

---

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, 19 May 2025.

For this call, we did receive apologies from Sarah Wyld (RrSG) and Sebastien Ducos. An alternate has been formally assigned, that is Roger Carney (RrSG). 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. If assistance is needed updating your SOI, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat.

Members and observers will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat-only and have listen-only audio. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call.

Please remember to state your name before speaking. 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. I will pass it over to John.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks a lot, Devan. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. This is John McElwaine. I'm filling in for Seb, who is out sick, I think, unfortunately. Full disclosure, I'm at a INTA conference, and I have to drop at 30 minutes into the meeting—or now 27 more minutes into the meeting—for a meeting that I have that I couldn't reschedule. So I

---

*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.*

---

apologize for that. We have a pretty short agenda, so it may be that I don't miss anything.

The first thing to mention is that we're pleased to have Greg Dibiase, the chairman of the GNSO Council, who's going to add some comments on what the GNSO Council is looking for with respect to our Standing Committee Report. I'm going to move on to a really quick piece of housekeeping, shall I say, and a message that Seb wanted me to pass along, and that has to do with our Assignment 4, so Chapter 4 of the work that we need to do. So as we've been advancing our work on Assignment 4, that part of the charter, we really need to reiterate the importance of timely and thorough participation in this critical phase of the RDRS Standing Committee's assignment. So we really need people to carve out some time. I know everybody's busy. I've looked at it and that Assignment 4, and it's not a huge heavy lift. But Assignment 4 asks us to assess each of the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, considering our expertise and our experience with the RDRS Pilot project. Specifically, our task is to evaluate whether each recommendation could remain as originally drafted or should be considered for potential modification based on the RDRS experience that we've collected or could be considered as no longer necessary based on RDRS experience.

As also noted by Council leadership, our feedback has been critical to determine whether consensus can be reached on the RDRS Standing Committee recommendations to GNSO Council. So our responses in the document should clearly indicate your assessment of each recommendation status. Could it be retained? Could it be modified? Is it not needed anymore? So those criteria that I went over earlier. And

---

should be based on objective analysis of the RDRS data, our experience, and lessons learned.

Unfortunately, so far, nobody has completed the homework action item, and we've noticed from past discussions that not all Standing Committee members are familiar with all the previous draft chapters that we've discussed. If there's a particular reason why the Standing Committee cannot complete the review of their action items, please let us know and we can adjust that schedule. But again, we really need to buckle down. Or if anybody wants to propose another approach, we're open to hearing about that and what can be done to more easily facilitate review and feedback. But we cannot go back to the discussion of scope. The last two meetings in this meeting, we've reviewed the scope and expectations towards SC and their delivery on Assignment 4.

So this is a collective effort. The quality and the timeline of our final report depends on the engagement and contributions of all members of this Standing Committee. Let's ensure that we meet our objectives, work with diligence, and we'll get this work done in a timely, professional manner.

On a positive note, this group has completed a lot of work, and we've come very, very far since the beginnings. And while it doesn't look like it maybe just yet, we're close to the finish line, and our goal is to have this report so it can be published for public comment by August. We have 18 EPDP Phase 2 recommendations that need evaluation. If we all can collectively do our part, we can deliver this in a timely manner. So the following timeline is what we're proposing is to discuss the six EPDP recommendations today in the next meeting, 2<sup>nd</sup> of June, during

---

ICANN83 meetings, discuss the pending 12 recommendations, six per meeting. We've got two 90-minute sessions planned for ICANN83. This will allow the Standing Committee to have an in-depth discussion on the recommendations with the goal of understanding where we align, so that we can produce our draft recommendations shortly after ICANN83.

Okay. So with that, again, theme is let's buckle down and there'll be information circulated so that we can all do our homework. With that, I'm going to pause and I might have to pull up on my phone participant list, but see if anybody has any questions or comments. All right. I don't see any right now. Greg, I'm going to turn it over to you to give us some comments on what the GNSO Council is looking to get. Over to you.

GREGORY DIBIASE:

Thanks, John. We thought it might be worthwhile for me to stop by, just to align on expectations of what the GNSO is considering, because again, this kind of a unique assignment, right? We're talking about policy but not making policy. The recommendations at issue have already been adopted by the GNSO and are technically pending before the Board. I think that, at least on Council, there's been some confusion and talking through what that means. So I thought it may be worthwhile to kind of give our perspective here.

So what this group is doing is on Assignment 4, in particular, is providing feedback on the recommendations that will go to Council and that will inform Council's dialogue with the Board as the Board considers these recommendations. So folks shouldn't feel like we're making policy or they're making policy in this group. They're just providing their

---

perspective as people that have been close to this process and have really looked at the RDRS and have taken lessons from the operational data, and then providing their perspective on these recommendations.

So per that form that I think went out on Recommendation 4, the first step is to assess, have these recommendations be implemented, partially implemented, or not implemented at all, and group them like that, and then provide insight on each constituency's perspective on the recommendation. Do they do we think they should be retained as is, modified or rejected? And if there is consensus, great, that can be a recommendation that goes to the GNSO Council consider. But then I'd also note if there is divergence on a particular recommendation, less ideal, but that is also a viable outcome. The Council can take that back to the Board, saying, "Hey, on this recommendation, there was a divergence of opinion on what the Board should do next."

So hopefully that aligns with what people are expecting. But we thought it might be worthwhile to just come to this meeting and talk over what the Council is expecting, just to make sure we're on the same page. So I'll stop there and see if that made sense to folks. Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

How are you, Greg? You asked about whether we understand what Council needs. But let me ask you what you believe Council thinks that the Board is looking to learn from this. Is the Board truly an open book, or is the Board more oriented to want to do SSAD and just wants to get the green light? Is the Board inclined to kick SSAD to the curb and move into a different direction? In other words, if you can share any insights

---

that you've got from your interactions with the Board, we'll be sure to address those and what we give you as input.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Sure. I don't think we have specific comments from the Board on that, at least. And staff, feel free to correct. Jump in and correct me if I'm misstating. But I think they have an open mind on what direction this can go, and they're really just looking for feedback from this group, which will then be the GNSO as well as others, right? I'm sure there'll be an opportunity to for public comment at some point. But at least from my personal perspective, I don't think there's a direction that the Board is trying to go to that this group should be giving them tools to do so, right? I think they're just looking for objective feedback, and they're open to a lot of different directions on the way this could go.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Greg.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Marc?

MARC ANDERSON: Hey, Greg. Thank you for joining us. This is obviously a challenging exercise, and something we've been very focused on and working hard on. I'm dropping some text into chat. This is from the EPDP Phase 2 final report on the SSAD, and this is only relation to the SSAD recommendations. The EPDP team considers these interdependent, and

---

as a result, these must be considered as one package by the GNSO Council, and subsequently, the ICANN Board.

I just wanted to say that, as I've been looking at this exercise, that's been very much in my mind for the working group working on Phase 2. It was very important to us as a group that that these be considered as one recommendation. And so while I'm not objecting to the exercise of going through each of these recommendations and providing input on them to Council and anybody else in the community reading, looking at this, it's also very much in the back of my mind that these SSAD recommendations were intended as a package, and I'm certainly leery of any suggestion of cherry picking recommendations and changing the overall intent.

I'm not objecting to the exercise. I do think it's valuable. I think we've learned a lot from the pilot. That's the intent of the pilot, it was us to learn lessons that would inform policy work. But at the same time, I think we also have to be cognizant of the fact that the SSAD recommendations were intended as a package.

GREGORY DIBIASE:

Thanks, Marc. I definitely think that is valuable information for the Council to know when they're considering this. I think that is feedback that the Council will consider when they look at these recommendations or look at the feedback from the Standing Committee.

---

JOHN MCELWAINE: I am unable to see whether there are any hands up in the chat, but I'm presuming from the silence—

GREGORY DIBIASE: I see one from Steve Crocker.

STEPHEN CROCKER: Thank you. I was giving some thought to what Marc has just said. I guess there's two ways to interpret that. One is that it raises the threshold of against making any recommendations that are other than go ahead with SSAD. The alternative is that it raises the prospect of making shorter work of this process and say, "Well, look, there's no way in the world that we can accept all of those recommendations as they were. And since it's an all-or-none proposition, let's get on with the business of starting over." Full stop.

GREGORY DIBIASE: Sure. Like I said, from Council's perspective, we just want to note what the perspective is of the people that have been following this closely, right? I don't have an opinion on that, other than if these are the perspectives that the group has that they should be shared in the doc and provided onto Council.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Just kind of jumping in on that topic. I mean, I certainly think that the request of the Standing Committee to provide input on the particular recommendations shouldn't be interpreted by any Standing Committee

---



---

members saying that they endorse not taking all the recommendations as a whole. So I don't think that that exercise is meant to say that that is something you agree with, but it was what was asked of us. I think it's okay to kind of put that in. If then you or your constituency have an issue with that, when it gets later on, you could raise those issues as being out of line with what the recommendations were.

GREGORY DIBIASE:

It makes sense to me, John. I don't see any other hands. I provided what I hope is helpful to the group. I guess I'll just add that if there are additional questions on how the GNSO wants to think about it, I'm happy to revisit and consider those as well. I guess I'll turn it back to you, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Awesome. Thanks, Greg, for joining. I might ask staff to help me out here. Are we at the end of the agenda, or is there anything that we need to discuss? I've got all 11 minutes before I would need to drop.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, John. I don't think we have anything else that we can go through the exercise once again and what is expected. And just a reminder that, yeah, what we want the Standing Committee to do. But if, based on the recent discussion with Greg, they think this exercise is not needed or we should change, then, as you said earlier, we are also open to that discussion. Marc, I see your hand up.

---

MARC ANDERSON:

Since we do have a little bit of time, I'd like to request we spend a little bit looking at two of the items on the spreadsheet under not implemented in RDS, number one, accreditation, and number two, accreditation of government entities. I very much like to spend a little bit of time having a conversation with the Standing Committee on these two items. I have to admit, I've kind of struggled with what kind of input to provide on these two items. Accreditation was certainly a key part of the SSAD recommendations. And in the view of the SSAD recommendations, contracted parties receiving disclosure requests would receive those disclosure requests from accredited entities. And so the original concept was that all the requests that contracted parties would receive would come from somebody that's already been verified and validated to some degree. I think everybody knows this. I'm not saying anything new. And, of course, we had the Operational Design Assessment, the ODA, which highlighted the extreme cost and complexity of such a system, and so we had first thing is noting in chat, lots of costs associated with those accredited requests. So one of the keys for the pilot was that we would drop the accreditation piece, and so contracted parties receiving the request would receive them all from non-accredited entities that would have to do the accreditation by themselves.

So, that, to me, is sort of the largest and most dramatic change going from the SSAD recommendations to the pilot that we've been evaluating. For myself, I'm not quite sure what's my lesson learned from that is. Was that a good thing? Did we trade upfront costs for the accreditation model in exchange for a longer time in processing the requests by registrars? I don't know the answer to that. Was that

---

trade-off valuable or not? We certainly heard about the complexities of accreditation on a global scale, across many jurisdictions. Then also along the way, we've heard from Gabriel, who's been doing some valuable work on Recommendation #2, how to accredit particularly law enforcement entities. And I think that's been incredibly valuable work, but I'm not sure how to consider that in view of the recommendations.

So, I'm sorry if that was long-winded. But I guess what I'm saying is I really like more discussion on this item because I'm really having trouble with that particular assignment, and I'm not sure what to say or what input to provide when it comes to those two in particular.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Okay. Kind of jumping in on that topic. I think it's a really good issue to raise. As you said, could request be responded to quicker? Would there be a higher rate of disclosure if there were this more accreditation of the requesters? I think that data, at least from the RDRS perspective, resides all with registrars. But I think that's, as you point out, a good thing to discuss and maybe drop into the document.

Okay. I think I can kind of run a queue here. I see Steve has got his hand up. Is that a new hand, Steve?

STEPHEN CROCKER:

Nope. I'm sorry, yes. It's a new hand.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Okay, go ahead.

---

---

STEPHEN CROCKER:

I think this is an absolutely pivotal, crucial point. There's a way forward, which is much better than the all-or-none approach that, I think, is the only two options that are on the table. Either everybody is accredited in some central, global way, or nobody is accredited. Both of those extremes are inappropriate and infeasible in the extreme.

Mention was made of work Gabe is doing on law enforcement. And I think there's a model there that can be applied more broadly. And just to quickly summarize—I don't want to speak for Gabe—but the idea is that you have groupings of law enforcement agencies, that somebody—FBI in the case of U.S., Europol in the case of Europe—acts as an umbrella and accredits some portion of the law enforcement community that they are comfortable speaking for. That is not 100% solution across law enforcement globally, of course. And the same principle applies if we look at other communities, intellectual property attorneys, security practitioners, IP attorneys, etc., that the accreditation should be from self-organized communities that take care of the essential work of knowing who's making a request and how are they accountable, and so forth, and is willing to speak for them. There is no requirement. There should not be a requirement to decide in advance exactly who those accrediting agencies or groups are, nor how many there are, or how they're structured that will emerge over a period of time. Now, that will leave us necessarily with a partial solution. And if somebody says, "Oh, but that won't cover," and then makes up a particular hard case, the answer is, "Yep, that's right." And if somebody who's not accounted for, if you will, wants to make a request, then we're exactly in the same position as we are with RDRS, and that request from

---

such a person or such an organization would be treated the same way it is now that the registrar would treat it as somebody they've never seen before don't know anything about and would go through whatever vetting process they want. On the other hand, some percentage, hopefully a fairly high percentage, of requests will come from accredited people in accredited organizations at a greatly reduced cost on both sides and presumably a great improvement in speed. And so you get a positive, a win-win situation, not one where you have to make a choice between all or nothing. That's the short version. That's a much longer version. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks, Steve. This may be my last opportunity to run the queue. So I might ask Feodora or somebody else to come on from staff to run the queue. Gabe, over to you.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Gabe Andrews for the record, speaking, I guess, in capacity here as co-chair of the PSWG and where we're working on some of this. Largely in agreement with the sentiments expressed by Steve. I've pasted into the chat here from the Recommendations 1.3.3, which speaks specifically to this notion of there being a centralized accreditation authority managed by ICANN. In my review of this, from what I'm looking at, I'm seeing contemplation of exactly what Steve was describing, exactly what we're working on in PSWG. ICANN is sort of operating as an intermediary, but having independent—what are they called in this context? Accreditation providers? Where's the term?

---

Accreditation authorities? Maybe there's another term that's in this big block subtext I put here. But the notion that ICANN is central, and then you'd have identity providers—that's the term they use, third party identity providers—that would connect to ICANN.

So in this context, let's say AIRPOL is operating as an identity provider. They're doing the work of validating and describing to ICANN how they do all the validation of their independent members. They're passing some sort of attestation of identity for those folks that they have the relationships with, and then ICANN is just acting as the touch point, so that any group that wants to attest for their own members can connect to, that can happen.

But somehow there seems to be a disconnect between that notion, as described here in 1.3.3 and what I see when I'm reviewing the Operational Design Assessment. For in the Operational Design Assessment, somehow it seems like I was managing or contemplating managing every direct relationship with each individual and user themselves. And I think that was really, probably, I mean, I'm not one of the authors, but I have to suspect that that was a huge driving factor in the costs that they were contemplating. I'm thinking that if we were to go the route of enabling these identity providers as organizations and managing their own relationships, provide those attestations to ICANN, and you can really work around some of those main cost drivers that were contemplated.

Now, there still has to be standardization of exactly what sort of attestations would occur. We're working on that right now to try to show a model for how that could happen with Interpol and with the platform

---

---

that we have here in the States called the Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal. And I'm really hoping that through open conversation that between Interpol globally and us here in the States, we can try to come up with some standardized ways of how we're providing those attestations. For the engineers in the group, we're talking about using SAML tokens. This is something you can Google, but it's something that's already done. These problems have been solved elsewhere. We're just trying to take those learnings and employ them here. But if we can prove this as a proof of concepts, then we could still follow the recommendation as contemplated in 1.3.3, but perhaps absent a lot of the cost that was contemplated.

So I'm optimistic that we can at least show a model that doesn't run afoul of the recommendation here. It's going to take longer, though, than the report will take to draft. So the report has to before looking at the work will proceed after this. But I don't see this as being in direct violation of the original recommendations, even if it might not align with the ODA. And I'm going to end there. I see hands already in response.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Gabriel. Just to let everybody know that John left, had to drop, so we don't have a chair of the meeting. I see Steve and Marc's hands raised, and I will give them the time to talk. And after that, Steph has to close the meeting after we discuss the action item in two weeks. Steve, the floor is yours.

---

STEPHEN CROCKER:

Thank you very much. I want to go a little bit further than Gabe has described with a couple of points. Each of the recitations here about where this might go has included having things go through ICANN. I want to raise the dramatically heretical point that not everything would need to go through ICANN. It's one thing to set the rules. It's another thing to be operationally involved in each and every transaction. I think that is a serious mistake, and it's also completely unnecessary. The picture that emerges when you listen to Gabe and to me is that you've got separate accreditation bodies, and then they provide that accreditation. Who did they provide it to? Why not provide it directly to the registrars so that the transactions go from the requester to the data holders without having to pass through or be vetted or accounted for by ICANN. This is remarkably similar to the way not only WHOIS has always run prior to GDPR and the way the Internet runs in general, having central mechanisms really doesn't scale very well, has very bad cost and performance and is error prone on top of that.

Another point, which adds yet more color, is that it's one thing to think about having a kind of uniform standard for law enforcement agencies. And even there, I think one runs into trouble with what the rules are in various jurisdictions. But when we move into other communities, as I mentioned, the intellectual property, for example, or security practitioners and others, I don't anticipate that there would be a uniform level of authorization related to those. So even if you have shared SAML tokens or some other mechanism that provides the stamp that says this is the identity of the requester, what you are willing to provide to that requester may depend quite a bit on what you know about that community and whether or not you're comfortable that



---

they're accountable and what the trust characteristics are. That's a much more subtle and more nuanced area that is not going to give in to a uniform standard across the entire system, and it's going to have to emerge bit by bit. So those two things, a distributed operation that is not necessarily based on ICANN being in the middle and a more nuanced and graduated or set of privileges, depending upon what the experience is and what the trust levels are across these different sets of requesters and registrars. Thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Steve. I give the floor to Marc.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thank you. I want to say thank you for the discussion. I think this has been very helpful to me. Sebastien, I guess, as you're listening to the recording, I think this is more the type of discussion we should be having to help inform, I guess, both staff in drafting the document and the small team in general and in providing input to the document. I think this has, certainly for me, been a helpful discussion.

I'm inclined to agree with Steve's point about the sort of all-or-nothing paradigm. I think what we learned in the SSAD, the SSAD recommendations envision sort of—and everybody must be accredited model. And I think we saw in the Operational Design Assessment that costs go up as you chase the long tail of potential requesters. And that's just not really cost efficient or necessary. I think that's one of the learnings.

---

I think, again, Gabriel, the points you made I think are excellent. I think there's a way to consider accreditation bodies for types of or groups of requesters. And I'd like to see this group spend some time considering that in our recommendations. We're recommending that the RDRS pilot continue and tell a successor system is in place. But is there room? And I'm just kind of spitballing here. Is there room to recommend or suggest that the RDRS pilot be expanded to consider accreditation for a small test group of potential requesters that we can flesh out how an accreditation system would work for a single group of requesters. I think that would be valuable information to gain. Maybe not thinking that through all the way but just a thought based on the points Gabriel made.

I want to echo something Farzi put in chat earlier. She's interested in understanding what we learned from RDRS. That's the initial points I raised in bringing this up. I think there's some lessons learned around that from RDRS, and we should endeavor to include that in our report to Council.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Marc. Just to let you know, in terms of recommendation, what you propose, that is definitely that something you can put in the assignment and then we can consider it so it wouldn't be too far. As we already discussed last time, that one recommendation could be continue RDRS but expanded with, let's say, the top five system enhancements from draft Chapter 2. Just that to note. Gabriel?

---

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

I just want to follow up because this is something I forgot to say as I was sharing my thoughts previously. But also I see Thomas kind of hit on this in the chat with regards to a right to knock on the door without access being guaranteed. The terminology that I see being used in security space is authentication versus authorization. And I don't know that we're using the exact same phrases here in the ICANN space, but I would suggest that if you just Google authentication versus authorization, you could see a lot of really good explanatory work by Microsoft, by Okta, by Cloudflare and others that try to explain techie terms to non-techies like myself. The key point being that when you're answering the question of, "How do I know that the person I'm talking to is who I think they are?" that's authentication. A completely separate issue is then, "What rights should that person have?" Access rights, data access rights, etc. And those are two very different questions to answer, and they should be treated distinctly.

I see Farzi asking in real time. So what is accreditation? I think that accreditation use in these ICANN papers is sort of authentication. I think that they're being used anonymously. I don't want to state that definitively because I wasn't the author, but the notion of authorization is then the pulse, like what rights do that person have? The balancing test might be an authorization practice, and so on and so forth, right? But these are two different concepts, and I would like to see us really try hard as we're addressing these questions in our homework assignments to keep those separate. Because otherwise, you can accidentally talk past each other, and I just want to flag that. Thank you.

---

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Gabe. Farzi, you're next.

FARZANEH BADII:

Hi. I think that was a very important point. I think that we should go back and have a look and see what we're talking about, and I would like to see what we have learned from having RDRS in place with regards to authentication of the requester. So one of the things about this that we learned was that we need some sort of authentication mechanism for law enforcement. That was quite obvious because also if you want to resolve the issue of urgent request and stuff like that, and the registrars really also needed that data.

I have might have overlooked this. So I think we need to go back and have a look and see what other the requesters that are not law enforcement, what that sort of authentication does for them, and how it facilitates the use of RDRS, and how it facilitates the registrars with their decision. Then we can come up, based on those, maybe we can create some data points on what we learned. Maybe it will help with the standardization of the process and stuff like that. But at the moment, I am very unclear. Correct me if I'm wrong. I don't see it in the document. I am very unclear what the authentication, authorization, or accreditation of other requesters will do for facilitating this kind of disclosure.

And as always, I always update NCSG about these things. But just to be very clear, at the moment, this is not the NCSG position. We have discussed it informally, but it might be that I might suggest to NCSG that we need authentication for law enforcement and we need to have more

---

discussions about authentication, accreditation, or authorization of other requesters. Thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Farzi. Thomas? Thomas, I see your hand. Do you want to talk? Or otherwise, we cannot hear you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Can you hear me now?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, because I was not able to start my video because that was not permitted by the host. But anyway, we can do with the audio. I'm intentionally trying to stay away from concrete terminology because I think that's something that probably needs to be further discussed. But I think that along the lines of what Gabe and others have suggested, I guess that if you mirror this against what NIS is doing at the moment, we would define what categories of requests should be able to be part of the scheme, right? So let's say law enforcement, as we said in our document already, should be able to be part of the scheme, then we would still need to know whether a specific request or is actually law enforcement authority or not. So that's to learn whether they are who they claim to be.

---

I think this is something where we might still have different understanding conceptually. In NIS2, if you are amongst those who are legitimate access seekers, that does not mean that you automatically get your disclosure requests responded to in the affirmative, but you need to still duly substantiate your disclosure requests, and they are then legally reviewed by the disclosing party. And if there's a legal basis for disclosure, you need to honor the disclosure request. And if you can't honor it, then you need to reject it with a rationale. So I think that maybe these are the different decision points in the scheme that we need to hammer out a bit more, and maybe we can then attach the terms provided by Gabe to that as soon as we've come to a common understanding. Thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you all for your comments and the discussion. Before we close the meeting, I would ask Caitlin to just go to the beginning of the document. So what staff will do is to gather the input of the discussion today and try to put it into this document where relevant. However, if you could also all go back. Caitlin, if you could scroll a bit further to the first recommendation. Yes, here. If you could all go back and see in the third column where we have lessons learned, many of the things you mentioned today would fit into this part. So you can edit there. And then based on the lessons that you've learned from RDRS, you can put your input in the last column where it says this recommendation doesn't fit into this categorization, or it should be maintained as is, or it should be modified, or it should not be considered in the future. What you can do based on the charter as well, say that all of them should be treated

---

as a package, or all of them should not be considered at all. This is within your possibilities for assessment based on the charter.

So if you could go back as a homework, review this document, add your input in either the lessons learned or only in the last part, how this recommendation should be treated in the future. Then from that, RDRS leadership could gauge what to propose as recommendation and what could fit as recommendation to the Council. If there are any questions on the assignment, please let me know. Otherwise, Farzi, please.

FARZANEH BADII:

So what's the punishment if we don't do this homework? I think this group should need a little bit of encouragement in form of punishment. I'm guilty. I'm guilty myself. But we don't want to miss deadlines over and over, and then suddenly, like, "Oh wow, we did not." So if we can maybe have a working session, that we can have these really useful conversations and bring issues back to our constituencies and stuff like that, really gather a lot of information from this session. So if we can have a working session or whatever, we need to get this work done. And it's very important for all of us to focus on it. So please do comment on the Google Doc. Otherwise, you will be punished. I don't how.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you so much. Farzi. Yes, next week we won't have a Standing Committee session, so you have two weeks to review this document and get familiarized again with the original recommendations, and the implementation in RDRS, and the lessons learned, and what you think should happen to these recommendations. And then we will discuss in

---

two weeks again. However, whatever is in written is easier for staff to summarize, and then it's also easier for the Standing Committee to discuss in a working session, as Farzaneh said.

If there are any other questions or comments, please let me know. Otherwise, we look forward to your input into this document, and we wish you a nice public holiday on Monday, and talk to you soon. Have a good day, everyone, or good morning or rest of the evening. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**