
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, 27 January 2025.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or unmute your mic now. If assistance is needed updating your Statements of Interest, please e-mail 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 call. Apologies are also posted there as well. Since the wiki is unavailable, I don't have a list of apologies, but I will record them properly. Please remember to state your name before speaking. All chat sessions are being archived.

As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Thank you. And back over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Devan. Welcome, everybody. First of all, does anybody have any suggested change to the agenda, anything they want to add or retrieve? I hope you had time to look at it, and you had time also to look at Chapter 1 of the report. I've seen a bunch of comments from a few

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.

people. But I've seen a bunch of comments, so that's good. Seeing no hands, then I guess that's it. We'll just go with the agenda as is and we'll first spend a bit of time on—Farzaneh, I see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I'm sorry. I can only stay for the first half hour, so I wanted to put on the agenda, if we could discuss Steve Crocker's e-mail to the RDRS mailing list, that would be great.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We can, but if you're staying only for a first half hour, then it can be an AOB. Thank you very much. And I'm going through quickly through the list of participants, and I don't see Steve on the line. So quick poll maybe. Did everybody see Steve's e-mail? Did anybody else than Farzaneh had comments?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay, Sebastien, if he's not here, then we can discuss on the mailing list.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That would be better.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. I think it might be fair. I have a few points too. But in his absence, I think it might be more fair to discuss it on the mailing list. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Actually, I think that mail will receive a lot of discussion and perhaps we should reserve some time at the next meeting for it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. We'll note that. I think it's a good idea. In the meantime, before we send everybody racing, I assume that we just go with the course as planned. We'll see how we integrate those comments once we have had the discussion. Farzi, I see your hand up again.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Sorry, Sebastien. So you have events related to RDRS. I just wanted to make sure that we are flagging events that are limited to RDRS and not other events that were promoted on CircleID, because I don't believe that NCSG has been actually either invited to other meetings or was aware of these outside working groups that have been working on different projects, we haven't been invited. So I just wanted to make sure that we keep the promotion/publicizing the events that are related to RDRS within ICANN and not the work that others are doing. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Understood. They're doing a fantastic job promoting their own work. So, no, I don't know that we need to. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Seb. I just wanted to speak to what Farzaneh was saying about the events. Those specific events, which I'll cover later, are two events where there will be sessions on RDRS. So those events are open to other people but there's specific sessions on RDRS, and I just wanted to let everybody know. I'll cover those in a little bit.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And for clarity, you're talking about ICANN organized events that are happening.

LISA CARTER: Yes. One is the M3AAWG event in Portugal, and the other one is APTLD87 in Hong Kong.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Exactly. Thank you. Paul McGrady, I see your hand and your face.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hi, Seb. I know you want to get back to the agenda, but I just wanted to plus one what Farzi said, which is, everybody can do all kinds of work out in the community. We have a similar kind of parallel thing going on right now with UDRP Phase 2 Review, where WIPO is doing alternative work. Great, free speech, hooray. But that's not the same thing as the work we're doing. So I'm glad Steve's out there doing stuff, but to a certain extent, I think we can't get bogged down in trying to be the marshallers of independent work that our friends are doing. Does that make sense? That's all. Just a very long plus one of Farzi. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I'm sure she will appreciate. She even says that. Great. Thanks. Actually, no, I don't know if she says great. Thanks to Paul or to Lisa before. But thank you, Paul. Okay, all good.

So now, returning to the agenda. I guess the first step is to go through Chapter 1. Feodora, I see that you're running the screen, so if you would go on to—yeah. I hope that I'm not breaking the rhythm that was prepared. So thank you very much for all the people that put their comments. I didn't see comments from everyone. Largely, I saw comments from, well, a few from John. I saw from Gabriel. I saw a number from Sarah. But I don't know that everybody commented. So just as a quick run here before we go into the details, did anybody not go through this and still wanted to go through this and comment? Do we need to expect more comments on this? Or did you say a piece? Paul, I believe that's a previous hand, so I'm going to give it to Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI: I'm sorry. I'm guilty as charged. I have not managed to comment. I generally didn't feel the need to make a comment. But now that I look at other comments, we will have to make comments. So if you can give us like a few days, I promise.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Do we say until the end of the week?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, that would be great. Thank you. I appreciate it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. That was fantastic. Gabriel, I see your hand up now.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you, Sebastien. I had a question with regards to some of the later bullets in Chapter 1, how much of the text that was there was placeholder, just noting that, like, hey, this is a topic that's expected to be expanded upon versus that was proposed as actual final text. I wasn't certain when I was reading it whether it was intended to be one or the other.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can you give me a minute?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can you guide Feodora which part of the text you were mentioning?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Sure. Scrolling down to, for example—okay. Now, actually, I see Sarah's comment here too, but scrolling down to, for example, in Observations 2.1, there's a number of pieces of text that have the square brackets around, and I see Sarah's comment that perhaps that's intended to be

then text that will be fleshed out/expanded upon potentially, or is that just purely meant to be that that was drafted by ICANN? I just want to clarify that I'm interpreting the brackets properly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Feodora, correct me if I'm wrong. But these are elements that ICANN, that staff, Feodora, not to name it, added to give context to the reader outside of this group. Whoever is going to read this is going to need a bit of context, stuff that we know and we take for granted that wasn't noted directly in our spreadsheet that are relevant to understand the context. Is that correct, Feodora?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thanks, Seb. That's correct. But just to add a bit more, nothing in the chapter is final yet. It was for all Standing Committee members to comment and recommend what should stay, what should be reworded, what should be removed. The green text, as Sebastien said correctly, was not taken from the workbook, but was added as additional context to provide non-Standing Committee members with more information and to make the report more user-friendly. So it's not necessarily going to be elaborated more on, but it's for the Standing Committee to say this can stay, or this should be removed, or whatever you think should happen with it. That's why it's green and in brackets because it's not from the workbook. The black text, however, is from the workbook, not word to word, but derived from it and adjusted for this chapter, but also not necessarily final, but for the Standing Committee members to comment on as well. Thanks.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you so much for that. And then I'm also taking away then that we expect the final text probably will be a lot of bullets included in just the format rather than paragraph narrative, which I'm totally fine with. I just want to make sure that that's kind of just what we're expected to look like then is this sort of bulleted summaries.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I personally don't have—I like bullet. It makes sense.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I do too. I'm comfortable with it but—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: People want to go through the motion of actually developing it into a full text. I'm happy to let them do it. But yeah, that's for the committee to decide. There's no preconception behind it. Again, my own personal preference is the bullet and short and sweet, but if others prefer reading proper, fully developing sentences, I'm not against that. I believe that answers your question.

I just want to go back two seconds to comments I've seen from Alan and Thomas following Farzaneh's request to have a bit more time to comment. This is all fine, but we all agree that then you get to do it this week. This doesn't mean that it's the final comment. It's just to be able to give Feodora then some time to sort of recoup everything, take all the comments on board, and give us a clean version or a version where

the comments have been taken on board. So we said this week. Again, we're not fully closing this. There will be other opportunities to comment and to work on it, but at least we give Feodora another iteration here.

I'm going through quickly the rest of the chat. A link to—so Mark gave that. It's all good. Notification. Thanks. Okay, we're all good.

Can we now go from the top? So the idea would be to go through the document and make sure that we've checked each other's comments. Again, if there's a few parties that haven't had time to comment yet, it's fair enough, but it might not be worth going through the exercise line by line. Can we go the other way around? Can I have a show of hands if anybody had one questions like Gabriel did, or had specific comments that they wanted to make sure that everybody noted and develop? Gabriel, I see your hand up again.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

I also see a question from Sarah in the chat, I'd like to hear the answer to as well. But my first one, just because it's on screen right now, is I note that in the overview of the ongoing RDRS metrics. Sebastien, both you and I have tried our hands at Sankey graph visualization, and I really like it, and I'd love to see us insert a Sankey visualization in here as we did previously. I don't know if it makes sense to do so for the one-year mark for the first year, or if we should wait to do one for when this report gets kind of closer to done, to do one for the absolute most current data that we've got, but I do want to put a placeholder in for

where we would put a Sankey visualization if there aren't objections from others.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I personally don't have any objections. No, I don't have any objections. I just want to make sure that then it's also that we have a narrative around it and that we agree to the narrative. Because it's very easy to use the same graph to prove that the flow works, and there's a million options, and a request has a life of its own, and lens, and our system drives these requests the way they should and use exactly the same graph to explain exactly the contrary, which is essentially that there's too many things that go in and too little that goes out. So I want to make sure that if we put the graph, we also agreed to put a narrative around it and agree to the narrative, which is probably living between those two statements that I made before.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

That's fair. Can I comment back, Sebastien, very briefly?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sure.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

In order to facilitate that then, perhaps it would make the most sense, even if it's just as a placeholder, to maybe insert the one year, the first year of already arrested Sankey ends that people can see what it looks like that we're talking about, noting that even if we choose later to

change that, to update it to be to date, at least the visualization won't change too much in terms of what kind of data it represents, right? And that would might enable people to start forming their thoughts on how to create narrative, if that is acceptable as a possible immediate path forward, just to include it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, I don't want to put you on the spot, but I seem to remember that you're probably the one that produced the latest version of it.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah, I think I had one for the first-year mark done. So I can take as a homework item to go back and find it. It was in a slide at minimum, I want to say, but I'll go back and I'll find it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If you can share that. As to the data, we're definitely not stopping, neither collecting nor reporting on the data. But we did agree with John and I and staff that we would, for now, work on this report on the basis of the one-year data that we're not going to constantly update the report month to month with the new data because we'll be chasing our tails, that we'll work with this data. Now, the report, initially we talked about in the February, is not realistic. It's going to take a bit longer. The report probably is going to come or we're trying to aim now to have it within the deadlines prior to ICANN83 in June. So, at some point in May. At that point, we may decide indeed that the data has moved enough to be relevantly to update it, and we probably will because it'll be another

five or six months. But at this point, we're not going to change the data every month. So, Gabriel, the report that you have, the one-year report that I've seen, indeed, you showing on slides in Turkey share that, and we'll put that as a placeholder and a placeholder for a text under. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Hello. I have a couple of points on this specific topic. What I understood you just said is that the report will be created looking at the data from one year of RDRS working, which is great. I really like having a defined period. With that in mind, three things should happen.

Number one, the report in the introduction needs to make it very clear that it is showing a specific snapshot and that the reporting is only until a certain time and not subsequent to that time. That should be clearly stated.

Number two, as you just suggested, Sebastien, before the report is finalized, we should look and see like, did the numbers change drastically, right? If we report that something was 80% at the end of the year and then later on it's 82%, I think that's fine. If it's later on 20%, that's a huge shift. We should make sure to look for that. And the report should say that we did so even if we don't change what the reported data is. Because otherwise, someone's going to look at it and say, "Well, did they check to see if it changed?" And we did check, so we should say so. Okay.

Number three, this is something I left comments on throughout the document. There are areas where it says things happen in the current

reporting period, in the most recent reporting period. Those will not be the current or most recent reporting periods if they're in December and the report comes out in June. So everywhere where it says that needs to be updated. I left some comments to that effect in the document, but I'm not sure if what I was saying made sense. So hopefully this now explains that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Super clear and 100% agreed. Yeah, reflects exactly the discussion that we had before. So we're working on the basis of the one year. If there's dramatic changes and we agree that they're relevant, we'll update the data before publishing. And to your last point, I hadn't noticed, but thank you for raising it. If it says the latest period, that's not the latest period, it's as of whenever that one year was, first of December and end of November, whenever we've chosen as marked. I see plus one from Gabriel. So, assuming that we're all pretty much in agreement here.

Good. Any other comments on this? I want to also call upon you, Feodora, since you're the one working and picking up all the comments, is there anything that you picked up that wasn't crystal clear?

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. So far, I've only worked with the comments made by you, John, and Sarah. The one made by Steve and Gabe, they arrived today, so I have no comment on them yet. The only remaining and most, let's say, important part is for the Standing Committee to review the recommendations and agree or not agree with them and indicate what should change or what should stay. Because that's, I understand,

the message the Standing Committee wants to convey with this report, and I think that's the most important part to consider. But the other comments were very helpful and were made the chapter definitely more user-friendly and better to work with. But that's it. Back to you, Seb.

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

SARAH WYLD: Sorry. Just a logistic thing. In terms of timing, I'm very happy to hear that more people will be leaving comments in the document, but I don't want to have to check back every day for updates. So can we pick a time when they'll all be in and then everybody else can go back and respond to the other people's comments without—you know what I mean? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. So that's why I said the end of week.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Sorry.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry. Yeah, I don't have a calendar in front of me, but that Friday. We all agree that we leave the document fully commented and ready for Feodora to integrate on Friday, COB, wherever COB might be,

depending on different people. But that means that indeed, you might have to not spend the week on it, but go back once or twice during the week, just to check if there can you comment that you haven't seen. Gabriel? I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:

Yeah, totally agree with all of that. I am guilty of having recent comments. So yes, guilty as charged. But then I also really appreciate your comment earlier, Sebastien, about the text. Even after it closes for Chapter 1, not being entirely immutable going forward. I think that as we go forward and do work on additional chapters, we might realize that, oh, you know what, actually something's implicated by this back in Chapter 1. And we might want to go back and have a chance to do a final like pass through based off of future work. I just want to make sure that we all have that shared understanding so that, for example, if that occurs to me in the future, that I don't ruffle feathers by the need to go back and suggest revised text as a result of something we discuss later. Is that something that I think we're all in agreement with? Or would that pose a problem to anyone?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No. I'm in agreement with you. I don't know about the others. But no, it seems fair. As long as we don't get into a constant iteration of comments, at some point we're going to have to stop. But so far, yes. This is not the only opportunity to comment this.

To Sarah's comment in the chat, yeah, obviously there is always somebody that's going to put a comment on the 11th hour. What I'm

saying, well, I guess there is a time check on this. What I mean by Friday COB is for Feodora to be able next week at the earliest, but I suppose that she's not going to start on Monday morning at 6:00 in the morning to be able to consider that document as fully commented and ready to go for next iteration. Yes, if somebody, at the very last hour of whatever, Pacific Time on the Friday, has a comment and might require us to have a look at it, a peek at it, on the weekend. And yeah, I don't want to make you guys work on the weekend, but sometimes it happens. There you go.

With this, I think that we need to move on anyway on the agenda. I think that we've said enough on this, go back to it. So it's not three people that need to go back on it to comment, but the whole group also to verify what those comments may be and what your comments might be on those comments. As all agreed, that will be the task for this week, and maybe we can then move on to Chapter 2, which I believe Feodora is going to walk us through.

FEODORA HAMZA:

Thank you, Seb. Actually, for Chapter 2, I have only an update. There is nothing to be shared just yet. But yes, the idea is now having also the proposed timeline in mind is to share in the coming days also draft Chapter 2 with the Standing Committee to review, and that chapter focuses on the system enhancements. But prior to that, and in addition to further commenting Chapter 1, we would kindly ask the Standing Committee team members to go back to the workbook for this particular chapter. And the reason is that we have some system enhancement proposals that have no marking. And for those, I would

like the respective owner to indicate if they want to revoke those or if they would like these system enhancements to be included in Chapter 2 as a potential future enhancement.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Just to make it very, very clear, Chapter 2 is about all those enhancements?

FEODORA HAMZA: Indeed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So before we go and have a document to review, can you go back to the spreadsheet and on the stuff that has your name? So yes, this is still a keeper, or no, this can go. As to the timing, I would suggest—Sarah, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I'm sorry, logistical. The spreadsheet is protected. I cannot edit it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see that you've just tried, and thank you for just trying and confirming that you can't. So good time to do it.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I don't know who's at the command behind that spreadsheet, but can you make sure that indeed then that field is something that can be changed?

Well, you warned us, Farzaneh. See you next time.

So, yeah, we'll get that fixed. I don't know how. I'm not an expert. We'll get that fixed. Oh, I see everybody jumping on it to see if they can indeed change it too. Good move.

So we agree for this week that go back to Chapter 1 and work on the spreadsheet. I think that logistically, Feodora, please don't complicate the matter. And Chapter 2 does need to come out until next week. Maybe you can divulge what you have so far next week and let us work on that whilst you're looking at Chapter 1 again. The only task for this group is then to go back to the spreadsheet and assign to maintain or call, whatever remains on those items.

So it's the Registrar and the Requester side, and so that everybody knows exactly what they're looking at. So it's those tabs one—no, it's just a tab called Registrar and tab called Requester. If you can scroll back to the top so everybody can see what they both look like. To go back to those requests you made, depending on who you are, on the Requester side, on the Registrar side, check for your name and see if there are still things that need to be changed.

Sarah says, "There was an interesting comment from John on Chapter 1. Should we talk about this?" What comment are we talking about? I'll

tell you if we can talk about it or not. No, we can talk about everything.
That was a joke. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. If you click on my face where it appears at the top of the screen, it will take you to where my cursor is in the document. Yeah, okay. Did it work?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You're a magician.

SARAH WYLD: Scroll down a little bit more because we want to see the comment on the words for "denial included". If you click on the words for "denial included," there where it's yellow at the top of the screen now—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Stop, stop, stop, stop. Second block on the—

SARAH WYLD: Yes, exactly. Okay. This is the comment that I was hoping we can talk about today. The reasons for denial, I thought, were taken from the statistics, the usage trends from the reporting. And yet I see that John is saying, "I don't think we can make this statement. The reasons are self-selected by registrars." Indeed, they are. But I think if we're at the point of questioning whether the self-selected reasons are accurate, then that's sort of a bigger and different issue. And then listing all the

reasons and dropping a footnote about them, I'm not opposed to that. I think that might be an interesting thing to do, but here we're talking about the main reasons. So I'm not really sure where to go with this, but I thought it might be interesting to raise. And thank you, John, for providing food for thought. Okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: John, do you want to give a bit of background? I'm catching you unaware. A bit of background on this?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Sure. I guess my point is that we might need to drop a footnote. I definitely think the reasons and the statistics there, the counts are what they are. But because it was just a handful of options for registrars, I don't believe that a lot of thought were going into the real reasons. Like a lot of mine, I received denials because they said my request was incomplete, but there was never any proof that it wasn't complete. And I can tell you, all my requests were complete. I'm joking. But the reasons then never were able to verify. Actually, not the reasons. The explanations were never really able to verify the reasons, because typically there'd be a like a laundry list. I just don't want there to be a belief in the community that there were 500 incomplete cases when I know that's not the case. It was just what was selected. So I'm concerned how this is going to look. Now, we can handle that with a footnote or something like that, but we need to provide a little bit more color on this. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see Paul's hand, and then Sarah, assuming that, John, you've already had your moment.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes. Thanks, Seb. I totally get where Sarah's coming from. I also understand what John is saying. And I think footnote might—I don't know if somebody will read a footnote, right? So why don't we just soften this and just say the main reasons provided by registrars for denying the request are? And that way we just say these are the reasons that the registrars believe the request should have been denied, but it doesn't admit anything in terms of whether or not those reasons are good reasons or misapplied or anything else. And we can leave it up to the reader to put their bias on top of it, right? I think we just soften this a little bit. I bet you do it. Thanks.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I think I'm open to Paul's suggestion. I guess I would want to think about it a little bit more. It just really bothers me that people within this group might suggest that the reasons documented are not correct, right? I don't think anybody's intending that. And if the issue here is that what's noted as an explanation doesn't well correspond to the reason that is an option in the drop-down menu, then maybe that's feedback that some groups should be providing to the system of we should update the reasons to make them match better the actual

explanation that people type. If you think there's not enough options for reasons, we can work on that. But I don't think it's appropriate to suggest that the people documenting those reasons were incorrect or were documenting inaccurately what they were doing. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks. I was thinking much along Paul's lines. I was going to propose main reasons selected by registrars for denial included. Just as middle ground, I'll note that, Alan, through our text as well. It seems like there's probably middle ground that'll make people happy.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Paul, I see your hand again. And then I'm going to raise my hand but I don't see in the room—I can't find how to raise a hand. So I'm going to do it like this. But go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Marc is suggesting what Alan suggested, what I was trying to suggest less eloquently, is that we can remain agnostic about whether or not the reasons are accurate or inaccurate. I don't think anybody is saying that they know for sure that the reasons given weren't good reasons or inaccurate. There would be zero way for this committee to know that because these are not run through us. We were not privy to what was filed, what was requested, and what the responses were. We're just

looking at this data and the aggregate. And so I think we just need to be agnostic about it and say these are the reasons provided by registrars, right? And we're not taking a position about accuracy or inaccuracy, one way or the other. That way, everybody keeps their powder dry for whatever it is they're worried about. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. John?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. I'm fine with where we're headed in terms of softening it. I think maybe what I would ask is let's put all of the reasons for denial in here. Let's not combine lack of response with request. I don't think anybody on this call—maybe Sarah can—but tell us what were the selected options? I've got a sneaking suspicion one of them isn't the registrar did the balancing test and just didn't agree with my request, and so they would check incomplete request or something like that as a reason for denial. I think we need to list all of the reasons if that's the case as they are for the registrars to select. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, John. Sarah, sorry, but I did put my hand up even virtually or actually physically. I just had a question to staff here, because maybe I'm naive, but request incomplete, I would hope, would trigger some kind of conversation between the requester and the registrar. It's incomplete. What else can I submit here to make it more complete? And there was this whole discussion a month ago, two months ago,

about going back to the data and where we closed on something that wasn't finished because we have selected to have monthly data, that if things moved on the next month, that we were able to sort of correct the previous. I see Lisa's hand immediately hopefully to answer that.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks. It's my understanding, just from feedback I've gotten, and even other registrars I've spoken to in terms of the user experience interviews, which, by the way, that report should be ready probably later this week, that registrars are taking everything at face value and that there's not a lot of communication, if any, happening outside of RDRS for anything that happens in terms of the denial reasons, etc. So everybody's taking it at face value. If they got what they needed, great, but they're not necessarily reaching out to requesters for clarification.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. We can consider that answer to be as far as the registrars that you spoke with is final and not something that is sort of in the hiatus with a ticket open or something like that. Thank you. John, I believe this is your previous hand. I haven't seen it flashing on and off, so I'll give it to Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Yeah, well, I'm not in any way opposed to the idea of including all the different reasons for denial along with the number or percentage or both. I do notice that in this section, it seems to be like

high-level trends rather than all the metrics. So I'm not sure where is the best place, but in the report, yeah. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I heard that we might change the phrasing of the main reason for denying included and add the fact that it's from a registrar answer, and then potentially adding all, or at least all the relevant, all the ones that have been used answers in that list. Thank you, Sarah, for raising that.

Now I've completely lost track of what the agenda was all about. So maybe, if there's no further question on this, I believe that we gave the update on the draft to Chapter 2. So, again, please go to the spreadsheet, reevaluate your ideas on what needs and what doesn't need to go forward in terms of recommended development, and we'll include that in Chapter 2. That is, they will come to you sometime next week. Actually, I'm saying that. Feodora, correct me if that's not feasible, but I would assume sometime next week.

And with that, there was a point through RDRS registrar enhancements. I guess that goes to you, Lisa.

LISA CARTER:

That is me. Thanks, Seb. Just for everyone's awareness, the last request or enhancement for registrars was the ability to update the Request category. This was as a reminder because registrars were finding that some requesters were selecting categories, for example, as law enforcement requests when they were not. This now allows them the flexibility to change the request to more line with the proper title that

was released actually last week on the 21st. So that's available now. It will work very similarly to how the selection for priority works that registrars can change as well. And so metrics will be updated accordingly. If the registrar changes the Request category, it would subtract that label in the stats and add it to whatever new label the registrar has indicated. So that's available now. And the User Guide has been updated to reflect that as well. Any questions for that one?

And then, just as I kind of mentioned, if there's no questions for that one, we're finalizing the report for the user interviews. I'm hoping to have that ready by the end of the week. It might be next.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Before you get into that, again, this is the last enhancement that we all agreed that we would put in this pilot. So that's the hard line behind it. Everything above and beyond that should definitely be included in that Chapter 2 but will not be developed within the framework of this pilot. Is that correct, Lisa?

LISA CARTER:

The only other outstanding thing that's in process now is Gabe's item seven on the Requester tab, which is the work on the frontend solution he's doing with his colleagues on law enforcement. That's still in progress.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Thank you for the precision and the correction. Okay. So now I'll let you go with the user interviews.

LISA CARTER: Just really brief on that one. Again, looking to have that finalized end of this week, probably available to you guys early next week, so it'll be a report basically on the outcome and responses that I got doing those interviews. And also, just to let you know, we'll be doing those interviews again for ICANN82 in Seattle as well. Any questions on that one?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Maybe a quick peek. I guess we can wait for another week, but just that more time we have. Is there any major party in the community-wide side that you wish you had been able to talk with and that we can organize if it takes a bit of time prior to Seattle?

LISA CARTER: There's only three registrars that gave feedback. I think it would be good to have more registrar feedback. There were nine interviews total. Six requesters came to me, but if we could have a matching number of registrars, I think that would be helpful. If we could convince Tucows maybe, Sarah, to jump in on that, that would be good. And then any others, any other people who can convince some registrars to meet with us, that would be great.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Well heard. And I hope that Sarah heard it too, and we can work on it. Fair enough. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I assume you're not reinterviewing people. You're interviewing people that you haven't had a chance to interview, right?

LISA CARTER: Yes, new people. Yes, new people.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: New people, good. Sarah will obviously work with you on that. Then item four on the related events. We talked about it very, very briefly, but you had more to say, and that's back to you, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Yes, sure. There were two specifically. And now at the top of my head, there's actually a third, but I'll go over the first two. There are two events coming up, one on the 12th and one on the 19th, where there will be sessions related to RDRS. The first one is on the 12th on the February APTLD87 in Hong Kong. Specifically, I was told, really, the audience will be ccTLDs, and the name of the session is Plowing or Kowtowing Challenges of Managing Law Enforcement Information Requests. I've recruited Gabe to help with that session. So we'll try to do an overview of RDRS in general. And then there'll be a section that can be covered related to ccTLDs working with law enforcement in general outside of

RDRS, so it's more broad. And then we'll do a section that's kind of on a discussion and education for ccTLDs on what it would take to participate in a future version of RDRS, some of the technical things that need to be addressed, etc. So there's that on the 12th.

And then the 19th is the M3AAWG 63 in Portugal, which I found out is only in-person and no remote participation allowed. We don't have any ICANN staff that will be there, but I did have a conversation with Rod Rasmussen about him taking notes and sending a read-out back to ICANN of what happens in that session, and then potentially doing a follow-up focus group with some of the participants reviewing the feedback and having discussion. I thought also it might be helpful if maybe one or two people from the Standing Committee could be participants in that follow-up focus group to kind of hear what their feedback is, etc. So he and I have not agreed upon a date that would happen, but sometime, probably before the next M3AAWG meeting which I think is in June. So between now and June, we would do that focus group. And that's the third one. That session, again, is all based on feedback, strictly devoted to what can we tell ICANN about how to improve RDRS. And then the last one—go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

For the record, I try to get a free passage to Portugal just to be able to participate to this non-remote participation adventure. But that's not going to happen. But please do get me in for the read-out or the comments afterwards. I'd be interested.

LISA CARTER: Perfect. We'll do, we'll do. Then the last one, and I don't know if you all want to talk about it, but I know Steve has his event coming up on the 6th.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think that we agreed not to. He's done a fantastic job promoting it so we'll leave it at that.

LISA CARTER: Okay. That's actually all I had, unless there's other questions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, that's perfect. Thank you very much. Which leads us to AOB with nine minutes to go and no AOB to go to. So, unless there are questions, pressing comments, or anybody that wants to discuss anything, I'm more than happy to give you another nine minutes of your life. Today is my seven-year-old's birthday, so I will use that time well and spend it with him. Calling once, twice. Well, you won yourself eight minutes of your day. Have a fantastic time and talk to you all in two weeks. Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks all.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]