
JULIE BISLAND:

Everyone, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call, taking place on Monday, the 21st of April, 2025. We did not receive apologies for today's call, but we were made aware Steve DelBianco will be joining late. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now.

All right. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And as a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. And with that, I'll turn it over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Hi, everybody, from the center of France. I'm not turning my camera on today because I'm on holidays and I've been cleaning a country house and so a bit disheveled. But anyway, doing fine. So, as a welcome, I wanted to remind everybody that Chapter 2 and 3 remain open for comments. At the last check, and I didn't check this afternoon, so I could be wrong, but the last check, there was no additional comments on either chapter.

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.

So, I remind you that there's still the task of prioritizing in Chapter 2 all the elements that we wanted added. And we'll talk about it briefly. Well, we'll talk about it today, but not in terms of priority. And in Chapter 3, at my last check, we had ample comments from Sarah, but that was pretty much it. So, you're very much invited to put your comments.

And today, we will be-- Oh, I see a camera. Maybe I should do it. So today, what we'll do is to concentrate on Chapter 4. But before that, so maybe for those who have lost the links to Chapter 2 and 3, if somebody could add those in the chat, I find it always useful to open them and leave them in one of the thousand tabs open in my browser. Eventually, I find them back. But if that can help, we can have those links so that there is no excuse whatsoever. Thank you, Steve, for that. No excuse whatsoever at all with your comments.

So, second point, update on the RDRS doodle poll. So, we circulated a doodle poll regarding the new cadence the last time, either to go to one hour every week or to go to keep every second week that we had, but to do it for an hour and a half. And the one hour every week won. I was given the numbers and everything, but I can't remember. I think there was 12 votes. Thank you, everybody, for voting. But that seems to be the vote that took the majority. Thank you, Julie, for the links.

And unless I've forgotten anything specific, and I'm turning to Caitlin who will correct me, but I think that we can directly dive into-- sorry, I haven't opened my laptop in a few days because I'm on holidays, and it keeps on popping up with all sorts of reminders for me to log into this and log into that, but I'll quiet it. So, maybe we want to dive directly

into the conversation on Chapter 4, and I think that Caitlin prepared a few slides. So, if you want to walk us through that. And again, stop me if I forgot anything before that. But otherwise, I'll let you take the mic and walk us through your slides.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Seb. I am standing in for Feodora today. A couple of notes before we get into the slides. So, Chapter 4, as a reminder, is really the crux of this group's report in that these are the ultimate recommendations that the group will be making to the Council or agrees to make to the Council. Again, they're not policy recommendations, but in essence, this group was charged to observe the RDRS, look at trends, lessons learned, and provide some guidance to the Council on how it should prepare for its discussion with the ICANN Board about how to proceed with the 18 SSAD recommendations.

So, my plan is to walk through what leadership and support staff have gleaned as potential areas of agreement between this group about what you might want to recommend to the Council. And once I get through all of those, we can talk about if anything's missing or if there's an objection to anything here. It was gleaned from what was written in the report or what folks had suggested to be in the report.

And then lastly, I think I mentioned this, but we're looking for things that the group largely agrees to. So, there might be some strong opinions, but if it can't get the consensus of the group, then it shouldn't be in Chapter 4. There can be text about it, but these are really what

the group largely agrees should be included as recommendations to the Council.

So without further ado, the upcoming slides, we've divided the recommendations into a couple of slides so that we can go revisit them individually. And again, this is based on the discussions from the previous three chapters, and then when the group reacts to them during today's meeting and notes anything that might be missing or that is improperly placed as a recommendation, support staff will take that back and produce Chapter 4 and send that out so that everyone will have a chance to actually edit the text and add to it, similar to how we've treated the last three chapters.

So the first recommendation that we think we heard is that while additional policy work is ongoing, the RDRS should stay in place and that improvements can be made to it, and additional policy work might happen on other topics, but ultimately RDRS should not cease to exist in November following the two-year introduction of RDRS. That's the first one we think we heard.

The second thing that we think we heard is that the EPDP Phase 2 team in its report noted that recommendations 1 through 18 should be treated as a package rather than as individual recommendations. So, in other words, the Council voted on those recommendations as a package, despite there being some recommendations within that package that did not achieve the consensus of the EPDP team. But it sounds like this group thinks that perhaps there are some recommendations within that package that are okay to go forward, and others that might be more complicated. So, the Council could consider

treating those recommendations with flexibility rather than here are the 18 recommendations, approve or reject all of them as one package.

The third thing that we think-- Oh, sorry, Farzaneh says, "I don't understand what that means". It means--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So maybe, Caitlin, go through it, because we're going to go back through those slides one after the other and discuss. So unless you have urgent questions, we'll come back through and discuss every point.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

The next slide is some of the recommendations that some groups have noted that if that further policy work would be needed to update any of these topics. So, for example, there was a discussion about currently privacy or proxy providers that are affiliated with registrars are not required to use RDRS or disclose that underlying data in RDRS. There might be interest in doing that, but that would require a policy recommendation. So, that's an area of potential further policy work that could be flagged to the Council.

Similarly, there was discussion about it being helpful to have a link to RDRS within RDAP responses. That's something that wasn't recommended by the Phase 2 team. So, if it were to be a policy recommendation, obviously, further policy work would be needed there. And lastly, there was discussion about it would be helpful if all registrars were required to participate, but there's not currently a policy

recommendation that requires that. So, that's an area that could be potentially flagged for further policy work.

The next slide is a recommendation on more of the implementation related things about key system enhancements. So, in addition of an API for both requesters and registrars, we know there's work going on related to an authentication mechanism, beginning with law enforcement. And then lastly, there was a discussion about optional ccTLD participation that could be a potential system enhancement.

And then we have the slide, anything we missed, anyone wanted to flag, but I will go back, starting at the beginning, and see if there's any recommendations that we highlighted that either folks have questions about, object to, or some maybe areas that we should have included or may have missed. So again, with the typical disclaimers of this is just for discussion, nothing set in stone, and we put these out to get the discussion going. So, we're happy to hear from you about what your thoughts are on these. I'll turn it over to Seb to manage the queue. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. So, I see Sarah, Andrew, and Marc, but, Farzaneh, because you had a comment in the chat, I'll give you the hand first. Do you want to make your comment now?

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Yeah, I don't know what "package" means.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So this is on the next slide, I believe?

FARZANEH BADIEI: And also another question that I have, I think that one of the recommendations is worded badly, diplomatically.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, it's not even a first draft, it's before we got to the document. This is an early, before first it's a draft zero. So, all the wording matters for the future, but none of this wording is going to be.

FARZANEH BADIEI: And even the constructive feedback, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. The second thing I want to note is everywhere we wrote, we write a post recommendation with a big R and we know that these are recommendations with this small R. So, about the package. One of the recommendations of the SSAD is that all the recommendations were to be taken as a package, as in they weren't to be separated, dismantled. It'll work as one object, which is clearly super important, the R and r. Yes. Which is clearly what we're not doing, because we're not taking all the SSAD recommendations. We're going to go and piecemeal them and review them and et cetera.

So, one of the first recommendations is to null and void the previous recommendation about taking the recommendations as a package.

That's the one package that is met here. Again, the wording, we can work on it. If that doesn't work, I don't think that was the main problem, but that's the explanation where the package is. I hope that makes sense. We'll get back to the other slide and you'll give your comment on the wording at that point, if that's okay with you. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I actually would propose that we go to Marc next, because I think he has a topic or a comment on this slide, and I want to comment on the next one. Thank you. Is that okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, that's okay. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: I mean, I'm happy to go. I have lots of comments, so maybe--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Maybe we'll just go slide by slide, yeah.

MARC ANDERSON: So, we could maybe go to the first recommendation then.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The previous one, okay.

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah. So for me, this is a no-brainer. I think there's support for maintaining RDRS until, I'm not sure I would word it this way. I think what has been broadly discussed in our group and in the community and by the ICANN Board is until a successor system is in place. But I think the sentiment I'm fine with. Go to the next slide.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, just on that slide again, I seem to have heard and I have heard the same thing, that even the Board is ready to keep on financing RDRS until indeed a successor appears. So, yeah, I think that there is wide consensus, and if there is no more screaming about it, then I think it could be a first win for today. That is, again, the wording, but that is a recommendation that we can take on board. And I see no particular screaming, so we can go to the next slide.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. So, for this one, I don't think I agree with this. And I can't quite reconcile it with the comments you made, that we're essentially going to tell the Board that the SSAD shouldn't be adopted as recommended. I don't think we're okay keeping the policy and leaving it open to somebody, I don't know who, to cherry pick which ones to keep and what not to keep. I am of the opinion that this has to go back for policy work, and that additional policy work may decide to keep or reuse some of the work from the previous round. But I think making the determination as to what parts of the SSAD recommendations to keep and what to get rid of, I think that's policy work and not-- This is

way too nebulous and ambiguous for me. As this is written, I'm not okay with it. Gabriel has a clarifying question?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I see that, and I'll open the microphone to Gabriel now.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah. So, Marc, I'm just kind of, I wanted to know, where do you see our role in this? Is it our role to, for example, identify individual pieces of the prior SSAD policy that we think may not be implementable versus, and perhaps worthy of a visit by policy? Or how would you suggest we treat those if the majority of the SSAD might be applicable and one or two things you might take issue with the applicability of? I'm just wondering how you would like to see that addressed.

MARC ANDERSON: I'd be totally comfortable with that if there were parts of the policy recommendations that we wanted to say, okay, these we think are good and could be capped, and if there were other parts that we said these are bad that need to be gotten rid of or revisited, I would be comfortable with that. But the way this is written, it just says "consider treating SSAD recommendations with flexibility rather than strictly adhering to the recommendations as one package". What is our recommendation? Are we saying, Board, adopt the recommendations, but on implementation, you can sort of cherry pick which ones you're going to implement? That recommendation as it's written, not good with it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It wasn't the intent. The intent, and we've discussed this before, is to have a successor group to this one who would actually go through the policy recommendations and alter them in a way that is RDRS compatible.

MARC ANDERSON: So a successor group, we're saying this should go back to the GNSO Council and the GNSO Council should form charter a new working group to revisit the recommendations. Which I'm okay with, but that's not what's written here. Not even remotely.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So, that's what we need to write. And I think that is what we discussed before. This is picking specifically on one recommendation, again, on SSAD that mandated everything was considered as a block that needs to be avoided. But yes, indeed, I believe--

MARC ANDERSON: If we reopen it for new policy work, then the bit about it being one block or not is open to revisit.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I cannot say today if it's a new PDP. Yeah, I get it. I'll let Council decide in what form it needs to exist. I don't know. I frankly haven't put enough thoughts about it. But if it's a new PDP, it'll be another acronym

in their toolbox to review policy and draft new policy. Strongly based on the SSAD, inspired by the SSAD --

MARC ANDERSON: If it's drafting new policy, it's a new PDP.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes. I don't want to say from scratch because I think that there's work done that needs to survive. There is a strong foundation in this PDP. It's not from the top, taking it back from the top. But the review is going to be from the top, I believe, yeah. Because every single recommendation will need to be reviewed in light of what we've done. And I would, again, I've said many times that I don't particularly want to chair that next group, but I would encourage most of you to partake in it, given the history that you've had with RDRS. Should we get now to--

MARC ANDERSON: Yeah, in the interest of time, yeah, can we go to the next one?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead. No, sorry. Sarah, did you have anything on this slide?

SARAH WYLD: I do, thank you. This is Sarah. I want to give my strong agreement to the concerns that Marc has raised. This group, I don't think, should tell the Board that it's okay to implement only some of the recommendations that they've already approved from a previous

working group. We should stick to our scope of understanding the RDRS and documenting the experiences with the RDRS. So, I don't agree with the text on screen, and I don't think that the text on screen says what I understood Sebastien to describe the intent of the text on screen as being.

So, I don't think it says that we should charter a new working group if that's what we were intending. That's not what it says. And then also, I don't think we're at a point to even suggest a new working group. I don't think that that is necessary. The Board needs to consider the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations now that they will soon have this report that we're going to give them, which is the additional data that they asked for, right? We are getting way ahead of ourselves by suggesting other policy work that is premature. If there is a need to create policy, as Marc said, it has to happen in a PDP working group, whether that is new from scratch or taken from the EPDP Phase 2. But I don't understand why we're not letting the Board do their job of reviewing the report we're going to provide and deciding how to proceed with that, as said. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. So again, technically, we're talking to the GNSO Council. We're not talking to the Board. And so, we're recommending, things for the GNSO Council to do. The GNSO Council will work out with the Board what happens because, indeed, right now, we have policy that is in the hands of the Board and possibly needs to come back to Council to go and do some more work. That bridge hasn't been crossed yet. I think that the Board is ready to send it back to Council, but I'm not sure in

which form the Council wants to receive it. So, do we want to recommend that more policy work should be done and we don't label it, or do we not even want to say that? Your mic is off, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

I don't think we need to say that. I think if there's another slide with some specifics about policy work that we've talked about, but I don't think that we need a slide that talks about how to deal with the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. So, let's park that. We all agree that this is not the wording that we want to have, but let's park that for now and see how we verbalize that after it. Unless anybody else has anything on this slide, can we go to the next slide in the interest of time?

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

One quick question on the previous slide. So, this is Gabriel speaking. Absent the recommendation that you just proposed that Sarah is disinclined to do, what do we think would happen? Is there a default course of action that we're anticipating if we don't say anything? I'm just curious.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Good question. My gut feeling is that the GNSO Council already understands, or at least the leadership already understands that there's going to be a successor group to this one that is going to work on policy,

but I don't want to preempt. I haven't had, other than off the record, I haven't had that conversation with them on an official matter.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Next slide. So, these were three recommendations that came out of Chapter 2, as it says. Again, we're taking only three. There was more work that was dictated there. Was this one of the questions that you had originally, Fazi? It was on the next slide, maybe.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Oh, yes. So, actually, it's very much in line with the conversation we all had. So it says that, "consider additional policy work on key system enhancements". And I think we should be very clear on who should consider additional policy work. And I think here we mean the Council, right?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay. But then based on Chapter 2, and then we are telling them in which areas they should consider additional policy work?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, again, remember, in Chapter 2, there's going to be a series of additional features. I would assume that every-- Well, I don't know, I don't have the features right in front of me, but at least those three, and possibly others, but at least those three specifically require policy work. So, the privacy and proxy, because it's not at all seen in, it's not at all discussed in SSAD. The links to RDAP, and this is what Gabriel was suggesting. So having in the RDAP responses in a link to that, that requires, because the contract that this registry signed is quite prescriptive about what you do and what you don't do.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Oh, so, I'm sorry. So, I thought that was a very simple solution to that about what must happen. So, we need a policy work on that?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, no. The very simple solution is anybody can do whatever they want and put the link if they want. But if we want them to actually add the link to the response code, we need to have that in some kind of policy or in a contract. Because it's not part of the contract, yeah. And the last one is mandatory participation in RDRS in these registries. I'm conscious also that Steve Crocker's had his hand up, and you have two more minutes here.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Yes, with apologies, I do need to break off. I have two points, and let me cast them as a question. The question is for these two points, I look for guidance as to where they should be taken up

because we have this sort of complex matrix of what's appropriate here versus what's appropriate somewhere else and so forth. So, I'll just make my two points, but understand them with respect to where's the right place to take them up.

So the first point is that, yes, continuing RDRS, no question about it. However, we should not anticipate that that is a smooth transition into SSAD and should not be taken like that. All things are possible from a smooth transition into SSAD to a complete revisiting of what's needed and how to proceed from scratch and throwing out some of the basic assumptions in SSAD. So, that's the first point that I want to make. And as I said before, if you deem it doesn't belong here, then my question is where does that belong?

The second is that whether we're talking about RDRS or we're talking about something else, I think one of the biggest things that has emerged from the experience is the requester experience of not knowing what kind of requests are going to get granted and not getting consistency across registrars and perhaps not even from time to time with the same registrar. So, one of the things that I think the requesters will benefit from and, not incidentally, the registrars will also benefit from is if the experience from the requesters is that improves to the point where they know what kind of requests are going to succeed and which kinds are likely not to succeed. So, that's clarity and transparency from the registrars in terms of guidance for the requesters. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, noted. Again, in the document that we'll pass on to Council, we need to have consensus. So, your points are taken. We'll see how these go and whatever doesn't make consensus, every group will be invited to then add a side letter or something like that. I have put to the Council the request about us running public comments or not. I assume that if there is a public comment that we run, then those comments that don't make sense can be added in public comments. Otherwise, we will arrange for some room for a side letter.

STEVE CROCKER: With apology, let me squeeze in one more comment. The third slide, this consider policy work on key enhancements included RDRS links to RDAP, and the next slide mentioned an API. It seems to me clear that the API ought to be RDAP based and then it doesn't matter whether or not you make that required for everybody to participate or not, RDAP becomes the basis for whatever you have. Thank you. With apologies. I will try to catch up later. Bye-bye.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Bye. So, back in the queue, Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Sebastien. Marc Anderson again. A lot of good stuff here. I want to comment on making comments with the hope that this will be helpful to staff when they put pen to paper. So that's my intent, but if it also stimulates conversation, bonus. So on privacy proxy disclosure, I am of the opinion that this has to be included in the conversation about

whatever successor system exists. One of the limitations of the RDRS is it just deals with or it's just useful for redacted data, which is a subset of data that's not available.

I think this is a difficult topic to take up though with a IRT currently formed trying to figure out what to do with some existing privacy proxy recommendations. So, I know this is a difficult topic to take up and I'm not sure exactly how to thread the needle with this one, but I do think it's important that any future or follow-on policy work consider the question of how to handle privacy proxy disclosure requests in conjunction with a centralized disclosure system. I'm going to skip over the second one. I have some thoughts and comments on these, but I think I'll probably wait to make them.

The third one though on making RDRS mandatory, there's a lot to unwrap there. So the SSAD recommendations, it was mandatory for registries and registrars to participate. The RDRS was an optional pilot for participation. So what exactly are we talking about when we say "making RDRS mandatory"? Are we talking about requiring registrars to participate in the pilot as a stopgap measure? Are we saying that the successor system should be mandatory? What are we saying here?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

This is where there's a bit of strategy to be thought about here. And I'm not taking any in the order, but for example, if we lump back into the work to be done in terms of policy development before we get a successor system, something as big as privacy proxy, we could be looking at years. And then if we say making RDRS mandatory for the

successor system, we could be looking at the same years. So where do we believe things should come? I personally find it difficult to make mandatory something that is a pilot that is not finished where additional services might be implemented, etc., and ask all registrars to go and adapt technically to the system if it's not finished. But where do we draw the line?

And that's a very good question. Is there a minimum viable product for the successor system that we want to describe and then say that is mandatory participation? All the rest is extras. And this is part of the exercise in Chapter 2 of prioritizing and giving deadlines on things. Do we consider that the successor system is a whole system and understand that it might take years until we have it online? And at that point, we can make it mandatory. Do we force, and I'm sure that Sarah would disagree, but do we force upon a registrar something that is not finished and that they will have to spend a number of years keeping on adapting? I don't know. It's for this group to describe what they want. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. I have several thoughts here. Just to start, a question. There are three different recommendations on screen. Is the intent that these would be one proposed recommendation together or that we would have three, one for each? Because I do imagine that we might agree on some of these, but not on all of them. So, I will pause to understand that before I continue.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: As this group wants. No, I think it was meant to be three, three separate ones.

SARAH WYLD: Okay, three separate ones. That's great, thank you, okay. So, that's noted. Marc did already say some of what I was going to say on this topic of number three. I support his questions of what does it even mean to make the RDRS mandatory? What is that? This is a pilot. This is a test project. And there already is a policy for a mandatory disclosure request system. That is the SSAD. So, I just don't understand what's going on here.

We're talking about a successor group, a successor system, a group that would work on policy. Who is that group? Why are we thinking about that? Our job is to provide a report to the Council. Yes, we can make recommendations. Maybe what we want to recommend is that there should be a mandatory system. But there's already a policy for that. That's the SSAD. The minimum viable SSAD was the RDRS. And we built it in order to gather the data to decide if we're building an SSAD. So, I'm feeling just kind of baffled here as to why are we recommending these things. What is going on? Thank you.

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

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Just very briefly respond to Sarah and others. I think Sarah's confusion is not unjustified in that point. I think some of these recommendations

came about because we were trying to collect better data. And so, one of the notes was you're going to have better requester participation if there was more consistent participation by the responsive registrars and so on and so forth. And so, these all might have been recommendations that came about from those initial conversations about data collection, but obviously are also treated by the SSAD.

And so, I think perhaps because we're so focused now on what happens next, that's why these are being interpreted in that light. But we might still nonetheless benefit from having in the report recognition that these are attributes of an RDRS that would have collected or perhaps would have allowed for better collection of data. I don't want to overly state the case for it, but you know my position on that. And so, to that extent, that's why they were initially considered recommendations. And we note as well that SSAD or the feature systems do include some of these as well. So, I'll end there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Should we go to the next slide? So, yeah, Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, actually, this is my original hand. I had a comment on this, in particular, point two for the authentication mechanism. I think most of the group here is aware that I am working with the Public Safety Working Group for law enforcement specific authentication mechanisms. And I had a question that I want to come back to the standing committee for, in that we are identifying in that work short-term and long-term paths to assist ICANN community with law

enforcement authentication. The short-term mechanism that we're contemplating is not perfect, but it's something that is achievable near-term. And that involves collection of domain names for known law enforcement.

And the idea is that we would want to be able to provide those domain names for known law enforcement agencies that are unique to those law enforcement agencies, provide those to ICANN technical staff to include the RDRS, so that if someone were to make an RDRS request, and the email address they're using that a response would be sent to matches with a known law enforcement agency's domain, that that might be a data point that is also shared with the registrar so they can use that in their balancing test and their disclosure decisions.

Because this is ongoing, I don't know if we're still in the place in the standing committee where I can suggest additional tweaks to RDRS, especially since we're considering the RDRS to continue to be operated in the future. But to the extent that I can ask you all if there are objections to me being able to pass those domain names to RDRS staff and have them do a minimal amount of work, which I'm led to believe is a very small amount of work, but I don't want to overpromise. But being able to continue that work, I would greatly appreciate it if I have the consent of this committee to be able to continue with that as the short-term work, which I don't know. I don't know that has to be documented in the report, but this slide brought that to mind, and I will pause for any sort of reactions or questions about that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, I see immediately Marc and Farzaneh's hands up, but first, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Marc Anderson. I raised my hand for another thing, but happy to respond to Gabriel's question. I'm super supportive of the work Gabriel's doing. I think it's extremely valuable year into the broader community, so I have no concerns or objections with what Gabriel's suggesting, and I'm supportive of that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Do you keep your hand up for later, Marc, I guess. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADIEI: So, I actually made some comments about this. And it's totally my fault. I didn't see this coming that we were going to use the law enforcement authentication mechanism in the RDRS system, and I think that there are many good things to it. Like for example, well, now anybody can go and say I'm law enforcement, right?

So, I think that it can bring some good to this system and I am supportive of that, but I don't know how NCSG feels. I am going to talk to them. It's going to be very quick because we've been discussing this and it's our part that was not done. But also, in order to carry that and to relay that message gap, maybe we can have a meeting with NCSG so that you can let them know how you gather these domains and lists and what the process is and the long-term plan that we have for holding law enforcement accountable and have those kind of measures in place.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. So, Gabriel, without belaboring this too much, so if my understanding is, and I assume you've discussed this with staff because you're already saying that it shouldn't be too complicated to implement. If a request comes from a domain name that has been vetted by you, that request will appear flagged in some whatever code for the registrars to know that this is a vetted domain name.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Correct, that's the short of it. And there's more conversation to be had about the detail, but yeah, that's it. No additional obligation whatsoever from the registry and registrar. It would just be a data point that they can use in their determination.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, good. Any other comments? So I see Marc's hand, you wanted to make a comment about something else. So before I close the topic on this, and I've seen that, well, apart from the fact that Farzaneh wanted to talk to NCSG and get some feedback there, I sort of got a nod from Sarah. You had no further questions on it. You're comfortable with it, at least in the chat. So, Marc, go ahead on any other topic at this stage.

MARC ANDERSON: All right. Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson again. So, on this slide here, the one on the screen, I'm generally supportive of what's here, but I'm not sure what exactly we mean by "additional implementation work". And so, this is worded to suggest-- the way this slide is worded,

this suggests to me that we are recommending that the existing RDRS system be enhanced to include an API for requesters and registrars, be enhanced to include an authentication mechanism, and be enhanced to include optional ccTLD participation. That's how I read this slide. I'm not sure if that makes sense. And I think it maybe depends.

So, while I support having an API and additional conversations about authentication mechanisms and optional ccTLD participation, I question whether it makes sense to put the resources into the existing RDRS or if we want to apply these recommendations towards a successor system. And obviously a lot depends on timing. And I'm not sure, I feel like I don't have enough data points to be able to answer that question, how long do we anticipate RDRS continuing to exist until a successor system is in place? We've talked about a successor system. Maybe the RDRS is the successor system. Maybe it needs to be enhanced.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Marc, so this is a discussion that I've had informally with, well, not the Board, but with Becky. And I've had also with staff, including Elisa. And the short of it that I was told is that from a Board's point of view, that is an ICANN org decision to decide if this is the system they want to base the successor system on, and we keep on developing on this, or should we start from scratch on something else. The Board sees that as an org decision.

Now we can go against that. We can say, no, we absolutely don't want this. This is not workable. We want to start from scratch. We can say that. But at this stage, what I'm hearing from the Board, what I'm

hearing from Becky, she's had these discussions within the Board, is that the Board doesn't see that as either the community or the Board's decision to be made. That's for all to run that because they're the ones running the system in the end.

I hear also from Elisa, because I asked for a meeting with Kurtis in order to be able to develop this and explain all the different angles as we see them. And I was kindly told that actually he is fully informed that staff has been able to relay our concerns. So, at this stage, I don't have a meeting with him. Again, if this group feels that we really want to invite him on our next call or one of our next calls to have that discussion, that was our offer. He's ready to participate, but it's for us to call for it.

Afterwards, I have the same question. So, if indeed it has been decided or the feeling is that this is it and we can keep on building from it, then fine. I understand. If it's not, then I also have exactly the same problem. What way do our recommendations have if we're first going to go and spend a year waiting for a successor system to be built somewhere else? I don't know. I don't know.

So, again, if you feel that that conversation, if that conversation is one that needs to be had with org at high level versus somebody else, because that's where the decision is going to be taken. If this group wants us to go and invite that leadership to one of our calls and have that discussion, I'm happy to organize that. If this group feels that it is indeed an org decision and let them take it, that could be it too.

MARC ANDERSON: So, I'll just respond to that. I don't think that that needs to be a conversation. I think we just need an answer from org. What do they intend to do? I'm fine with that being an org decision. I don't think it's our place to tell them what or how to implement the recommendations, just what the recommendations are. But I think we do need to know the answer to that in order to be able to word this recommendation appropriately. Depending on the answer to that question, I think we would word this recommendation or I think the answer to that question would inform how we word these recommendations.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, fair enough. And I hope that Caitlin's been able to know that because then that's a conversation we need to have possibly later this week with Elisa to see how we can get that answer. Thank you. Any other comments on this slide? I see none. Go ahead, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, I just said it in chat. I think that I might be wrong, but what I see here, especially for authentication mechanism, is not the implementation work. It can include policy work and that worries me. So, I think that if we mean by implementation work, we have to be very clear on what we're talking about when we say implementation work. Do we mean that the Council should convene an IRT or? And also, be very clear how this does not touch policy work, especially for authentication mechanism, as you know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, yeah, again, choice of word. No, by implementation, I don't think that IRT was meant here. By implementation was additional work to be done on RDRS, again, as is now developed or a successor, because maybe RDRS as is now is its own successor. The technical work. Yeah, exactly. That's what was meant, not IRT. And so basically what you're saying is authentication might need to be in the previous slide that requires policy work.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, at the end of today, some part of it might, yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, okay. So, we'll flag that accordingly. We'll flag that accordingly, thank you. Next slide. Was the next slide the other or was there something else before the other? No, any others. So, are there any other big themes that we've completely missed and that you would like to see in that Chapter 4? So, again, the wording was maybe not the one you wanted. We'll find better wording, but the first one was that somebody will need to go back to the SSAD recommendations or review them in light of what our findings are. That's a recommendation.

Second recommendation is that specifically we'll see some enhancements that will need additional policy work in the second slide. And the third one was we also see some additional technical work with occupation, technical work, which in our view doesn't require policy and can be a green light faster. But then again, some of those, as far as I know, might actually need policy work. Marc, I see your hand up and we've got seven minutes to go.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson again. As I found myself listening to you talk just now and providing a recap, I found myself listening to most of the points I was going to make. It's essentially that just a reminder of where we sit right now. We have GNSO Council approved recommendations, policy recommendations that have been sent to the ICANN Board. And by agreement between the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council, the ICANN Board is not acting on those recommendations. We are of course chartered by the GNSO Council. So, as has come up, our report is to the GNSO Council, not the ICANN Board.

But really a significant piece of what we're tasked to do is to provide or propose next steps for what to do with these recommendations. And on the two ends of this spectrum, I don't think we're saying implement the policy or Board, you should approve the policy recommendations as written. I don't think anybody's come out of this pilot with that assumption. And I don't think anybody's come out of the pilot saying there's no need for any policy. We should scrap it all altogether.

I think what we've generally come to the conclusion is that something is needed. There's need for a system and for policy in this area, but that the existing SSAD recommendations aren't really fit for purpose as written, and that new policy work is needed. And so, I think all that needs to be said explicitly and not alluded to. And so, I think that's my ask is when we're writing this Chapter 4, that we're very clear on exactly what we think the ICANN Board should do and that the GNSO Council should do with these policy recommendations that are sitting out there.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I strongly agree with what Marc just said. Thank you, Marc. And I will refrain from repeating everything he just said. Just pretend I've said everything again, my own way that Marc just said. I strongly agree, especially with regards to the SSAD recommendations. Okay, two other thoughts.

Just going back to Gabriel's suggestion about the list of government domains, I like the concept. I do think we may have differing opinions among the group as to what should happen with the RDRS in the long term. I want to make sure that things we are recommending are appropriate for long term. And so, I don't know that we should suggest the RDRS as the enhancement or suggest that enhancement to go into RDRS necessarily. Maybe in the NSP, which is the portal that registrars use and will continue to use with or without the RDRS, that might be a better place for that. And then finally, I just want to raise again-- Sorry, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: How do you mean that? So, what I understand from Gabriel is that at that point, so when requested law enforcement will register, they'll register with an email address that will have a domain that will be vetted as a government domain. Then any requests emanating from

that individual will be flagged as recognized law enforcement as per Gabriel's definition. Is that correct, Gabriel?

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yes, but I think there's non-mutual exclusivity here that we can explore having this list on NSP. But the key point being that when the requester is making the request that will be sent, if the disclosure is made, it will be sent to that particular email domain, right? That's the key piece. So, the requester's email domain has to match that. And so, for that reason alone, there has to be some plugin with the RDRS in order to make that viable. But the list itself, I don't know enough. I have to ask Simon and the RDRS team. But if that list is housed on the backend of the NSP, maybe it's simple as the RDRS's requester domain being compared against it there, right?

As long as that check is done at the time the request is made, and the fact that the check has been done is communicated to the receiving registrar, those are the key components of that. I think that really helped the RDRS become more useful so that people can't claim to be law enforcement erroneously or in bad faith as often as might otherwise occur. That's really the end goal is to improve the RDRS in that capacity.

But certainly, I'm happy to explore having this also available in the NSP to make sure that it has the easiest access possible for the registrars that need to be able to conduct those checks, even above and beyond the RDRS. I just can't overpromise yet. This is all ongoing work, but I think that your interest there is a valid one.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you so much. I appreciate that. Okay. And then the final point I wanted to make is I just want to raise again, I do not think we should meet on the 5th of May. It is during an ICANN meeting, the Contracted Party Summit, and so two of the core groups in this group will not be able to attend. And it just it feels unfair to me. Okay, thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Well noted. And I can't confirm it, but I think that it was already noted with staff that there would be a skip. So that leaves AOB and there was no particular AOB other than to confirm that we're meeting not in two weeks, but next week, same time, same place to continue this discussion. But by then we should have at least a rough first draft of a Chapter 4, or at least by the beginning of that. And that's all for me. Thank you very much for all your input. Very valuable as always. And see you all next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]