
DEVAN REED:

For the recording, this is Devan Reed. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call taking place on Monday, 24 February 2025. For today's call, we did receive apologies from Farzaneh Badii and Thomas Rickert. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, you can raise your hand or unmute your mic now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

Members and alternates 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. And all chat sessions are being archived. As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you, and over to Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Hi, everybody. Good evening, afternoon, and morning, depending on where you are. I have a bit of a difference of schedule today. I have a seven-year-old co-pilot who's promised that he's not going to talk too much during this conversation. But if I need to escape at some point or another, I might need to.

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.

With this said, maybe we have a quick round around the room to see if anybody had anything to add to the AOB. So, you would have seen the schedule. We wanted to spend a bit of time discussing Steve's email or two emails now to see what we're taking in. We might not. And then we wanted to have a last discussion on Chapter 1. We'll talk about it later again. Dive into Chapter 2, talk about our session at ICANN, and then AOB. Steve, I see your hand up. Go ahead. Steve, you're still muted.

STEVE CROCKER:

The AOB item I had in mind is the RDRS one-year report just came out, and it's full of statistics. It occurred to me that it might be interesting to ask the registrars how many requests they serviced outside of RDRS in order to get a slightly larger picture of all of this. So, apologies for saying all of that in one piece, because that is the AOB, and now you can choose to--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sure. And you mean by that to have it in the report itself? Because we've mentioned this several times that anecdotally they tell us that it's about half and a half. Depending on the registrar, it might be 40-60, the other way around. But roughly, it's about half of the queries. But it's anecdotally in conversation. I think that Lisa said the other day that she had captured that also in some of the interviews. Lisa, I see your hand up. Let's do a quick now, and then we'll work it as AOB. Lisa, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, I was just going to co-sign what you said, Sebastien, that there is data in the user interview experience report that's published, where the one question was, how many do you process outside of RDRS? So, you could look at that as well.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, I apologize. I only just glanced at it quickly. It came out a few minutes ago, and I just did a quick scan. But I was remembering in particular, and Gabe was on the call, he shared some numbers once about how many requests, he's from the requester side, how many requests they put through RDRS versus how many are processed by his organization through other means. So, that's actually two different ways to look at the relationship of RDRS to the alternative channels, both from the requester side and from the registrar side.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. In any case, we'll taper that for the AOB and maybe have that discussion. It gives a bit of time also for Sarah, who's already answering in the chat, to formulate that maybe on the mic. So, with this, we wanted to have a discussion about the comments sent by Steve Crocker, I want to say three weeks ago now, even more than that, probably a month ago.

Initially, when it was received, Steve, you weren't able to attend the-- 27th of January. Thank you. Yeah, a month ago. You weren't there on the following call, and then we moved it. And then I wanted to make sure that people had ample time to respond to it. It turned out that there was minimal response. I reread this afternoon, again, your

answers to my comments to it. And I wanted just to have a conversation a bit with the group, it doesn't need to last for a bunch of time. But just to pick up what we want to pick up in the report from it, and then move on.

As I answered, there's another point and premises that I didn't agree with in your statements. But I've written all that and people have had the pleasure to read it. So maybe instead of listening to me, we'll listen to Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. Paul here. So, I guess I'm trying to understand what we're doing here. So, there is that everybody has an opportunity to go into the documents and add whatever comments they want. Are we running a separate thing for Steve, where Steve did it by email, and so we're going to spend call time integrating his comments into the document? Or will Steve be putting comments into the document? I thought he had. I'm just trying to understand what's happening. Because I have an enormous amount of respect for Steve, but I'm not sure that reading emails together and integrating them into documents is going to be terribly efficient, but I'm open minded. Thanks, everybody.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, thank you very much for your comment. It is very much a possibility. And if that's the way we want to go about it, I'm more than happy to go this way. I'm just fulfilling a commitment that I gave about a month ago, when Steve was absent on that call that we would talk about it. And so, we're only ticking that box. Steve Delbanco, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Sebastien. I'll try to do two things. I'll answer Paul McGrady's question and then give the BC's perspective on Steve Crocker's recommendations. Paul, I believe that when you look at that January 27th email from Steve Crocker, it lays out the notion that there were assumptions behind RDRS that are worthy of challenge, since those assumptions, we believe, led to the wrong framing for the system, and will lead to an inferior outcome if we recommend creating a set.

And Steve's email made it clear that it's not obvious where to put that in the document, because the challenging of assumptions leads to the recommendation of let's re-examine those assumptions, but keep RDRS running until we can reframe where we go next. So, if it's a minority report, we can structure it any way that we want. And I believe, I know that the Business Constituency is a full-throated supporter of Steve's January 27th email. I would suspect that the IPC and ALAC and GAC would have similar concerns, although I cannot speak for any of them. I'd welcome their input on that.

But if it's a minority report, it isn't nearly as interesting as if it's part of the report where we can articulate, there's no place obvious to challenge the assumptions that were used to set up RDRS. So, would you allow us, for instance, to put it in the recommendation section? Is that an appropriate place? If we know where to put it, a lot of us can then insert it and support it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. Just to answer very, very quickly, I think that it's in neither of the first two chapters that we've redacted, that we've worked on so far, even though it should possibly, if it's a premise in terms of readability, it should appear early on. But I believe that it's in Chapter 4 that we'll put the recommendations and there might be premise there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. And a recommendation to challenge the premise is ultimately a recommendation rather than a descriptive element where we describe the premise behind it. Because if you do that, there's disagreements on whether that was the premise and then we lose it as a factual description. So as phrased by Crocker and supported by the BC, it belongs in the recommendations. Thank you.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I think it'll be interesting to have recommendations in the report that are supported by some, but not all members of the Standing Committee. Not necessarily a problem, just an interesting outcome. But with regards to Steve's email, I do note also that there was a response to that email sent on February 5th, I guess, and that seemed to address several of the concerns. So, I guess just whatever does end up in the report, I think should accommodate or consider those responses also that were, I thought, quite helpful. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that. Quite helpful. The issue is that the response was from me and I'm not a-- I'm a shepherd here. I don't know that I'm a-- So, if you want to own some of those, that's fine. But I don't know that I want to have a position here other than historically, because I remember from the beginning that some of the assumptions seem wrong to me, just on a historical perspective. I see your hand up again.

SARAJ WYLD: Yes, thank you. This is Sarah. I hadn't thought of that in terms of your role and providing this info. So, I guess in that case, what I would say is I look forward to reviewing the suggested input in the shared document and might refer back to your response to address that.

And while I'm talking, I'm also going to say I had thought we were going to answer or speak about a different email that Steve Crocker had sent later on, I guess, in response to your response. And then Steve had some other things. And just, I had a question on that where there was a statement that some registrars are not responding to disclosure requests through RDRS. And I would be interested in talking about that in more detail if it does make it into our report. Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I think that too needs to be addressed. And I don't know if it's something we can track through our stats. Again, we were trying not to identify registrars in the process. So, I don't know to what extent that

can be done. But if it's something that is stated, I'd rather it be stated with facts, with numbers, rather than just hearsay.

So with this, and I'm sorry, Paul, but I'm not very good at reading and talking at the same time. Maybe I should be quiet and read, but I'll talk instead. So, I think that we all seem to gel around the idea that these points should make it to the recommendation document, possibly with answers and then we can decide what stays, what doesn't, what still has an owner and what doesn't, and then put the appropriate owner around it, if it happens to be only a portion of this group. There seems to be backing from the BC, as Steve DelBianco was saying, but we'll see who else wants to put their name on it. Steve, I see your hand up again.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. So, I took the moment to read the chat, and I take Paul McGrady's comment that he said earlier. I wasn't trying to not be a good member of the committee by refusing to-- Sorry for the double negatives. I couldn't figure out where to put my comments in a way that fit into the structure. So the point that Steve DelBianco made quite clearly is it isn't clear that the structure provides a natural place to put the kinds of things in that I thought needed to be in there.

So in essence, one way to interpret this is I'm asking for help from guidance as to where to put things in. I'm willing to do that. I'm willing to put it in. Sure, if somebody wants to do the work for me, that's fine, but that's not what I was-- I wasn't trying to be that distant from it or ask for any privileges, but I was saying that given the structure, as I say, it isn't evident where to put it. And that means that trying to get those

messages in there in a way that would be meaningful runs the risk that it just gets lost or sort of diminished in its impact. And so that would be the area where we might have some discussion about that.

I think there really are two separate discussions that are taking place with respect to RDRS. One is how is RDRS performing and what do we have to say about it taken on by itself, just as a given. But riding right along with that is the implication that this work is intended to or will be interpreted as, what does this tell us about how to move forward to a more fully fleshed out system?

And I think there's a big fork in the road. One point of view is you can take what we have and extend it in various ways and it will be the working system and that'll be fine. And the other point of view is there's no way to extend it to be what it should be. You can extend it and extend it, it'll get better and better, but you'll never get to where you want to go because there's a fundamental divide that can't be crossed without digging deeper and tearing into some of the assumptions behind it. I think there has to be room. I think that has to be understood. How we want to handle that is up to this group. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks. Marc, I see your hand up and then we'll draw a line behind this and move on to the chapters. Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: This is Marc Anderson. I feel like I've lost the thread a little bit of where we are and what we're doing. I just heard Steve talking, I think about an email he sent on February 27th and I think I heard--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: January. January 27th.

MARC ANDERSON: On January 27th, okay. I guess February 27th hasn't happened yet, but I guess I'm not exactly sure what we're talking about or what we're doing at this point.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'll recap and put a bow on it. We agreed to take Steve's point before the document existed, so he didn't know where to put them. It'll be in Chapter 4, which are recommendations. At that point, the group will discuss the points themselves, see if they want to put comments to it or put diverging opinion and see where we go, and then we'll move on with that.

We're not creating a circuit for comments from Steve. It just happened that the document that he wanted to add comments to didn't yet exist. Steve, I see your hand up, but really, we're drawing a line under this, so please make it quick.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I'll just say this without asking for any further discussion. The idea that I hear repeatedly is, well, we do our job and then it's up to the Council or it's up to the Board and they can consider whatever they want and they can take information from multiple sources.

The way things actually work when you're inside of those operations is that what comes up from the bottom has enormous amount of sway because that's where the real work got done. And so, I always look at the idea of what to write and what kind of things we should say from the perspective of how will this be received by the people who are going to read it and will it be sufficient for them to do what they need to do.

I'm not very happy about writing the general comment implies in many places besides here. I'm not very happy about the idea of, well, we'll just write what we write and then it's up to them to make the decision. I think we have to take the responsibility as if we were sitting on the other side of this.

They certainly have the authority to go any direction they want, but I think the responsibility that I feel in a situation like this is that we write as useful and as complete a message as we can. The worst that happens is that they follow what we say exactly and then we should, yes, you can point to them and say they own it, but actually we're the ones that did the work. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sorry, not what I meant at all. It might have been lost in my translation, but all I said by we put it in there and see how we go is not for others to

read into our unclear statements. It's we see how we go because I don't think that it's going to be a simple copy paste of your email into the recommendations. We see how we go, the group will comment on them and see then what we keep and what we don't keep, what we keep maybe under the BC's name only. That's how we go that I meant.

I absolutely agree with you. I wouldn't spend three years of my life on this if I didn't think that the document that we'll produce will be not only read, but at least a major part followed because we've done the homework, we've done the legwork and we're supposed to be the experts here.

STEVE CROCKER: And I was pointing at you particularly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And you would what? Sorry.

STEVE CROCKER: I was not pointing at you particularly. It's the sort of broad statement about the role of what we write and how it's received and so forth. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. With this we can go to discuss Chapter 1. And there's not much I want to discuss, but again, this is because we're not closing it for good, but we want to move on and pass to something else. So, I just

wanted to give a last chance, possibly to Feodora if you can help me, to review those bits that either are inconsistent or will need to be brought into the recommendation and discuss them in terms of recommendation. We'll see very quickly that during the ICANN session next week or the week after, I'll strike a time, I would like that to also be discussed in the group with the presence. Feodora, do you want to walk us through this very quickly?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Yes. Thank you, Seb. This is Feodora for the record. As we have asked the standing committee kindly to flag any issues or areas for improvement in the Chapter 1, we've received a few comments and I've put them here in the separate document. So, we have the first statement or recommendation that was considered as too subjective. So I'm going to ask you, Seb, do we want to go through each recommendation and ask the Standing Committee if they agree or disagree or should I go through--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, no. I think that we'll do that in Seattle. I just want to make sure that those points that we need to discuss are highlighted or marked clearly so people can actually prepare for it and come up with opinions and ideas on how to proceed.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Okay. So, yes, I will put them also then in the notes and an email for everyone to have handy, but they will also be marked in the respective

chapters. So, for this one, it was commented that it is too subjective. For the second recommendation, where we include corresponding required timeframe for requesters to reduce overall response time, there were SC members who didn't agree with this, so they wanted to discuss this further.

Also, for this recommendation, the ticketing system, SC members commented that they are not sure what this means or they needed further clarification. And with the denial responses, particularly this part, the question arose, how do we achieve this? And last but not least, and I think this has been confirmed now, is that we will take out the recommendations from Chapter 1 and we'll put them in the following sections. So, I think this has been clarified, but just to make sure. Back to you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah. Any questions on this from anybody? Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah. I'm a little bit confused about just the work process here. So these are comments that are flagged that we're not talking about, which is fine. We can talk about them later. There are some other comments in the document that I would like for us to talk about at some point. So for example, there was a text that Gabriel suggested to add about confidential requests, and then I had some comments on that.

If you search for the words a total that I just put in the chat, it'll take you there. If you click on my face where it appears at the top of the document, it'll take you to my cursor. Isn't that great? Yeah. Should we talk about this or when are we going to? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, I'm happy to talk about this now. We just have another half hour on the call. I thought it would be more efficient to discuss face-to-face in Seattle, that sort of thing, where we might need to wordsmith and negotiate a bit on this. But if you want to make a comment now, I'm more than happy to listen, particularly if you think that people need to have a bit of time to think about it before agreeing to anything.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Yeah, I'm happy to follow whatever work path you want. So, I didn't mean that we have to talk about it right this minute. If we're talking about it later, I just didn't understand what's supposed to be happening at this time in the call. The suggestion from Gabriel is to add anecdotal reporting about the outcomes of confidential requests. I don't know that this report is suitable for anecdotal reporting because we're doing this specifically so that we don't have anecdotal reports anymore. The whole point of the RDRS is to have non-anecdotal reports.

So, that's concern number one. And then number two is I have a response to it. If we are going to include this anecdotally, then there's some other information I think we should include along with that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see Gabe's hand up and then I'll come back to you with a question. Go ahead, Gabe.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi, Gabriel Andrews here. So, this comment or a question or I was sort of seeking feedback on how to approach the issue. And Sarah raises a valid point that we want to be as data driven as possible. I'm open to that. The core issue at hand that I don't think was getting much attention in this report as is drafted so far was to highlight that when the confidential requests checkbox was being checked, that there has been, well, denials based off of the fact that that box was checked.

And I don't have firsthand the ability to know how many of the participating registrars that are participating on a voluntary basis are taking that stance versus not. And if there's a desire to not have this anecdotally treated, I would be very open to ICANN and just asking each of the 70 or 80 participant registrars when that box is checked, do you respond to the RDRS request if it's otherwise justified in your mind to elicit a disclosure of data or do you deny based off of that box being checked?.

I think this is a really important thing if we're going to continue to have that box because it's sort of, it very much informs the utility of that feature versus a potential need for further iterative improvement. And I take the point that it would be great to collect data above and beyond just the anecdotal reports that I've received on that.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. So maybe it's not a question of reporting a statistic, a rate of confidentiality or confidential requests. Maybe it's more about talking about the process and what happens and what might be beneficial or possible in a future system. So, I think I heard Gabriel say, to suggest to ask registrars, do they respond or deny? I think perhaps Gabriel might mean approve or deny because we have to expect that every request gets a response of some sort, whether that is approval or denial.

I'm interested in asking that question, but I'm not sure that we can effectively do so in an appropriate time frame to get a response and issue the report. And so maybe it's more about making, including somewhere a discussion of that there is this option for confidential requests. People sometimes use it. It seems that these requests are often not resulting in an approval because for many registrars to do a request with that level of confidentiality requires legal due process, which the requesters, law enforcement requesters have indicated they're not going to do through RDRS.

So, it might be that this is sort of unfair for everybody to try to do confidential requests through RDRS if the process for them doesn't fit into the system. Maybe that's what we need to talk about. Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Sarah. And thank you, Gabriel. And I think that raises a fair point. So, I fully agree with you, Sarah, where this report is not about ESA and whatever we want fact-based, but when we can't uncover the facts, I'm not saying that we should invent it, but we should raise the fact that maybe it's an avenue of further research and further implementation.

I think that it's clear to everybody that while this is a pilot, this is not a pilot that has delivered or will deliver a final product. It's a pilot that delivered a number of answers that were asked to us three years ago, and then a number of avenues to better it. And that's what the Chapter 2 will be about. And we'll see if we have time to delve into it now, or if we'll keep that for Seattle, given that the conversation now is moving a bit better on this.

So, the idea was, indeed, if maybe anecdotal is not the right way to say it, but let's leave that as turned, not leave it unturned. Even if we don't have the data behind it, it's not because we don't have the data and able to demonstrate something by it, that we shouldn't raise the fact that there's a possible issue there. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yes. So, thank you, Seb, and thank you, Sarah. Just very quickly, do we already have a place in the report, either currently drafted or can we add a section for additional questions that we've identified as part of our work then, that the RDRS has not itself answered, but that the steering committee feels are important to continue to work toward?

And I think this is a prime example of one such question. I think Sarah and I both agree, this is something that we can and should look into, but it might not be done by the time the report is complete, but it's still very much worth noting it within the report that, hey, this is one of potentially multiple areas of follow up that are suggested to occur. Is that fair?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

It is completely fair. I don't know exactly, depending on the nature of the question, I guess, either in that Chapter 2 in new features or in the recommendations themselves, and we'll create a block for those. I think that works best, but we'll fit it in. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. Seb, you already said what I was going to say, but just to reiterate, I think it's really important that we not omit things that we feel are salient to the discussion and to any future development, even if we don't have the facts. So, I totally agree with you. And somewhere we need to put in notes about these things, even if we can't report them as factual statistics. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So now question to the group. Either we spend another 10 minutes on this, and then we wrap up on what we're going to do at ICANN, or we put a line on it and go into Chapter 2. Are there any other points that are salient here that you've noticed and you would want

either to discuss now or to make sure that everybody has prepared for, because you would like to discuss them in Seattle?

And I'm seeing no other hand. So again, Feodora is going to prepare notes, please review them on what to do with the points that have been raised and are still open. My idea was to take the time that we have in Seattle face-to-face to discuss those. If you have better ideas, I'm always open. And we'll make sure, Feodora, I'm going to make sure in her notes that that is clearly highlighted and giving you time to come prepare for it. Obviously, the work in Seattle is going to be so much more efficient if people are a bit prepared, and we're not having to start from scratch on those ideas.

With this said, and seeing no further hands, then I think that we can close this. And I'm very, very bad at reading the chat at the same time. So, if you are saying something important, please voice it. I'm sure all of it is important, but if it's important enough to be voiced, please do so. And if not, maybe, Feora, we can move to Chapter 2 and see where we're at and what you intend us to do there.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. So same as with Chapter 1, you can see here the list of the marked text and system enhancements that were supposed to be discussed today. So, one was the API, because there's the overall API shown as proposed future enhancements, but obviously, there's also the initiative that Gabe is working on. So maybe some more clarification on how these two are different from each other would be good to discuss.

And then in the second comment is, I think, sorry, it was said that the Standing Committee cannot decide this. So, I think this one also includes further discussion. And the comment owner, I'm happy for them to raise the hand and ask for that further clarification. The same for the following two, one on the ccTLD inclusion and the other one for the external platform. I think that was something you recommended. And I can go to Chapter 2 now, where we can see the comments here.

But in addition, we also still have pending action items, which includes marking if the implemented enhancements were successful or met the expectations. And we also are still missing the risk of independencies for some proposals and also the priority ranking as something to complete before ICANN82. But I give back to you and we can maybe focus on--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, you lost me a bit and I should be the last one to be lost here. But on those points, the four items that you had listed in your previous, these are items that people commented on.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes, indeed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Do you want to show us in Chapter 2 where that is and maybe find whose comment we're trying to chase? Because I'm not sure that people recognize themselves.

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. So here, the first comment on the API is here. I think Sarah made it and we can discuss further. So, that's the comment.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Sarah, thank you for raising your hand and saving me here.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, thank you. This is Sarah. So maybe we can just start with like, is there only one API or is there going to be two APIs? Is law enforcement-- I thought the idea was that-- Actually, I don't know what I think.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, there's multiple levels here. First, as I said previously, I think that we need to be a bit careful about what-- So, suggesting something that would be necessary for further development, that's always good. But we need to make sure that we keep at the level of ideas and features that we want rather than starting to build on this before we know that this that we have in our hands is going to be the future.

And on this, I have asked staff if there was a possibility to be able to speak with Kurtis in Seattle. And as expected, he's going to be extremely busy. So, I was invited not to do that, but to organize a call with him after ICANN. I'm not sure that he's going to be less busy after, but we'll find some time there to have 20 minutes to explain a bit what the pros and cons are here before, as Becky Burr suggested, he takes the

decision or management takes the decision to carry this forward on their own or to go and find a third party to go and develop that.

Then the other notion that I've heard from Steve Crocker, but from others too on this call is that we live in an environment, the internet, where multiple solutions exist for identical problems and same problems. So, there is probably not going to be an infinity of APIs, but it is very possible that there'd be multiple API or different APIs to the taste of different people. There will be at least two entry points for the API. There will be one that is more sort of requester oriented and the other one that is more responder oriented. Technically it'd be the same platform, but it'll be two interfaces to those APIs.

I personally think that the people that develop this interface being at ICANN or somebody else at some point will need to produce at least those two APIs. But that's my own thinking. And it certainly doesn't mean that others might not try before or try after even if those APIs are not exactly what they wanted to see. Does that answer your question?

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. I'm still a little bit confused, but I think perhaps I'm just asking the wrong questions. It doesn't really matter how many APIs there are or who-- although I imagine you can't build an API for a system that you don't run, I would think. But anyways, what is this proposal? If we scroll up just to the end of section 3 above, thank you, Feodora, up a little bit more so the full chart, yeah, okay. Is this a proposal to build an API or is this a proposal to build a user interface? Or is this noting that

the law enforcement requesters are making a user interface to connect to whatever API might future exist?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, I know I suggested language in the margin there to make it more clear because I think the goal rationale could be phrased perhaps a little bit more user-friendly. Can you expand? Okay, there we go. Yeah, I suggest language to enable existing LEA tools and to spell out the acronym, law enforcement agency tools and portals to connect to the RDRS.

And I further note that such an API may materially benefit efforts to authenticate law enforcement agency requests. So, if you already have authenticated users going through existing tools and portals, the ability to connect those authenticated users to a RDRS API allows that pass-through of the authentication, or at least enables us to discuss that in a much more constructive fashion. And that's why we're talking about this.

Further, to answer kind of a related question Sarah asked about improving the user interface, there are also comments on that elsewhere, but I think that's separate and apart from this. And I just want to make that clear delineation that when we talk this, really we're talking about how do we enable existing portals that exist out there to connect directly rather than having to sort of hack it through the web

interface, which is really the only option that exists right now to my understanding, not an engineer.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. So, it sounds like the proposal here in section 3 is that law enforcement agencies will build a front-end solution, and that front-end solution is going to connect to the API that's described in section 4. And so that's what I was asking in that comment thread that I started on February 19, just a little bit below the one that's highlighted on screen right now, is where I'm asking is this the same API or a different one? It sounds like the answer is it's the same one. This is the API that up above relates to a UI. And so, I think that my comment can now be resolved now that we've discussed that because there was some other text changes that also helped.

And so, while I've got the mic, and thank you for that, if we could scroll right back up to the section 3, pending enhancements, I do also want to flag that there were some other pending enhancements that I would have expected to see here in the report, but they are not here. And so perhaps I misunderstood the purpose of this section, but those enhancements were suggested in the workbook. So, if they're not here, maybe they should be. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can we not be so mysterious? Do you want to point exactly to the ones you mean?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, they're in that comment right there. So, we propose to add a pending input status to request because then it would be easier to track what their status is. And we had proposed creating some way to change the outcome of a request or to create a linked follow-up request. And so those seem to me to be appropriate for what we should document here as planned system enhancements that remain.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Absolutely. And I think it should be added. Yeah. Thank you very much for picking that up. I'll see with Feodora if there are-- Because I just had those to make sure that they're clearly identifiable and describable, but we'll add them. And then we, as I was talking, went to the next point. Is this you, Feodora, trying to point us to another point of discussion you wanted to open?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes. So, that would be the comment that was flagged for a discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, that was another comment of yours, Sarah, if you want to elaborate on it. Let's see.

SARAH WYLD:

Yes, thank you. So, the text was saying, sorry, I'm just distracted because the mail arrived. Text was saying that they would require registrars to disclose the data. And I don't think that that's a recommendation that we can or should make. I don't think we can make that recommendation because it would be a policy decision.

And I don't think it would be the right thing to recommend because the customer data that is in the Privacy and Proxy Service might not be something that can be provided without legal due process, which we talked about already is not provided to the registrar through RDRS. So, this disclosure, I think, must remain optional, certainly until there is such a policy, but I would think that that's what the policy should eventually say also. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I see Gabriel's hand immediately up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yeah, this is Gabriel Andrews again. So, I think Sarah raises a valid point that any treatment of proxy services in the RDRS, it shouldn't change the fact that the registrars are able to make their own balancing test for the disclosure of data, right? I think what has been asked in the past, or at least I can speak for what I've asked in the past, was for the registrars who operate affiliated proxy services, when they make their balancing test, to make that decision on behalf of their affiliated proxy providers as well, as opposed to purely pointing to them as the, what is the term that's already public data, or whatever the term is that we see in the post.

And so, we're, to Sarah's point, very much not suggesting that there should be automatic disclosure where the proxy exists. Rather, we are suggesting that the registrar should be in position to make those balancing test disclosure determinations on behalf of their own business units. And I hope that's not objectionable.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'll let Sarah answer and then I might answer from my point of view. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Thank you, Gabriel, that is helpful to understand. I do think that that is different than what is written here in the text. So, I would ask that that be made more clear. And then I will think about how the registrars might respond to that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I just wanted to say from the point of view of my personal employer who made it clear that that's something they would want to do. It's a purely voluntary at this stage. And indeed, there is much policy to be described around it for this to go any further than purely voluntary.

Now, I don't think that this group should be making policy recommendations per se, but I have actually no problem with us putting recommendations that a theme of policy should be further discussed in the policy group. And the contrary, I think that if we flag something that is missing, I think it could be helpful. If I remember well, that was the

fourth of your four points. Was there anything else you wanted us to discuss, Feodora?

FEODORA HAMZA: I think there were two more comments to flag, but having the time in mind, maybe we talk about ICANN82 and any AOB you might have. Up to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Let's look at another one. And then we can stop in five minutes.

FEODORA HAMZA: Sorry, I think it was this one where we talk about the external platform that everybody agrees with, or if that needs further discussion of if the text can stay like this part.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, and that's what I alluded to already when I said that we might need to speak to with Kurtis about this. Again, yeah, I don't really know what to do with this in the sense that if the Board had said we'll listen to your recommendations, maybe one thing, but they were quite clear in saying this is neither our remit nor it's only the ICANN org's remit. So maybe we'll agree to differ if we strongly feel that this is not the platform it should continue on, or we'll just leave it an open question. And yeah, all I can do is to make sure that Kurtis is arriving here only a few months back that has enough background to be able to take a full decision on it.

Does anybody have any stronger feelings about this or not particularly? On this, I did want to say, sorry, Gabriel, just before I give you the mic, I did want to say I heard on the last call, again, to the point I made earlier about the fact that on the internet, different solutions may cohabit and the best will survive and whatever other analogy. There is something that I, maybe it's because I'm limited in my mind, but I'm having trouble with in this multiplicity of solutions that I've heard people saying we should have. We have to take it on board that if we have multiple systems running this, that means that requesters and responders will have to connect to multiple systems in order to be able to play.

And whilst technically it's a good idea, because it just creates the best of breed, in terms of operationally, from a registrar point of view, particularly, I don't think that registrars will be willing to go and connect in 5 or 10 different interfaces on this. So, there will be some kind of a hub needed, if only to make sure that people don't connect to 20 different things.

I don't know whether it needs to be ours or somebody else's, or I don't want to have too much of a sale, but I don't see the possibility of connecting to multiple interfaces left and right, because otherwise we'll go back to what we had before, which is every registrar has its own interface to offer to the requester world, and that defeats the purpose of what we've been doing. With this said, Gabriel, I see you hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yeah, I just want to note this, too. This is not the first time in this call that we've been talking about suggestions that are beginning to

encroach upon engineering decisions. And so, my rule of thumb, and I ask if others agree with this or not, but my rule of thumb is more or less to describe the feature set that is most useful, the set of expectations there, rather than talking about how that is engineered into existence or not.

And so, I'm pretty darn agnostic with regards to whether it's Salesforce platforms in the back end or others, but I think this is one of the reasons why that discussion of the API is so key, because to my understanding, an API is a description of a standardized set of how you are expected to communicate with us. I mean, that's really what it boils down to. It is this is the instruction set for how you can connect to us using whatever the heck you've got. And as long as you make that consistent, then you're basically creating standards. And that helps to alleviate the concern I think you just expressed, Sebastien. But I will end there. I won't blow their hands.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, I think I fully agree. I just want to make sure that the question is asked so that we don't end up with what we've created now just out of inertia, just because it's there. And I'll take the opportunity of asking a question. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I wanted to respond to you, Sebastien, about the myriad, the image that you're conveying about a myriad of interfaces and the chaos that that would bring of everybody having to figure out how to connect to everybody else. That's exactly the problem that internet

protocols solve by providing a standardized way of communicating and everybody implements to the same protocol, but they do their own implementation. There's no need for a centralized operation of anything.

Email, for example, just to take one, you can talk to anybody and all the interfaces have to be the same. That's what SMTP and so forth, web interfaces, et cetera, et cetera. So, I wanted to suggest that you want to tease apart this picture that you were conveying of a bunch of what I'll call ad hoc interfaces where everybody makes their own definition of what their own API is. Yes, that would be messier than necessary. Bringing together the common elements of that and having a common API does not mean that they all have to be implemented or run centrally, but you just define the standards and you publish them presumably as an RFC. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yeah, good point. Absolutely taken. And if Sarah doesn't say what I think she's going to say, I'll say it afterwards. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

I don't know what I was going to say. This is Sarah. You mentioned just that I have to verbalize this. You mentioned, Sebastien, that every registrar will have to have their own process. Yes, we have that anyways. We are required under the phase 1 policy to have a direct request process. This text on screen about will the system run on Salesforce or not seems to me to be appropriate for this discussion and possible technical updates. So, I think I heard the suggestion that we

remove it and I did not understand why we would do that, but it might just be that I misunderstood. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I certainly didn't suggest it. I think it should be there. Yeah. Alan Greenberg, and then we're going to draw a line because we did want to talk about what Seattle is going to be about and I let the time run. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. In terms of that paragraph, I don't care if it stays or not, but we should not be in the position of saying how this is going to be implemented in the end. This is an option. Someone will have to decide. It's not our call. It is an engineering issue.

In terms of multiple providers and protocols, again, we should not be forbidding or excluding options like this, but again, it will depend a lot on implementations. If there is significant authentication issues associated with the final product, there may be restrictions on who you talk to. You want to make sure that if a registrar is talking to someone, that it's someone who is authorized to do this. So, these things will have to come out in the final decision. If it's a completely unauthenticated type system, yes, you should be able to have multiple providers. There may be other restrictions associated with it, depending on exactly what the feature set is. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay, thank you. I think I agree in general. Again, the purpose here wasn't to dictate what should or should not be. I'm slightly afraid of that inertia and the fact that we've created something that is starting to gel in people's minds as the product that will stay. Maybe not in this group because we've had these discussions many times, but in the rest of the community. I just wanted to underline that.

With this, we will meet in Seattle I want to say on this Saturday morning, but I can't remember exactly when it is. I can be corrected. No, Wednesday, the 12th of March. So, it was another meeting I'm thinking about. I wanted to make sure that-- So as these things go, I will have to spend some time regaling the gallery with an update on what we're doing, which is all fine. I'll try not to spend too much time on it because I wanted to have time also face-to-face to have these sorts of discussions and be able to do that, which is always easier than on the phone.

Hopefully, we should be ahead in that Chapter 2, which we've just discussed in part. So come ready to discuss that. Come ready to make sure, as Sarah did on this call, that all the points you wanted to see in it are included. We're all humans, so it's very possible that things are missing. Make sure that you've brought your arguments. Make sure that if I didn't understand something, I'm challenged and I can be corrected. I'm very happy to discover these things and make sure that it's not just my assumptions there. And then elaborate on our next step and everything.

So again, I'll try to make that update that is a bit boring to you because you've been there on the calls as short as possible, but we have to do a

bit of that. It's part of the community effort. And then afterwards, we'll spend as much time as we can on the discussion. 40 minutes is a short time, but then tell me where I need to cut the rest. I'd love to make the beginning as short as possible to leave as much time as possible for the discussion. We'll try our best.

With this, we're one minute over time. And as my good friend Paul McGrady said, when it's time, it's time. We need to cut the conversation. Talk to you very soon and see you in Seattle for those that are going to be there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]