JULIA BISLAND:

Okay, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call taking place on Monday, the 21st of July 2025. We received apologies today from Sarah Wyld, RrSG. The alternate RrSG rep is Roger Carney. He will be actively participating today. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please speak up now. All right, 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 back over to you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julia. I wanted to note also in the last few minutes, Farzaneh reached out on signal to send apologies. She sent it to the list. So that if that could be noted too. Sorry, I have notes. And this is an important moment. So I wanted to make sure that I'm not missing anything. Particularly if we're a bit light on attendance. It's late July. It's understandable. But then people can pick that up on the recording. So you would have seen that last week, staff shared a new document. I believe it came from Feodora, which is the sort of the last line, the last version of the document. And so we've created this new document, which is essentially now taking all the elements from the four chapters that we have been working on for months into a single document, open for our review and for the next month before we send it for public

---

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.

comment. This means that the previous document with the four chapters and even more so the four different separate documents that we worked on initially are now closed. I'd like, or we would like to make sure that everybody's focused on this new document. I'm not monitoring the chat, but if somebody can put a link to that last document in the chat in case anybody missed it in the via email, that would be super useful.

With this document, we're going to work in a different way because it's now we're trying to get to his last review. We want to make sure that whenever you feel like you need to put comments, we're not going to ask you just to say, I don't want this or I don't like this or whatever, but then to go through the effort of proposing alternate language. Comments that are not accompanied by alternative language will have to be discarded. Obviously, we'll chase you a bit to make sure that you've provided and that it's clear to us and to staff to make sure that we can integrate it, but in principle, that's the new rule. You like it, don't like it, but if you want anything to change about it, you need to propose new language. We're going to make sure that we keep on compiling the document to the best of our understanding and knowledge. Sometimes we get it wrong. Sometimes your comments are not well transcribed into a final document, so be on the look for that. Again, if we haven't worded it or if staff hasn't worded it the way you meant it, please offer the words and make it easy for everybody.

We've created, and I'm not sure if we're going to go into the details, but we've created or staff created two documents, you will see. One of them is the report and the other one is a table with a recap of what you want changed, what you can't live with, and again, here, the stuff that

you can't live with, please, please provide alternate language that you could live with and then we'll try to find a consensus amongst us, amongst ourselves around it, but do make it absolutely clear. Then the stuff that you would like to change, but you're not going to die on the hill over. And finally, the stuff, the typos and the whatever, the mistakes that might still be there in the text and that you're spotting. We haven't blocked the main document for comments, just because we understand that having two documents to flip from the table and the main document that you look at is not always the easiest way to make comments on, but to the best of your abilities, please put everything in the table, not just for us, but also for each other, for your peers, so that people don't also need to check each other on two separate documents. So if we can keep it to the best of your ability in the table, I think we'll go anyway regularly and move the comments in the document back to the table to make it readable for everybody. What is blocked in the document, what should be blocked in the document, is actual edits. So you're allowed to comment, but you can't edit the text. We'll do that. Staff will do that. We don't get to do it. All this, all this.

So now we have until the week of August 11 to work on this document. We have a bit more. We have until mid-August. The week of August 11, so the last week before we publish it, I'll have to go and make calls on whatever, on consensus and making sure that we're agreed. As again, in chapter four, which is now the initial part of the report, we need to present a united front. We need to present consensus. And to this extent, and as long as Feodora or Caitlin don't have anything, oh, sorry, I was hiding my screen and I didn't see that hands were up. So before I pass it on, Gabriel, I see your hand.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi, this is Gabriel. Just quick question, because I'm not very familiar with how the public commentary works on something like a sand committee operation. When we put out the draft for public comment and that comment is received back, how does that, if at all, impact the draft? Is that added as like the annex at the end versus is it expected to change the actual body? How does that work?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So it really depends on the comment, I will say. So first of all, the comments are made, I think you know that, are made separately on a separate site. So people get a PDF or a document, but it's not at all the same process of playing within a document. It's people exposing their views on this or that topic in a separate document. Then we'll review all of those. And again, the stuff that is acceptable to all will go and change. The stuff that needs to fight a bit more for consensus, we'll have to discuss. The stuff that doesn't meet our agreement will be, yeah, thank you very much, but we're not including it. It will remain in the public comment site. I don't know how long these things live, but they stay there for a while after a document is been worked on. So people can go and check these things. But if the group doesn't feel like the public, the comment is worthy of change, it doesn't have to. Caitlin is already correcting me. I can feel it. But I'll give the hand to Alan and then to Caitlin.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I don't have any comments on that, although I think these public comments, I don't have any comments on that, live forever in theory. I don't think they ever go away, but I may be wrong on that. I just wanted to comment, last time I made a comment saying that the previous document was so hard to work on, and I just wanted to say, although I've only made it up to recommendation five so far, and I haven't looked at the table, the document itself is just a pleasure staff has done a really good job of clean editing and makes it really easy to look at it and say, I agree, or I don't agree and go forward. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, thank you very much for that. I appreciate it. I'm not taking any of the credit. But I appreciate it anyway. Caitlin, Caitlin, go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Seb. I wasn't going to correct anything you said. I was just going to supplement what you said for Gabe's benefit. And that is that generally speaking, when the group has talked about recommendations for a long time in text, we'll receive the public comments and support staff and the standing committee will highlight what's a new argument or something the group hasn't already considered. Because if it's something the group has already considered, and decided to go against it or come to a different compromise, then we usually won't spend time talking about the issue again. And as Seb noted, everything is documented transparently so that anyone who submits a comment, there will be a table that we'll work through and make sure that everyone knows what happens to their comment. And sometimes what

happens is the group has already discussed this. Thank you for your feedback. Hopefully that's helpful.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yes, thank you both.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: One last bit also, that is absolutely clear. Your participation in this group doesn't in any way limit your constituency from commenting, on the contrary. So we encourage you to work with them to make sure that they don't bring any problem that you know has already been discussed and resolved in a different way. But comments are open for anybody and everybody. Marc has his hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks Sebastien. Marc Anderson, can you hear me?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely.

MARC ANDERSON: Great. Before we get into sort of the substance, I wanted to make a general comment similar to Alan's. I'm also not all the way through the document, but what I have read so far, I think is very high quality. I guess Feodora is the primary panel there. So hats off to you. Yes, this is well done. Two things, I think we're really on the right track with this. I'm pretty pleased with the progress so far, speaking personally. I do

think sort of generally speaking, the sections on authentication and financial sustainability need a little more work. So I think those are areas we need to flush out a little bit more. And then maybe one last comment. Staff, Caitlin, I think you had asked me to provide a little more substance on I think what is now recommendation six. And I acknowledge that that's my action item and I still intend to get you something there. I just haven't had a chance to yet. So just responding that I haven't forgotten about that and I will get something as soon as I can. But generally speaking, I just wanted to raise my hand and say, great job so far. And I feel like we're on the right track overall.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good. Thank you very much. Again, I'm taking no credit for this. And I think that for the record, it is a lot of Feodora and Caitlin's input there too. They work together on it. So thank you very much both. With this, I'll pass on the mic to Caitlin, who's going to walk us a bit through what consensus looks like and the different forms of consensus that we'll work with. If you're ready, Caitlin, the mic is yours.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Seb. Theodora, if we can just share the charter or the document that shows the different consensus levels. Or if we don't, I'll just give a very short overview. But as we have talked about along, as the process has gone along, the recommendations that the group makes under its charter, the recommendations go through the standard consensus process that a working group goes through. And the thing that we wanted to highlight for this group, because some of you have never

been through this process before, is that the consensus building process can be tough. Not everyone gets maybe every word that they want in a recommendation. But that's the beauty of the multi-stakeholder model. And I wanted to take this time to encourage everyone that if there is a wording change or something that you're uncomfortable with, by all means, highlight that. And we're going to try to get everyone to be comfortable with the language. That being said, there can still be consensus on a recommendation, even if everyone in the standing committee doesn't agree with it. So, for example, there might be a small minority that disagrees with a certain recommendation. But based on the chair's appraisal, he can determine that this recommendation does have consensus. So while we want to aim for the full consensus level where no one disagrees, recommendations can still achieve consensus. So we want everyone to have an opportunity to be heard. But if, for example, there's one or two people in the group that feel very strongly about something, but everybody else is comfortable with it, the recommendation can still achieve consensus. So, again, everybody can be heard. But we want to try to move things along to the point where there might be some people that ultimately disagree, and that's how it works.

But yes, Paul, I know you've probably heard this speech in multiple fora. But for the folks that haven't been through this process before, we're going to endeavor to get everything, and we hope it gets full consensus. But it might not, and that's okay. Everyone still has an opportunity to provide a public comment. Everyone's group still has the opportunity to provide a public comment. And this group will review all of those. But just so that we know that going forward, if there is something where a

small minority disagrees, that will be noted, that will be clear in the report. But it might still ultimately be a recommendation if the majority of the group does agree. So, if anyone has any questions, happy to address those. But this is in the group's charter. It's also the charter is appended to the report. So, if anybody wants to familiarize themselves, these will be the levels that will be used. And then lastly, when the consensus call takes place, again, for those of you who have never been through this process before, the chair will make a call on the recommendations individually and note what level of consensus is believed to have been reached on that recommendation. And all standing committee members will have an opportunity to object to that level if they don't believe it has reached consensus or full consensus or divergence or whatever level it is. But I hope that was helpful for those of you who haven't been through it before. But it's meant as an encouragement and that we can all work together to get this to consensus. Even if everybody isn't in love with every word in the recommendation, we can still get there. So, thank you for your cooperation.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: On this, and I see a few of you that have already been through the exercise, I haven't. I've seen the exercise happening, but I've never been either part of it in a working committee like this, and let alone chair it. So, I just want to make sure that everybody appreciates that. I'm very well aware that I'm not perfect, in spite of my mother's best efforts to try to convince me to the contrary. And so, if there is anything that you feel is not being handled the proper way, or you feel you're not being heard, or you feel like anything should be, please do reach up, please do

tell me. I also love to learn through that process. Don't delay it faster, and come to me and we can talk about it. With this said, and I think that we had initially planned about 20 minutes of this, so we're back on track. That's pretty good. Oh, no, a bit over time. Anyway, doesn't matter. I think that I'm going to pass on the mic this time to Feodora, who's going to walk us through a few documents and sort of set a bit what she would love to see in the end because she's the one that's gonna rethread everything together. Are you ready, Feodora?

FEODORA HAMZA: Perfect, thank you. So just a brief overview on the new report version that many or most of you have seen. As you've noticed, it's in a different format. It's in the official template now and we've made a couple of changes which I just want to reiterate for your convenience. So we start with assignment four, the recommendations and then work our way backwards towards the chapters. So it's like four, three, two, one. We've adjusted and changed some introduction and like reduced some duplication to make things flow more easily. And as noted, we've added the line numbering for easier identification, which we are gonna use in a second when we review the comments. Yes, in the table, which you'll see here, we've updated it as well with more information. So now it also includes an estimated level of effort to modify the recommendation because there was a comment previously saying that we or the standing committee needs to be clearer in what it wants to recommend to the council and what the council should do. So this is something for you to consider as well. We've linked to the original recommendation. So if you click on the link, you get to the actual recommendation text. So not just to the generic report link, but each recommendation link directs you to

each text just for your information as we have deleted the copy pasting of the whole text to make it more easily readable for the external users. I think that's the most important part.

Then you have the lessons learned, not in the table. And you have the assignment two, as you can hear with all the system enhancement. Assignment one, the trends have changed slightly. Staff has updated the Sankey visualization with until June 2025, as it was, I think the last version was October. And we've included in the annex the latest metrics report, which focuses on June, but also includes the numbers since launch, I think for every metric. So we will probably have to adjust some language to make it clearer, but yeah, just for your information to know. If there are no questions on the draft just yet, I would then move to the review document so we can go through the comments that the standing committee members have included. So I see no hands, so I'm just moving on. Thank you. Yes, so thanks everyone who has included their comments into this document or into the copy of the full report. We start here with the first comment that was made during the last meeting by Alan, where he proposed new text on line 149, which is the recommendation of privacy proxy. So here he recommends, or the text should change to the SC recommends that further policy work be considered on the lawful release of privacy proxy data for PP providers affiliated to the registrars. The rationale was initial recommendation was three. So I hand over to Seb to manage the discussion, but I see here John has provided some input that he does not support. So maybe he wants to add further, but yeah, just to explain while the standing committee discusses, the staff will try to see based on your discussion

what we can derive out of that. And then we will either include it here or you definitely will see it in the full report. So Seb, back to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Marc had a question and it's probably for you.

MARC ANDERSON: Sorry, not a question. I wanted to get a jump on the discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I mean, it's perfect. Go ahead, go ahead. We're absolutely ready.

MARC ANDERSON: All right. So first, thanks Alan and John for getting us started. I've been pondering this a little bit and I think probably two things like right off the bat, I think all of us will agree on is that the RDRS system, which we're all recommending be maintained and to tell a successor system is in place. I think one area that I think I heard everybody agree on and nobody object to is that for any participating registrars who are, for participating registrars, there shouldn't be anything about the RDRS that will prevent them from using the RDRS for privacy proxy disclosures as well. I think like I heard from everybody that, yeah, that yes, that makes sense. So I think that's an area that we have strong agreement on. I think the other area I heard is that, I think all of us are aware that the PPSAI IRT is trying to figure out what to do with the existing privacy proxy recommendations. And I think all of us want to be careful not to step on that work or in any way interfere with what is already a

challenging IRT over there. So I think those are two areas where I think we want to be clear and I think we can all generally support that.

You know, where I think it gets a little more complicated is I think we're recommending new policy work be considered as well. And there I think we're a little less precise and I think we're not, I think new policy work should be considered in this area, but to be honest, I'm not sure exactly what the desired outcome is or how we should phrase our recommendation. So like, are we considering new policy work on privacy proxy, or are we saying when, or are we saying, you know, GNSO or council, you should undertake a new policy work to reconsider the SSAD recommendations. And as you do, should you, you know, should they consider how to deal with privacy proxy registrations? And I think it's the latter. You know, I think probably, you know, recommendations on sort of new privacy proxy work is, you know, maybe outside of our remit, if you will, but I think giving recommendations on how follow on policy work to consider what to do with the SSAD recommendations, I think would, you know, I think our experience is that, hey, more effort should be given on how SSAD or whatever comes after that should think about and deal with privacy proxy registrations. So those, you know, I see lots of hands up, but I, you know, I've given this a fair bit of thought, and I think that's where my head's at. And I think that's what my thinking is, and hopefully that helps get the conversation going.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have to agree with what Marc said that my sentence that I proposed was just sort of off the top and was not perhaps detailed enough. And I would support that. The intent of what I was saying was that currently

EN

there is an obligation of registrars to reveal who is behind the registration, the contact and name information of a registrant if it is redacted due to privacy reasons. There is no obligation that I understand, and I may be missing some obligation that is in the RAA. There is no obligation for a registrar to reveal on an RDRS type request who is behind a privacy proxy registration. Some registrars do, others do not. I was simply trying to say that that should be an obligation, and the fact that a registrant is using an affiliated privacy proxy service should not stop them from revealing the information in a lawful request. The privacy proxy PDP talked about a framework for law enforcement getting access to that information, did not go much further than that, and said it should be the subject of further policy work. This is just reiterating that. The fact that since all of this work was originally done, both SSAD and the privacy proxy, it has become a standard for many registrars to automatically use their privacy proxy services. When SSAD was being considered, it was believed that privacy proxy services would just disappear because they were no longer needed. That is the opposite of what has happened. This is just trying to capture that and saying that we do need further policy work to make sure that this is handled properly going forward by all registrars. I'm sure I've confused the issue more than I've helped it right now, but hopefully that makes it clear to some.

JOHN MCELWAINE: So I agree and really like Alan's idea, but I'm not sure that this is the place for it. So what we can't really see is the original text that Alan was proposing to change. And what I think we have are two different ideas. One deals with what we refer to as the treatment of the information

EN

presented to a requester. And then I think Alan and Gabe have been getting at further policy work on a mechanism, shall we say, for disclosure of the actual identity of a registrant that is hidden behind a privacy proxy registration. I want to focus on the first one, which I laid out and that's what the rationale discuss, which was under the current RDRS system, if the information was behind a privacy proxy and you submitted a request for it, you actually got a response back saying your request has been denied because the information is publicly available. And I might know that and Gabe might know that and everybody on this call might know what's going on here, but an average Joe or Jane, when they receive that, has no clue what's going on. And so what I took the word treatment was, was something like the process and information provided concerning the disclosure. I'd like not to lose this concept, which is that we need to improve upon the system by having better information provided to a requester when the domain name is registered and hidden behind a privacy proxy. The second point about whether you could then have a process to release that information if certain lawful grounds were provided, I completely agree with, but that's probably currently under work and I think a lot of my registrar and registry friends on this call would not support that anyways. So thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, John. I see the queue building up, so before I let it get out of hand, let's say that Alan is the last hand up on this. One tiny little thing that I wanted to say is I don't know that everybody is exactly on the same page on this topic and I don't even know that everybody is fully aware of where all that is, where the process is at. I think it might be a

bit short between now and mid-August, but I'd like to leave it for the group to think if it's worth inviting the people that are leading the current effort on privacy proxy to talk to us and maybe tell us also what would best work for them in terms of our comments. I'd like to be able to potentially reinforce what they're doing or helping rather than create more confusion. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yep, I guess. This is Gabriel for the record. So I'm generally nodding along with what I'm hearing from Alan and even what I'm hearing from John. You'll see in the text comments, I agree that it's very important to tease out these different distinct points that standardization of how privacy and proxies responses are occurring and how that's communicated is distinct from what the expectation is on behalf of any registrar affiliated privacy or proxy service. But I will note and reiterate a desire that I've made clear in the PPSAI IRT and numerous occasions that we really have to be careful with how we use certain words like the word registrant, which I'm getting the hate more and more as a term, because I get the feeling that when we use it, we sometimes use it sort of like casually. And even John, I just heard you say about the actual registrant behind a privacy or proxy service. That is exactly how I would refer to a registrant, like that is the person who's actually doing the registration. However, I've heard very strong pushback from other registrars in the past that, no, that is not the registrant. The registrant is the proxy service and that is just the proxy services customer. And this really comes into play when you look at the requirements in PDB phase two under rec five about what is actually being disclosed and whether or not a proxy service ends up being a contracted party. And so these

are the key issues that are going to have to really be deconflicted between these two efforts. The RDRS effort here and the PPSAI IRT and Seb, I really agree with your sentiment of inviting them to talk with us. Because we need to really look clearly at the rec five, it is a recommendation for contracted parties to respond and consider what happens if a privacy or proxy service becomes a contracted party. Does the language that exists there speak only to quote unquote registrant and does that enable an opportunity then for that language to be attacked if we would think that registrant means well, obviously the customer, but someone in the future might say, no, it's not. So those are my points. And I think that we're all becoming increasingly aware of this and I'm very thankful to everyone for that. But ultimately the end of the day is your requester communities out there in the world aren't going to have the first inkling what any of these words mean. They just want to know who's the person that's using your business, whether it's doing business as yourself or your affiliated business entity or what. It doesn't matter to the requesters. They just want to know who's the person that's registering the site and using it and we can't lose sight of that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabriel. I'll ask Marc and Alan to make the comments also a bit shorter. And Steve, I saw you sneak in into the queue after it was closed. So you'll have it the shortest of all comments. Go ahead, Marc.

EN

MARC ANDERSON:	Thanks, Sebastien. First off, I want to say, I think John McElwain really nailed it with his comments. I think you're spot on there. In particular, I think we did a lot of good work in this group and around our DRS. But one area where we did not was I think we were never clear in our responses when a registration was privacy proxy registration. So I think that's an area that we could work on moving forward. And then the last bit I want to say here really, and I came to this and listening to John and reflecting on the discussion, I think having participated in the EPDP phase two, produced the SSAD recommendations, I want to say we were very clear that privacy proxy was out of scope. And to Alan's point, that wasn't as big a deal at the time, but with the growth of privacy registrations, I think that's become a bigger deal. And I think what we're getting at is when the GNSO Council reconstitutes a group, assuming they do, obviously it's up to them what to do next, but if they reconstitute a group to consider SSAD recommendations, I think what we want to say is privacy proxy should not be considered out of scope. And I'll maybe draw a line there.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. I support what John is saying. We want clarity and responses, and we appreciate how innovative some registrars are of answering the same question in different ways, but that's not going to help the user trying to understand what's going on. I'll point out that if we ever figure out how to handle privacy proxy and put it into policy, we don't have to worry about innovative answers because we will already have defined it, but that's going to take a long time. Until then, we do need clarity. I support what John is saying. With regard to PPSAI, I am on that group, and I made a statement at the last meeting last week

EN

which basically said, you know, we are discussing the PPSAI is discussing it to a limited extent because the recommendations were very limited that PDP made. RDRS is discussing it. We have to be really careful that both groups don't assume the other one will do it and have it essentially fall between the cracks. So, yes, we do need coordination, but at this point, as far as I can tell, it's in neither of us' domain and therefore is very prone to be falling behind the cracks, which is why I'm suggesting that we do need some clear recommendation to the council that they not forget it. Thank you. And by the way, you remember we did hear from Becky that the board already has pretty well come to a conclusion that privacy proxy needs to be handled going forward in reveal requests. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. Steve, the mic is yours.

STEVE CROCKER: I'll be very brief. Thank you. I continue to be confused. And when I think about a person entering this environment and trying to understand what's going on, the confusion grows. And it's this. A registrar has already independent of privacy and proxy obligations of a couple of different kinds. One is to get accurate information about the registrant. Another is to protect the privacy of the registrant. And a third is to disclose the information they have under the appropriate circumstances. So then the question is, what is the role of privacy proxy in that environment? If there is already a policy that essentially covers all of the cases that might come up with respect to who gets the data

and who has to supply accurate data and so forth. So I'll close with this. It would be very, very nice if somebody, perhaps somebody in Org, could write a concise description aimed at somebody who's new to the system, explaining the relationship of privacy and proxy services to what services the registrar already provides. So that somebody can sort out and understand how those interact with each other, how they're intended to interact with each other. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. You see me frowning a bit here because I'm not sure that it is. I don't know that it's staff that knows those details. And, yeah.

STEVE CROCKER: If staff can't get it, find some sort of people who can speak to it. But another way of phrasing it a little more pointedly is, in what way does the use of privacy and proxy not undermine the agreed upon policies that the registrars are already following?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Okay. Well, we'll look into it. And I see that Caitlin is taking notes. That's something we'll have to discuss afterwards. Feodora, can I give you the mic back? And maybe to get to the next point you wanted us to discuss.

EN

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Yes. So, this is similar to this recommendation. So, I think I'm seeing Paul raising his hand. Maybe he wants to address something that was just before. Paul, please.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Yeah. And I was debating whether or not I should say anything. I think that the disconnect between coordinating with the IRT and what we're doing is where we are in the process. For the IRT, they're at the very end of it. For us, we're at the very beginning. We're talking about something, the RDRS, that's not policy, right? And we are making recommendations for future policy work because we feel compelled to do so, because we're like that. That's fine. But we're way at the beginning, and there's all kinds of steps before council would kick off a PDP to address anything that we're talking about. The IRT, and as a result of being at the beginning, it's an art project. It's a free-for-all, right? We could suggest almost anything. The IRT, on the other hand, their hands are tied correctly by the fact that council has passed resolutions and the board has adopted those resolutions, and they are met narrowly to implement things, right? And so, as I hear us talking about coordinating with the PPSAI IRT, I just don't want people to become frustrated when that happens because they have a very narrow thing going on, and we have a very broad thing going on, right? They have a timeframe to deliver things. We kind of do, right? And they are definitely limited in the subject matter and scope, and we kind of aren't. And so, I'm not against coordination. I just, as the council lays on for the next couple of months to the PPSAI implementation team, I just want to give you guys a commercial that that interaction may not be as fulsome

and charming as you hope, just because we sit at very different points along the Z. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fair enough. Point taken. Alan, unless you want to talk about this point that is on screen, in which case I'd love for Feodora to finish her point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we were talking about another point, which is when I put up my hand. The screen moved since then. So, I don't want to talk about 149. I do want to talk about what I think is the next one, which that's the one. Yeah, okay. Where Paul gave a nice philosophical discussion. I was simply saying I don't understand the sentence. Can someone please tell me what it means?

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Alan. So, yes, we can work on this, but as we explained the process, we just did it for transparency and comprehensive reasons to provide the overview here. But if you agree, we can add some additional language and clarify further, and we can move to the next point, if that was the issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: The sentence seems to be saying because of something, something else is happening, a since then statement, but the two are not related. So, they don't really follow in my mind. So, I was just asking for the sentence to be either explained or clarified so I could understand it, and

then perhaps I'll comment on it. But at this point, it's a non sequitur that I don't quite get. Thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Alan. I think this is due that that was a proposed change by Sarah to add the voluntary part. So, I wanted to wait based on the discussion above or the point above before I make those changes to the sentence, because if we change what we say earlier, this will change subsequently as well. So, I think things might clarify after that. I hope that helps. Perfect. Then I move on to the next point. So, maybe we can move the Sarah comments when she is back also because they relate to chapters that don't need consensus just yet. We can take the last time to talk about Marc's proposal for an additional recommendation on keeping the current standing committee in place with a more narrow scope. When staff read it, we were thinking to include what Marc proposed in the table under recommendation 18 in the rationale. I don't know if you want a separate recommendation or if adding it to the rationale works. Marc, I hand you over the mic.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Feodora. I think it's different than REC-18, right, but maybe similar in concept. I think we're recommending the RDRS stay in place for some indefinite period of time. And to help support staff maintain that system and deal with any future requests or any other work that might be considered with that, I think we're recommending a standing committee of some sort. And that's one of the roles we've played in this standing committee, although I think our primary role has been to

consider the lessons learned from the pilot and produce recommendations to the GNSO Council. Part of what we've done, and that was a big part early on in the process, was to help staff sort of consider new future requests and prioritize them and help refine them. And so what I'm envisaging is that either this group or a different group be formed to continue that role while the RDRS continues to operate. Does that help? Is that useful?

FEODORA HAMZA: That helps me. And if there are any other questions, I'll let Seb manage the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I strongly support the suggestion of doing that. I'll also point out that as we go forward with Council and then the board and then staff perhaps taking action on some future system, history tells me that occasionally there'll be questions of what we really meant by something. And having a group still in place to answer those questions takes the load off of the chair who otherwise would be asked to field them and in an ad hoc way try to get consensus from the group that doesn't exist anymore. So we may want to incorporate that into it. You know, that's not a specific thing. It's saying if there are questions, further questions of this group, we will exist to address them. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. Any other questions on this? We're fast reaching time. I don't remember any AOB, but maybe Feodora, if you want to walk us through your expectations for the coming weeks. What, again, what people should be doing and what you will be doing to help us. Oh, sorry, Gabe, I didn't see your hand up. Go ahead first.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I just want to make a tangential point on the issue of the PPSAI and then the bullets that Caitlin put into chat. I just wanted to call this out so it's not lost. There is recognition, I think, amongst the same committee that some registrars are right now responding on behalf of their privacy and proxy customers to RDRS requests. Some are not. That's fine. But this is sort of a change that's occurred over the period of the pilot, where more now do. And this is very important because it now makes even more important that we take action on the recommendation to change, if not eliminate entirely, the wall of text that a RDRS user is confronted with when they first log into the system, which more or less discourages the users from using the system if proxy is present. That is now like outdated and needs to be addressed. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, yeah, good catch. Yeah, thank you for that. Any other comments? Your hand's still up, but Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I just like clarity of how we should be doing this going forward. If I understood the intro, we should be making comments in the table and not in the document.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I'll stop you right here. Let's hear it from Feodora, who will tell us exactly. Okay, thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. Thank you, Alan. So, Alan, you are most welcome to make a comment in this document as well. As you might have noticed, I've included yours into the overview table. So, if whatever is easier for you, you can make comments either here or here. If you make them in the full document, staff will transfer them into this one. In terms of next steps and having in mind the number of meetings we have left, I think it's important to note that discussions will focus probably on Assignment 4 and the recommendations and changes or comments made in the other chapters. Staff will aim to provide a solution or suggestion based on the comment along the way, but the most important comments related to the Assignment 4 will be introduced during the call in the same format. If you have a text you do not agree with, not live with, you can include it in the red table or comment accordingly in the full document, say why it's not working for you, and ideally you would provide additional or alternative text. Then we have another table where you can name comments that you can live with, but just need more suggestions. We have the pending action items that Marc mentioned earlier, for instance, in relation to Recommendation 6.

So, he can live with it, but he will want to add some more language, and then we can add it along the way. So, during the next meeting, we will continue discussing the other pending comments in this list. And if you have new ones related to recommendations, we will, in consultation with leadership, see which ones need to be addressed first. But yes, just note these two documents as provided earlier in the chat by Gabe, and we will provide them in the notes again. These two are the ones we are currently working with. No other documents will be followed for comments. Hope this helps. Otherwise, we will provide notes tomorrow, explaining this again for your convenience. Back to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much, Fedora. And as I see no further hands, I think that we can close the call and go do our homework. Well, maybe wait for the notes tomorrow morning European time, but otherwise get back to the documents and meet again in a week. Thank you all and talk to you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]