiliated proxy, which is essentially controlled by them. And that's the challenge is we're articulating that if there is actually agreement that there is lawful need for access to this data, don't point to yourself, point to your customer, is ultimately the challenge.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. So that got a little bit more complicated because now... Okay, so that's a challenge that I don't know if we should solve it within a policy

or solve it through the registrar. And to be honest, if the registrar can disclose, I don't know why... Maybe we can frame Gabriel's problem as stated and put it in the document and say this is a problem that was brought up as a result of this experiment, this RDRS thing, and see what we can do about it, whether that's new policy in the future or something else.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. What I heard from Gabriel a moment ago is that it's hard to request disclosure for domains using a privacy or proxy service. It is difficult. So yeah, let's improve that. Let us improve the system to make it easier to request those disclosures. This is what I have suggested. We should build in the option to request disclosure for domains that use a privacy or a proxy service. But for the difficulties that Gabriel flagged just a moment ago, that does not belong in this suggestion for future enhancements, that belongs in the lessons learned. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. Alan, I see your hand up. Gabriel, I assume your hand is a previous one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regard to Marc's comment, the original text is perhaps too vague. I agree. And right now it says that an undefined ilk of policy

work be considered. I think what we're talking about is policy work related to the release of information on privacy/proxy data, and that might make it a little bit clearer. Now, we're not recommending a policy to answer Seb. We are simply recommending that policy work be considered. That's about as vague as we can get.

And lastly, I think you or someone also said that proxy providers are not part of our current ecosystem. Proxy providers that are affiliated with registrars are part of our current ecosystem. They're mentioned explicitly in the RAA, and I think they're fully within our scope, regardless of what happens with the privacy/proxy PDP. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I won't pass judgement there. I'm not a lawyer, and I don't know the constructions of every operator. I understand that there is a lot of combinations of both, but I don't know if they are or not.

I saw Steve Crocker's hand, and then I don't know, there was a magic trick, and then John got the priority.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

I don't know how I did that, but I'll be quick. I support this here, and I think that maybe with the word "treatment" that people are getting a little bit hung up on, but the rationale explains what was going on and why I think it fits here, which is that, particularly early on, when a request was made and the information was behind a privacy/proxy service, you got a denial of your request, so denied it's publicly available. That's not always—particularly with some of the naming

conventions of privacy/proxy services, like redacted for privacy is the name of a service, that was not very intuitive to people who didn't know what was going on. So I think treatment meant like the treatment of presentation of the results, and that's what the rationale is getting at there. So I think it can stay here in that frame that that treatment doesn't mean we're trying to make a policy concerning the disclosure. It means treatment of how that is displayed in a response. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

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

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I thought Gabe's summary of the situation was very straightforward, very clear, and very compelling. And if you see in the chat continued a little bit, and Sarah has pushed back and said the registrars will never accept a recommendation that ICANN basically forbid registrars from operating separate privacy and proxy services. And so my question is, well, Sarah, why? What's the advantage to the registrars? Are they making money on it? If so, then I think that some of us would argue that they are making money selling a service that runs directly contrary to existing ICANN policy that they've already accepted. That's a very awkward position for a registrar to be in. The registrar already is obligated to protect the privacy of the registrant. That's what the Temp Spec and all of the other policy activities are all about. And to be clear, what the level of protection is, and by implication, what it is not, selling an additional service that undercuts that is, as I said, puts the registrars in a position of having it both ways of making money

selling ways to get around ICANN policy. Is that the position that the registrars really want to be in?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'll let Sarah answer maybe after Paul McGrady. Just for the record, my understanding, and I don't know every case, is that there is no longer a market for privacy and proxy as a sold service since GDPR. It's a service that is, in the vast majority of cases, delivered for free as part of the rest of the services.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, in that case, it's just an extra cost, which, by removing that, improves the cost basis for the registrars.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. I'm not in tune enough the details of the business models of the registrars, but I'll let Sarah answer that. Paul, I see your hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY: I'll be deferring to Sarah because this conversation is 10 times more interesting than what I was going to say. So can I go after Sarah? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please. You need to do the Steve Crocker trick where you take your hand off and back on. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Sure. Hi. I disagree with Steve's framing of the legitimacy of those services. And I kind of think that not a lot of people hold that view because registrars have been able to follow ICANN policy while offering those services for years, and the Registration Data Policy includes how to handle privacy or proxy services. So I think if there were a concern that contradicts ICANN policy, that would have come up before now. But all of that aside, this is not helping us to figure out how to finalize the report, which is where we should be going with this conversation. So what's on screen still doesn't actually say anything. We recommend further policy work be considered on the treatment of this data. What would that be? What specific policy work is that? Is it a requirement to disclose? No. So why don't we just do something useful and actually require changes to make the system better, to make it useful for people who want to use it? Why aren't we doing that? Thank you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Can I ask a clarifying question of Sarah real fast?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please go ahead. I want to note also that we're half an hour into our call. There's plenty of other points to discuss.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay. So very quickly. I hear Sarah advocating for specific changes to the RDRS to make it more useful for dealing with requests to when privacy and proxy exists. Would that include, Sarah, to your mind, routing those

requests straight to those privacy or proxy services by name, even when they're affiliated, to make it clear that the disclosure request is going towards them for information about their customers?

SARAH WYLD:

Maybe. I mean, I feel like that gets very specific, so we would need to look into it in that level of specific detail. Some registrars have different contact points. Some don't, some have different processes. Like, I don't know how detailed we want to get here, but I think we need to do something useful. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Paul, go ahead, and then we'll have to draw a line under this.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. I agree that this should come out, but for much more mundane reasons. The mundane reasons are that, as it's written, it says that there should be further policy work considering something that's happening within the RDRS. The RDRS is not a creature of policy, right? It is something that staff has done for us at our request. It is not mandatory. And until the RDRS becomes policy in some way, further policy work on a nonpolicy item is just a non-sequitur in ICANN land.

So, as a Council member, if I get this, my reaction to it will be if I get it before I leave Council, my reaction to it will be, "That's interesting, but it's a non-sequitur. We can't do policy work to deal with a subpart of something that's not policy." I get the idea. I understand what people

are saying. It just doesn't make any sense in this document in light of what the RDRS is. So if we're keeping track of who says scrap it, I'm for scrapping it, not for the more exciting reasons that other people have raised. I'm just on a procedural reason. It just doesn't fit. Thank you. Thanks, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Paul, point taken. I can guarantee you that you'll see this as a councilor. I don't know that you'll have time to deal with it, because otherwise, I'll have a nervous breakdown myself.

Alan, is this still on the same topic?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It is, and I have a suggestion for wording. The subcommittee recommends further policy work be considered on the lawful release of privacy/proxy data for privacy/proxy providers affiliated with registrars. I agree with Paul, drop the RDS. It's not relevant. And be more specific, replacing "treatment" by "lawful release".

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. It's being recorded. We'll use that as a possibility. We need to see with the document in the end, what it looks like. But point taken. Can we now go to the next point of discussion? And I'll give it back to Feodora, maybe to introduce it quickly.

-
- CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Seb. This is Caitlin. Recommendation 3.2. There is one outstanding concern from Marc Anderson, and this is the note about RDRS links being included in RDAP responses. Marc, I'm not sure if you saw, but Seb noted in response if it would be acceptable to drop any reference to RDAP in favor of RDDS and explain in the rationale that this is related to the web display of RDDS responses rather than RDAP. So this is a question for Marc, if that would be acceptable, if there's another concern that we missed here.
- MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Caitlin. I'm not sure. I did see your response. And I'm not quite sure—
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Your concern—as I understood it, and I think I agree with it—is that RDAP is a protocol to basically deliver answer on the question of data. RDAP doesn't prescribe how the rendering of the information needs to appear, it's just a way of delivering the information. And that note about the fact that they should go to RDRS if they don't find the data, that's definitely one of rendering one of display at the end. That's how I understood your comment. And to me, then we're talking about RDDS, in general, the tool to disclose data, rather than the protocol RDAP, that is just a layer too low to add that.
-

MARC ANDERSON: I agree with your characterization as a concern. I think you're correctly categorizing the concern. I'm not sure that changing the reference from RDAP to our RDRS—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: RDDS.

MARC ANDERSON: RDDS. I'm not sure that fixes it, though, which is why I'm sort of struggling to respond a little bit. I think you get the concern. I'm just not convinced that that's the fix for it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I'm actually trying to read Marc's comment, at the same time make sure I understand what his actual concern is. Because if it's not about the RDAP protocol itself—you say that you see pushback. It's pointing out to you that this is a display requirement should be included as such as was done with the lookup tool, and doesn't make sense for inclusion in the RDAP response payload. So are you just saying then, Marc, that you think that there is a place to make this display requirement occur, and that it just needs to be phrased separately to refer to that? I just want to make sure we're not missing the rest of your comment.

-
- MARC ANDERSON: Yes, exactly. I think that's the perfect characterization. There's a way to put that requirement in way to make that as a display requirement, exactly as ICANN did in its lookup tool. But just putting it in the RDAP response doesn't make sense, at least not from a registry perspective.
- GABRIEL ANDREWS: Copy. Can I ask then, if there is smarter ways of referring to how a display requirement can be recommended, if you would propose some text to that effect? I don't think I'm smart enough to do that myself, but I do appreciate the constructive feedback and how to articulate that well as this was more or less or asked from me in the first place. And I do note that even using terms like RDDS and a report about RDRS, it gets very confusing for readers very quickly. And so I was also suggesting that if we are to ever use that acronym of RDDS, that we spell it out to and make clear that it refers to both the WHOIS and RDAP protocols. Most people in the real world still say WHOIS despite the fact we don't hear. So that was why I put that comment in chat and the side box too. Thank you.
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's very fair. Both Marc and I got mixed up just in that in discussion about the acronyms. Okay.
- MARC ANDERSON: If I could respond to that. I put myself on camera because I was smiling. Yes. There's too many Rs and Ds there. Yeah, Sebastien and I both tripped over that one. So, Gabriel, that's a fair ask. I don't have anything
-

off the top of my head, but I will work on that and come back with something concrete.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. That's what I was going to ask. With this, I don't think I don't see any other hands, so maybe we can go to the next point, Caitlin?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Yes. Thank you, Seb. I just wanted to quickly touch on—I think Seb noted this at the top of the call, but we'll ask everybody to review the updated Recommendations 4 and 5 this week. What support staff endeavored to do is to take the discussions from last week, asking that authentication be pulled into a separate recommendation not included in the umbrella of enhancements and explain what the group is actually suggesting here more clearly. We tried to do that, but you all are the experts here. So, by all means, if we didn't capture it correctly or if it could be explained better, please feel free to edit and mark this up.

The next recommendation, Recommendation 5, is also staff's attempt to reconcile a lot of the conversation that the group had related to financial sustainability and turn that into a recommendation that tries to approach a middle ground about what everybody was communicating last week. Again, that's just for the group suggestion. Any of these can be taken out or edited.

But we did have one question to consider as you read through Recommendation 5 on financial sustainability, and that is that, as you all probably remember, last week Sarah had agreed to remove her

proposed text, and there's still some remaining text that I think was originally proposed by Gabe that is explanatory text trying to explain what the financials mean. And the question was, if we have this recommendation here, could that introductory explanatory text be moved to Chapter 3 under Lessons Learned, under that table that explains the finances? So that's something to consider.

Support staff went ahead and did copy and paste the text into Chapter 3 so that you all can see what that would look like. So just wanted to note it's a literal copy and paste, and Lisa will be inputting new numbers into the chart, I believe, late this week or early next week.

But anyway, back to the document. We didn't want to spend a lot of time talking about the draft because I don't think people have had time to review these in detail. So maybe we can discuss these next week, because we have a couple of questions regarding Recommendation 6. But I see there are some hands. So if there's anything that you would like to make a quick intervention on, we are happy to hear those.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Good. Thank you, Caitlin. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you. And thank you, staff, for the new text. First, I think this is much improved over the previous text. Looking at this, this isn't a recommendation for new policy work, but it is a recommendation for ICANN Org. I'd like to hear from ICANN Org. So maybe I'm putting Lisa on the spot. Lisa, if you're not prepared for an answer now, quite

understandable. But what I want to know is ICANN Org looking at this, how do you interpret this, and what would you do with this recommendation, sort of small R recommendation? I think this is good as drafted, but very approved on what was in here originally, but I very much want to hear from ICANN Org how would they implement this if we went to press with it, so to speak.

LISA CARTER:

Hi, Marc. I actually don't think I can answer that question right now. That'll definitely be something we have to take back to kind of discuss internally. I think the information that we're going to provide in Chapter 3 related to some of the things that Gabe asked for, and in terms of maintaining RDRS for a maintenance period while the Board and the GNSO have discussions will be included here, but as far as what would happen with Recommendation 14, once all those discussions happen, I'm assuming we'll probably have to provide some additional detail to aid that discussion, but we don't have that currently fleshed out.

MARC ANDERSON:

Just to clarify, not 14. That would be this new 4 on partial authentication.

LISA CARTER:

Sorry. I thought we were still talking about the financial part.

MARC ANDERSON: Oh, no, sorry. Whoever is driving, if you could scroll up to 4. Yeah. Thank you. Sorry. I should have been more clear. I was asking specifically about this new 4 on partial authentication. And that's all very much aimed at ICANN Org. Again, I quite understand if you're not able or prepared to answer that now, but I would love to hear sort of how ICANN would go about implementing this, if we go to press with that.

LISA CARTER: I can say this, and then maybe we turn it over to Gabe as kind of the one leading the Public Safety Working Group, practitioners group on authentication. But we are having discussions with the practitioner group about that, and there are some proposals for a shorter term solution and a longer term solution that are still being discussed in relation to the work for urgent requests. So maybe Gabe wants to speak in a little more detail to that, but we are working closely with that group on fleshing out sort of the next steps and how it might go about implementing the authentication component.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabe, can we put you on the spot?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, you absolutely can. My hand is also offering number five, so I'll leave it up after finishing speaking here. But I think Lisa is exactly on the track that I was suggesting. I think that there will absolutely be required as part of the work that we're doing, ongoing conversations with ICANN staff. And so one of the key things that this recommendation enables is

for those conversations to continue to be productive, to enable them to take the time to come up with or to provide feedback if we're proposing a technical standard, like, "Hey, we think this particular way is how authentication tokens might be passed," the ability for them to think about that and respond to us, right? These are important conversations that have to occur, but we need to make sure that we're all aware that these conversations need to occur. This, I think, was sort of an attempt to document that need, and to make sure that we all approve it.

And my hope is that in doing this, that ICANN will be in position to, maybe not tomorrow, but in the relatively short term, be able to come up with agreements that, hey, yes, if everyone that wants to be an identity provider matches these technical standards and abilities and agrees to these Terms of Use, or what have you, then they can step up and do so. I think that will greatly offload so much of the anticipated cost and burden of the originally contemplated SSAD and recognizing that so significant a portion of its original costs were associated with the identity attribution component. So that's really the goal with this. If there's any folks that feel that needs tweaking, by all means, open to it, but that's the rationale behind it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Thank you. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Hi. My comment was on number five. Did we want to go back to Gabriel to start that part?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. Apologies there, Gabriel. Can you go back to number five? Indeed. Go ahead, Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: First off, I need to start with an apology to Sarah, because I think that she wrote this text some time ago, and it was on my to-do list to read it before this call, and I'm only now getting to it. So my apologies for not having been more swift to respond to your revisions after we provided that initial feedback, Sarah. Thank you very much for making those swift revisions to what was originally proposed.

I am reading this paragraph one, and I'm finding that my knee-jerk reaction is that still is not phrased in a way that I think matches my expectation. I think that no one is disputing Recommendation 14 applicability that I've heard, but I don't view that there is conflict between how the RDRS is being operated in 14, noting that 14 acknowledged that that ICANN funds could apply to it. Also noting that there was contemplation in 14 about the requester constituencies shouldering some of the burden about it. And I think this is actually really key to note now. I like this positioning as 5 immediately following 4 because we're already talking about how the requester communities can step up and onboard so much of that cost and effort to themselves. I don't know that we need to go further with this recommendation and say "and then more on top of that".

So all of the comments that I've had in the past about requester constituencies taking on more of the effort and costs associated with it,

I think that we are achieving so much of that in onboarding the greatest portion of the original accountability costs, which is the identity authentication component. So I offer that thought as a sort of a knee-jerk reaction to this. I think that I'm not comfortable with where this is, but I have neither had the opportunity yet to go back and review this new text with any of my other counterparts, neither within the PSWG nor within the GAC. So I'm not proposing anything to change to this at this time. I would appreciate if there's an opportunity to still to have more conversations before we before I speak on behalf other than my own. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Gabriel. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi. Going back to the staff changes in terms of where to put the text that's higher up in the document. I do think that putting it into Chapter 3 helps with the document flow and information being where it belongs. So thank you for that.

To Gabriel's most recent comments, I do appreciate hearing that we all support Recommendation 14. That is a very helpful level set. The suggested text here on screen is important because we need to affirm the primary source of funding, which is not ICANN. And without this text, we might end up with an assumption that the current only ICANN funding model should continue, but it should not. So that's why I would suggest that we do need this text that's on screen.

I had actually raised my hand for a different reason. So I just want to flag a concern that I know you've heard of already, but I feel the need to say it out loud, which is that we should make sure that all of the reporting periods line up and are the same period throughout the entire report. So it's fine if we extend it to include until June of this year instead of the end of last year, but the whole report needs to cover the same timeframe. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sorry. And you're saying this because? Where does it—

SARAH WYLD:

Because at the beginning of Chapter 1, it goes from November to December, so a year and a bit. But then in some of the financial sustainability parts in Chapter 3, we have updated information that goes until June of this year, and that's great, right? More information. We should include all the info we have, but we should use the same reporting period throughout the whole report so everything's comparable.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

It's fully agreed. And I just wanted to make sure that you noted where you had seen the discrepancy, we will correct. Absolutely.

Alan, and then I'll draw a line. I think that there's another one or two items that we need to cover before the end of the call. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I put my hand up with regard to 4, but I'll note on 5, I have not reviewed the current text. I suspect I will be very opposed to what Sarah believes should be the consensus decision, but I'll defer that until I've actually read the text.

On 4, I just want to make a very brief comment. Can we go back to 4, please? I think the salient word here is we've added the word "partial," and SSAD said everything has to be authenticated before you could make any reference to it. We said nothing has to be authenticated prior to using it. And here we're adding the word partial, saying that we'll be in a mixed mode. I don't think there's any disagreement, but it's probably the most important, simple recommendation we're making that may make this a viable system going forward. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. Feodora, Caitlin, who wants to take us to the last to look at?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Seb, I will do that. It's the last recommendation that we have, and I'll note that we only have about five minutes to discuss this one, which is unfortunate. So Recommendation 6 is the recommendation that is going to provide the Council with guidance on how to treat the SSAD recommendations. And Marc made an observation, which is correct, that the way that the recommendation is currently worded, it doesn't give a specific direction to the Council as to what this group wants to do with the recommendations. And part of the reason for that is that it wasn't clear to support staff if everyone agreed to what should happen

to the recommendations during the Board Council dialogue. And so that's why we don't currently have language explaining that.

We noticed that Marc made the comment without providing a suggestion. But, Marc, if you had a suggestion of what you think it should read, or if others did, it would be helpful for support staff to understand to make this recommendation more clear. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Go ahead, Marc. I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks. I think that's a fair comment, Caitlin. I think we haven't really sunk our teeth into this one, which is probably why you don't know what text to put there. I think, though, we are not saying adopt the SSAD recommendations, and we're not saying cherry pick some of the SSAD recommendations and implement them. So what I think we're saying is that continue to operate RDRS as an interim step, and in the meantime, the SSAD recommendation should go back to the GNSO Council.

We have a chart, and in that chart we say some of those recommendations should be kept and some of them should be modified, and so I think that's the conversation we're sort of avoiding having. But I think if we're being honest with ourselves, I think that's where we're at. We're saying these recommendations were approved by the GNSO Council, went to the Board and are on hold with the Board, but we think that they should not be adopted as is. GNSO Council

should take a look, take another crack at some of these. And so they need to go from the Board back to the GNSO Council in one form or the other.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. I don't know that there is much controversy in this. I think that's pretty much what the group thinks. Would you be wanting to put that in a few words to help Feodora and Caitlin?

MARC ANDERSON: Me? Sure. I guess I could take a first crack at that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Marc, and thank you, Seb. We just had one more question related to Rec 6, which is the inclusion of this table that goes through all of the recommendations and notes, the proposed treatment from this group, as well as the rationale. And our question is I think some object to including this table right under the recommendation, and think it should be relegated to a different part of the report, but we just had a question on if this should be kept where it is or moved. And if there's no opinion on that at this moment, we can leave it where it is, and you can see what it looks like in the clean draft, and certainly we can discuss this later.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Actually, if you're still around, Paul, you made a good point before saying we need to get this Council already. What would be your opinion here?

PAUL MCGRADY: I knew I was going to get caught out, and so therefore I should have been prepared to speak to it. My primary theme in all this is that we have to keep in mind that this is a small team of the Council, right, and it is we are dealing with something that Council asks the staff to do, and if we have other policy work that we're going to recommend to Council, we should be aware of the other policy work that's either out there that's in progress or out there that is done but is being implemented, right? And so as we look at all of these things, if we go back to Council and we say, "We think you should interrupt some other policy process or some other IRT process," we have to have more of a reason than we just don't like the way things are going, or it's on some kind of personal wish list. So I guess that's sort of my overall speech on this. And if there are specific things, I'm happy to answer specific questions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Specifically, does keeping the table here with our comments, SSAD recommendation per recommendation, is that a value in the end document in this Chapter 4, or should it live somewhere else?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah. Oh, I see. You're not asking about do I agree with everything that's in the chart.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Should we have the chart at all?

PAUL MCGRADY: I'm sorry. I was answering the wrong question. Charts are handy. I think I would put it into an annex, though.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Hi. With regards to the chart, I agree that charts are handy. I think they're most handy when there's only one of them. So I would rather see one chart that holds all of the information and is probably in an annex at the end, rather than multiple charts split out among different sections of the document that cover the same information. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fair point. And you've made it before. Good point. Okay. Thank you very much. With this, I turn one last time to Caitlin and make sure that all your questions were, if not answered, at least raised. I don't know. Do you have any other questions, Sarah or Feodora?

-
- SARAH WYLD: You said my name so I'm going to talk.
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry. Sorry, not Sarah, Caitlin. Apologies. Because your hand is still up.
- CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Seb. Feodora was going to go over our plans for getting this to the next stage.
- SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. Okay. Let's do that then.
- FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I'm aware of the time, but I just want to give the Standing Committee the overview of the next step. As raised earlier, Steph has started and almost finished with the full draft of the report and putting it into the official template. However, some sections are not fully completed yet because they were pending on today's discussions, so we will update those and share the full draft with the Standing Committee, latest Wednesday, for their comments and suggestions. To streamline the process and ensure all input is captured, the current work document or the so-called consolidated version will then be closed for comments. This is to avoid duplication or fragmentation of the feedback. And from this point forward, once we share the template or official version of the report, we ask the Standing Committee to focus exclusively on reviewing that document. The consolidated version will
-

remain in viewing mode only. So this is how it looks like. And so we started already, but we will update.

In terms of commenting and next steps, we are also adjusting the comment process to make it easier to keep an overview and to keep track, so Standing Committee members will now have comment only access to the document that we will share rather than editing rights. This helps support staff to better track outstanding issues and prioritize the discussion items for the Standing Committee and their meetings.

As some of you have done in the past with other working groups, we are now seeking or asking the Standing Committee members to focus on three types of comments, texts that you cannot live with, which is the table in red, then text that you can live with, but things just need some more text or clarification. And the last table, any grammatical edits or formatting errors.

To support this, staff has prepared the overview. And we understand that this format might not work for everyone. So Standing Committee members are welcome to comment in the document directly or put it in this chart. However, staff will make sure that all comments made here will be included here as well for discussion and to keep an overview.

Please note, when providing comments, please include a clear rationale and proposed alternative text. This is crucial to help staff fully understand your concerns and to support us in drafting language that accurately reflects the Standing Committee's consensus or what is meant and what we should proceed further. So if you cannot live with a particular text or recommendation or phrase, please suggest alternative

text that would be acceptable, and this helps us for constructive progress.

So, action item, we will finish the report and share with you and for your review and comments, and we will explain in an additional e-mail again how the commenting process will work from now on. If you have any questions, we will probably address them via e-mail. That's it, Seb. Back to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So, obviously, as noted by Farzi in the chat, the deadline is the 21st of July 2025. All jokes apart, that's a week from now, so don't sit on it. And as soon as you receive that e-mail, and as soon as you receive access to the document, please have a look at it.

Can we do the 25th? I'm not quite sure. In any case, we're not putting this to public comment until mid August. So we'll have time to get your comments in. Please, again, try to do as early as possible.

Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA:

The first deadline is the 21st, and we understand that this might be a bit short, as we are not sharing today right away, but it's the first deadline, and then we have some meetings left, four in total, until public comment. And also one week before the public comment, a consensus call has to take place, so there is some time to review the whole document. But we've been reviewing in separate chapters, so not

everything should be new to the Standing Committee. But yeah, the first deadline is 21st, and then we can take it from there, I think.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Cool. Thank you. With this, two minutes after the end of this call, everybody gets to be released. Talk to you next week. And thank you very much, Feodora and Caitlin, for walking us through all this. Talk to you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]