JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 28th of July 2025.

Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now.

All right. And 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.

With that, I will turn it back over to you, Seb. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie, and good evening, afternoon, morning, night to everybody. So today and possibly the next session or two is going to be a bit special. As you would have seen, we are extending our sessions to two hours, hoping that everybody can stay with us and animate the conversations. But given the amount of conversations that we've had in the last few weeks on points that still need to be discussed, we decided to extend the duration of

the sessions rather than adding more and more sessions (we're already at once a week); all this to meet our deadlines and make sure that we have something to present in August for public comment until mid-September.

I fully understand that some of you may not be able to participate in the whole extended two hours. That's all right. I appreciate the time that you can spend on this and the flexibility and we'll try to do our best. But I expect that some of you might need to drop out and possibly drop and come back in. We'll be here and we'll be pushing forward. If it turns out (I don't think that we will, but if it turns out) that we go through the document faster than expected, obviously we'll go back to the normal cadence. But in the meantime, I think that we need this time to be able to get to it.

Exactly. So that's what I expected, Paul (people walking in and out), but it's all right. It's all right. We'll manage and we'll make sure that we're able to cover all the points that we need to cover.

With this said (and let me check very quickly with my notes if I didn't forget anything major), I think that the way we're going to do this is I'm going to pass it on to Feodora, who's been masterfully compiling all our input into this big document, which she had now time to review and comment (and I've seen many of you comment [on]), and walk us through the different points of comment that she wants us to discuss to make sure that she has a full picture of what we want to say in the document and then go

on and draft that for us. And so without further ado, Feodora, if you want to walk us through point by point and then I'll come back to lead the conversation. Go ahead, Feodora.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Good day, everyone, and good evening and good morning. Thank you all for providing your comments into the review document. You can see we made already some changes, as what is marked as green has been marked as addressed as a comment. So we will focus today on the main comments that have not been discussed at all and are also part of assignment four that need consensus because as announced during last week's call or email, we will be paying special attention to the comments made for assignment four, aka the chapter four part, in the report, and staff will try to address other comments not related necessarily to that chapter throughout the week.

So that's what has happened and you will see that some have been resolved after discussing with the respective owner of the comment. But the main comment that we need to discuss now is the first (and sorry for all the scrolling): the recommendation on financing the system. Gabe and Ellen have made some comments on that they think, if I understand correctly, this should not be necessarily a recommendation, but focus more on facts and figures. But Sarah made a comment that actually this is the role of the standing committee. So I would hand over to Seb to discuss

how to proceed in the best way here. And I'm sharing the link of the document in the chat. Thanks, Seb, you already did.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, did you want me to take the conversation now?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes, [to] either Gabe and Ellen and Sarah to just present their views and also the others to either say they agree with keeping the recommendation or they agree or disagree with changing. So that's kind of what we are looking for right now. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, Feodora, can you go back to the top of the comment? So you're talking about the comment that is on lines 193 and 212 of the document? The one that is on screen now?

FEODORA HAMZA: Yes, correct.

`

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, good. Gabriel, I'll see your hand up. Go ahead.

GABE ANDREWS: I think when I'm looking at the document now, the lines might have shifted. It might now be 199 through 207, but it's recommendation 5 on financial standard. sustainability. And this is not a new comment that I've made, but in the past I've suggested that different constituencies have different interpretations of how to look at the data that's been presented and that, given that we had such contrary opinions on how to interpret it, my preference was that we avoid interpretation so we don't have to have each of us articulate our own and have contrary viewpoints one after the other, in favor of perhaps instead just having the clear facts in terms of how much was spent on what categories of expenditures and so forth.

So the re-issuance of that viewpoint here in comment was just seeking to keep in line with that. But if the standing committee does view that we want to have different constituencies' interpretations, then I would imagine that we'll have to draft our own to add alongside this. I felt that, however, it was easier and perhaps more agreeable to all to simply strike this text noting that it does not represent consensus viewpoints as I understand it. Over.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I don't think it represents consensus. Moreover, I don't think it is within our scope to do this. We are certainly supposed to be talking about the recommendations, whether they should be adhered to in some future system, and that is appropriate. To say that we should be following recommendation 14, a recommendation which the Board has not approved, in the RDRS continuation, pending some new system, I think is, number one, inappropriate. We're saying let's implement a recommendation that the Board hasn't approved. So I don't think there's any basis for referencing 14 in terms of this system.

Moreover, we're taking a system which has not been particularly well received by the overall community, is still not mandated for use by registrars, and we're saying we're going to put a charge on it (perhaps a large charge), and I think we're simply saying we're going to kill it. And if that's what we're doing, let's just recommend to kill it and not use some arcane methodology to make it look like it's not our fault. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Alan, on the point that it is a recommendation that hasn't been adopted by the Board, to my understanding, none of them have. So, we're picking and choosing the things that we think should survive.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we are picking and choosing the things we should survive in this future new system in the sky, but that's not what we're talking about in this particular recommendation. We're talking about the continuation of RDRS pending some new system that we should put a charge on

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. And so I understand your point of view, any charge at whatever level, even if it's just to create a habit of having a service that is charged and not free, is unpalatable? It's unpalatable until we have the successor system and there may not be any time … There might not be any line in the sand as to … It might be a progression until we get to a system that might be constantly evolving itself, and we may never be …

So what I'm trying to understand is, is this a final-final? It should be for free forever? Or do in your view there is, somewhere, something that will merit it being paid for?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that the RDRS continuation … Until the Board decides that the RDRS is the future system and it is the Board-approved system going forward forever and ever (amen), I believe it should not have a charge. If we are talking about a token charge of $1.50 per request, that's a different question. This whole section is talking about the registrars ("Registrars should not pay for it. It

must be a charge system"), which presumably means a cost recovery or mostly cost recovery. If we're talking about a modest token charge, that's a different issue, which I'll have to consider.

And by the way, Sarah at the last meeting she was at, asked, is that my personal opinion or that of At-Large? And I said it was my personal opinion because I had not checked with them. I have since checked with them, and it is an At-Large position at this point.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I think Alan just said something really interesting in there that I hadn't previously heard expressed, which was that the concern about charges is a concern until the Board decides to keep RDRS or to not keep it and do something else. And so I think maybe that is some of where this conversation broke down and some of where there is perhaps mistaken understanding of what other people think.

So the RDRS was intended as a pilot to gather data. It's a pilot to gather data, and that work is done. That's what the Board and the council agreed to do. And in that context, as a pilot, there was no expectation of cost recovery.

I'm actually going to pause. I do have more thoughts on this, but Alan says I misunderstood him. And I think it's really important that we do understand each other. So I want to just dwell on this concept for a minute. What I thought Alan had just said was that the RDRS cannot have billing until the Board makes a decision about whether some future system has billing, and that future system might be the RDRS or it might be something else. Is that not what you had intended, Alan?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And go ahead, Alan. Skip the queue.

ALAN GREEBNERG: Okay, thank you. We don't know what will come out of this following GNSO deliberations: probably more policy work and then a Board decision. It could conceivably be RDRS with more widgets on it. And that RDRS with more widgets on it may well have a price depending on what the policy recommendation says and whether the Board agrees with it. The RDRS, as we're talking today with perhaps an API on it or one or two other little bells and whistles, which will be in use until a new system is decided on, which could conceivably be a son or daughter of RDRS (or it might be something completely different) is in place until a future decision is made and, I believe, should be uncharged.

If, following a long deliberation process and probably more policy work, we end up with something which we can still call the RDRS for one reason or another, it may have a charge on it. That's the system in the future. But for the next several years while this work is pending, I believe it should not be charged. I believe it should not be charged at least until it is mandated for all registrars and registries to be used, as was the intent with the original SSAD. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you for clarifying that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And at least that sets a tangible line. If, for you, the financial sustainability rules apply at the same time as mandatory participation, at least it's a very clear line there.

Okay, back to you, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you very much. Thank you, Alan. That was a very helpful clarification. We're still not in complete agreement, but I now feel that I understand you better, and we are closer to agreement, which is better. That's good.

So I still think it might be useful to think about where specific changes we are going to recommend in this report would require dedication of resources. One of them is building an API, which I think Alan also just mentioned. Another one is adding a link to RDRS in our RDAP responses. So just keep those examples in mind as I speak.

Where a change will cost money, those funds cannot only come out of the ICANN Supplemental Fund for Implementing Policy, which has so far been the source of funding for RDRS. We do believe that those changes must be funded by requester fees with supplementary funding from ICANN, as described in recommendation 14.

Where a change requires policy development and implementation, especially as we are working to prioritize this against many other policy commitments, we also need to be careful to consider if that work that we are recommending is intended for the RDRS or for something else that's a long-term system or both. And that's not the same as dedicating funding, but we need to keep in mind that human resources, people's time and expertise, is also limited and also valuable. The RDRS might be the permanent long-term solution. It might not be. There might be something else that is required for everybody.

But either way, regardless, the RrSG is concerned about the level of resources, which is financial resources and human resources,

being dedicated to improving this system without considering whether those improvements have long-term value and utility. Thank you.

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

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I raised my hand, actually, because I wasn't sure I understood Alan's position and comments. And I think Sarah's questions and Alan's clarifications have helped me understand it better. And also, thank you to Sarah. I thought your explanation was very helpful in understanding your position. I don't think I appreciated that before.

All of that is to say this has given me a lot to think about. I'm rereading recommendation 5 here that's on the screen, and I guess this recommendation doesn't say what I initially thought it said. And so what I now understand is that we aren't making it … This is separate from our recommendations to keep, modify or delete existing recommendations. But rather this is more related to the continued operation of the RDRS system to the extent that it's maintained as a stopgap measure until a more permanent solution is in place.

And so I don't know if I have a point in there so much as just to say thank you to Alan and Sarah for the continued discussion and comments on that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve Crocker, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Just a small but important point. I heard the notion of a token charge as one possibility conveyed with the sort of implication that this would just be a small matter as opposed to a big matter. Putting any kind of charging mechanism in at all is a very, very big deal just in terms of implementation and management and operation at all. So whether or not it's a penny or a dollar or $100, you start with a huge, huge cost in a lot of ways.

Maybe one thing to make this vivid is the old telephone system where you paid by the call. One third of the entire system was billing.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. And whilst ICANN is completely set up to invoice registries and registrars on a regular basis, to my knowledge, there is no system running that charges the public big or small amounts like that. So, yeah, it's a significant bit of infrastructure that we're

inventing there. There's other ways to do it. Obviously, you can invoice somebody to prepay a number of requests or so on, but I agree with you, Steve, that a token fee on a system like that will cost a lot more to develop than it would ever erase.

STEVE CROCKER: Even if you just keep track and bill in bulk, you still would be keeping track of every transaction, et cetera.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I fully agree with you. Alan, I see your hand back up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of very brief comments. Number one, I really like Marc's term, the stopgap system. That says it is something pending some new other system, or at least some other decisions. And perhaps that term captures what we want to differentiate the before and after.

In terms of charging, I said I hadn't considered it, but I will give a gut feeling. Any token charge, if it's small enough to be a token charge, will almost surely cost ICANN more to build and to administer than to get back. And the concept of we're going to do this and cost ICANN money just to get people used to it, I think, is a really inappropriate idea.

And moreover, even a small charge … And by the way, I presume we would charge upfront with a credit card charge before you make the request, not billing afterwards. The concept of invoicing and then following up on bad debts for token charges is just ridiculous. But even that, I think, will dampen the enthusiasm for this system to the extent that it even exists. So I don't think getting people used to charging has any merit whatsoever. That is a personal opinion, not verified with At-Large. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Two thoughts. First thought: the RrSG can live with the text on screen in recommendation five. I don't love it. I don't think it goes far enough, but we can live with it.

Thought number two: building a billing mechanism is going to take time. It is not rocket surgery, but it is complicated. And it will have costs. Payment processing is not free of charge. I think we should recommend that work begins on creating billing functionality. And either that functionality plugs into the RDRS, if that's what we're going to keep using, which is what we have recommended (that we'll keep using it until something else happens), or it plugs into whatever is the next thing. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. Feodora, I have a good idea what you want to talk about. But go ahead, Feodora.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I just wanted to try to maybe summarize what has been said (and you are already nodding) and just suggest what we could potentially change based on my understanding of the discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Exactly. But the aim of the game is to finish with wording with the text that you see on your screen. And please, let's help Feodora find the right words to put the paper.

FEODORA HAMZA: So what I'm understanding is that the SC agrees that once policy deliberation have taken place, and a new or successor system (whatever the name of it might be) that charges on that can be placed … But the current RDRS should have no charge. And the system that is mandatory should have charges for the requesters. So we could change the text on screen, adjusting to those assumptions or discussion points. Of course, that will be more elaborated on than I just put it or just in the way I winged it, but I hope I'm understanding more or less correctly where the Standing

Committee wants to go, understanding that current RDRS, even if it continues post-pilot, while Council and Board deliberate, will be free of charge and borne by ICANN. But after that and after a decision has been made and once a mandatory system is in place, the standing committee recommends a self-sustained or financing system. So I'm back to the group for their discussion.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Feodora, for reminding everybody of that. Gabriel, go ahead.

GABE ANDREWS: I still favor deletion of the text rather than altering it. That's where I stand on it.

To that point, however, if there is a desire to include text here and to represent multiple different constituency viewpoints, I think that I can offer an alternative and perhaps an additional learning that comes out of the RDRS experiment, and that is encapsulated in my margin comment there in the second paragraph. But I'll just state it for the record here too: one of the key learnings that we've seen is that there's been a degree of self-organization amongst the request requester groups and in particular amongst law enforcement to try to take on board some of the most expensive anticipated costs associated with the SSAD, at least as contemplated in the original design assessment. That is the costs

associated with authenticating the requesters. And this is a non-trivial amount of work and effort that's going into this. And it is a good-faith effort to try to acknowledge that that there's a role for the requesters to play here to take on some of that, that work and that labor and that expense. And it is something I'm not sure is being treated in this section as it's currently written at all. And I think it represents a shared shouldering of all the expense that could go into a successor system.

And so this is something that I think perhaps deserves a bit more attention in any contemplation of how costs can be shared amongst the community in a successor system and the way that I would expect that[.] If there is a desire to keep text here in recommendation five, I would imagine that I'm going to have to come back with additional text to put in here alongside the viewpoints of those that perhaps don't align with our own. Over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Gabriel, I appreciate the point. It's true. And it will make a difference in the end. Again, from memory, the authentication part of the ODA was about half of the total cost. So it does make a big difference.

I'm not sure how to do this without also having them to recognize other parties' investments. And in particular, I'm thinking right now that the registrars, the registries, haven't started integrating

with this and who are also finding to invest in their own systems to make sure that they match this or having to handle double entry, et cetera.

So I don't know that it's a conversation that we want to slip into, but I understand, and everybody appreciates the work that you've been leading with law enforcement to make sure that our system doesn't have to bear the brunt of that cost and that you're able to bring your know-how and your methods to make it more efficient.

Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. I raised my hand to comment on Feodora's summary there. I think I want to put in a little bit of reminder. We have the table down a little bit. And if whoever's driving could scroll down … Let's see. Page 2023 has recommendation 14 on financial sustainability. And so just maybe a reminder that we have a little bit of overlapping topics here. And so here we have our language, which is sort of the recommendation on what to do with the existing asset financial sustainability recommendation. And what I think I heard from Fedora sort of overlapped a little bit, conflated, Rec 5 from our report with Rec 14 of the SSAD recommendations.

And so I think we need to be careful when we're drafting that we keep the two points separate and not conflate our

recommendation five on financial sustainability with the SSAD recommendation 14 and what to do with that recommendation, if that makes sense. So hopefully that's helpful feedback for Feodora.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, Marc, don't go. So concretely, what is your suggestion, apart from not conflating?

MARC ANDERSON: Well, I think some of what I heard Feodora say amounted to language on what to do with the SSAD Rec 14 on financial sustainability, not just on the Rec 5 RDRS financial sustainability. And so I guess I'm asking Feodora not to conflate the two in rec 5. And so if we're talking about what to do with SSAD rec 14, it should go here on the table. And if we're talking about what to do with RDRS financial sustainability, then that should go in rec 5. And I think we need to keep the two points separate. And Feodora's summary, I think, at least from my listening, covered both concepts.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, I'll give the mic to Feodora right now (sorry, Alan) because she raised her hand directly as you were giving that comment.

EN

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Marc. Thank you, Seb. That is good to have that further clarified. My intention was just to summarize what I heard from the standing committee wanting to change on that recommendation. But I understand (and it seems I understood wrong) that this recommendation five in the report from the standing committee relates to this table because I think it was a comment from one of the standing committee members saying financial sustainability should be in addition to the table as a separate recommendation. So I saw the link there, and from the conversation, I understood there will be a link. But if it's not the case, then that's good clarification. Thank you, Marc.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And if I may, I see another issue that now I'm getting confused about. If recommendation 5 is about the sustainability of RDRS, presumably before a successor system, which would be covered by SSAD (so by Rec 14), where are we standing as a committee on that sustainability? Do we want to find some level of sustainability even before we get to the successor system? Do we want to wait until something is affirmed about the success of system, including with mandatory participation [and] other thresholds there, to make the system used by everybody? What's our stand? Now I'm getting a bit confused.

I assume the CPH and the NCSG want to see some level of sustainability as early as possible to avoid, again … And this is just

to make it clear to everybody: the ICANN budget is not just ICANN's budget, but it's the ICANN budget that is funded essentially by registrants who pay their fees to registries and registrars who in turn pay their fees to ICANN. So in that sense, we are making registrants pay for the system. And I don't know that we need to argue all night about where that comes from, but that's the main issue.

So again, from my understanding, are we saying, in the interim until a successor system (let's call it SAD because we don't have any better name right now), do we want to find some level of sustainability? Do we want no sustainability because we believe they will kill it? Or do we want it fully sustainable because that was Rec 14 in the first place?

And there I'll give the chain back to Alan, even though I saw Marc and Sarah raising their hands, obviously wanting to answer to me. But Alan, you're in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Marc raised part of what I was going to say; if I understood Feodora's comment (and I think I did), it is saying there should be no charge with this interim system, the stopgap system, the pre-SSAD system, and that we are recommending that recommendation 14 be maintained for the follow-on system.

EN

"The recommendation be maintained" does fit in the section on recommendation 14 later, so we don't need to say it here, which changes recommendation 5 to say there should be no charge for this stopgap system. At that point, the title "financial sustainability" is no longer appropriate. So either we omit it altogether because we're not making recommendations on every status quo issue. So we can omit it or we can change the title and say there should be no charge if we're mapping to what Feodora said, which is what I believe we should be saying.

I think we already talked about whether there should be some sort of interim charge, a token charge or whatever. I believe there should not be. At-Large believes there should not be.

So, going on to Gabe's comment of noting that law enforcement is saying that maybe they will cover the cost, I'll point out that's exactly what the SSAD recommendation said. It said that accreditation should be self-funding. The ODP presumed that there would be charges to the entities being accredited to cover that cost, but there was nothing in the SSAD recommendation which said that the organization (be it law enforcement, world governments, or the Intellectual Property Community) could have decided that they are going to fund the accreditation program completely, and that's wholly within the recommendations. So I'm not sure that's a departure from them, but it is a departure from

what the ODP presumed, which I believe was faulted in that and a number of other ways. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. Sebastien brought up the CPH position, so I wanted to just sort of raise my hand to clarify where the RySG is on the topic. And so the RySG supports Rec 14 for SSAD, and we supported we supported a pilot that would be funded by ICANN. However, we requested that the standing committee consider if introducing billing as sort of a phase two or a follow-on phase made sense as a way of evaluating demand for user-pays type system. And so the RySG did not take a firm position either way on whether there should be billing or whether the RDRS pilot should be self-sustained, but rather it asked us, the standing committee, to consider that topic and make a decision as to if it made sense on a follow-on face. So that's sort of been a long-standing RySG position. And I think in this conversation we're basically talking about that.

And I think we heard from Alan that his position, the ALAC's position, is that, no, RDRS should not introduce billing short of mandatory participation by registrars. And I think that's a clearly articulated position.

And I think Steve Crocker brought up a great point: that introducing a billing system adds cost and complexity. And so that may be a losing proposition.

I've personally (and this is not an RySG position) wondered how, if there was a fee, even if it's a sort of a nominal fee, that would impact participation in the RDRS. And I've often wondered if that would make sense as sort of a phase two.

But just to clarify, the RySG doesn't have an official position that it should or should not include billing but rather has asked the standing committee to consider the topic. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. Sarah, see you hand up.

SARAH WYLD: So there's no charge for the pilot. Recommendation 14 should be considered if and when this goes beyond the pilot. If the RDRS remains as it is with no changes, then fine, let ICANN fund it as they have been with no changes. But building in changes will cost money, and that should adhere to Recommendation 14.

To the idea that billing would kill the system, that's really interesting. The agreement by the working group was that there should be funding on a cost recovery basis. So if we think that billing to recover costs would result in people not using the

service anymore, then that means that we think that that initial recommendation is actually wrong. Is that what we think? That's not what I think. I think that if a system is provided, then it should include billing. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, I see Alan's hand up. Go ahead. And then there was a comment made in the chat that I wanted to answer. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll be very quick. I'm not going to answer whether the future SSAD should have charging or not. That's a discussion for the future, which this group can make a recommendation on, but the decision will come eventually through other bodies.

But just to be clear, I am not agreeing with what Sarah said: that if we need some enhancements to make the system more viable, which we've known all along (an API, for instance), then I do not believe we should be trying to recover those costs. I believe that's part of continuing this stopgap system and making it slightly more viable. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So I'm not opening the debate on recommendation 14 of the SSAD. That stays, and we may put our own views on it. But that stays.

For recommendation 5 of the financial sustainability of RDRS, as going forward after November 2025, as Lisa quoted earlier, and until an SSAD exists, I'm be hearing two different parties, one that says (and it's about half the crowd) it should have financial sustainability at least to cover the further cost of development, potentially cover the maintenance of the system … This is not free. Even if the development doesn't move, there's still servers and people to pay for. So there's one half of the room that says that needs to be financially sustainable and paid by requests. And the other half that says no.

So essentially, there's two ways to go about it. One, we can recognize that we do not have consensus on this. Do we want to develop the two points of view and put names or names of groups behind it and show the divergent point of view? Because, well, I personally think that there are good points to both, and it could be interesting to the next group taking over after us, even if it's us. Or do we try to find a consensus here to have something to say?

At this point, from the last round of comments that I've heard, we can't even agree on the title of this recommendation. And I'm very sorry. I'm bad at following chat at the same time as I'm

talking. I'll give a minute or two for people to raise their hands if they want to comment on where we're going here with the consensus call here.

But in the meantime, I'll answer Gabriel. Yes, indeed, the … Where was your comment? Yes, the pilot has brought already valuable data, et cetera. I don't think we're discussing in any case paying backward for the investment up till now. We're talking about the period post-November 2025. Again—oh, Gabriel, I see you have your hand up. Go ahead.

GABE ANDREWS: Yeah, just to expand on that comment in the chat, Seb, I think it's valuable to the GNSO and/or the Board both to know what sort of ongoing expenses might be associated with the further maintenance of an RDRS. And so even if we as a group and as a standing committee don't find consensus to offer any sort of recommendations or smaller recommendations on the big-R Rec 14, I think we're still providing valuable information for a future party to consider Rec 14 with. And I just don't feel that that is non-trivial.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no, I agree with you. And that's in another chapter. Now that the document has been completely rejigged, I don't know what that chapter is going to be called, but it's in that section where

staff already put estimations, and they were going to fine-tune those estimations before we sent it for public comment.

I see some +1s to Sarah, but I'm sorry I didn't … Sarah, do you want to voice the comments? I can't follow both.

SARAH WYLD: It's the same in the chat as we have said verbally. So I'm not … I don't know how to … I don't know. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Farzaneh, I see hand up.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah. So I just want to support whatever Sarah is saying. We are fine with the paragraph that has been written. It's very narrowly defined. I don't know what the problem is, and we need to address the issue of financial sustainability because the people outside of this SC will read the reports and they're like, ["]How are we gonna fund this and how is it going to happen?["] as if like we haven't thought about it. And I think this paragraph is really perfect.

But I understand that you want to do a call for consensus, so I just wanted to say that we support the paragraph to stay in.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. I don't need to make a call now-now. I need to make sure that Feodora is able to sleep tonight and not panic with the amount of stuff to be done. But I don't need a call now. I just need to flag the fact that here I'm hearing two completely opposite views. And I think I understand the people that are okay with the text, and I understand the people that are not. And again, at this point, even the title just seemed to find consensus.

So given the fact that we've spent already 45 minutes on this, do we want to park this? But I don't know how to highlight it and say we need to find some middle way. Or it'll have to be out and left in other comments elsewhere.

Gabriel, one last on this topic and then we'll move on.

GABE ANDREWS: Oh, it's just a question for you and Fedora then. If there is a desire to retain texts, do you want me to go ahead and draft some of the other texts that I had referred to before that I've been refraining from doing because I thought it'd be easier just to not have dueling viewpoints? Because otherwise—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do.

GABE ANDREWS: Okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't guarantee that we'll make it to the final, but please do so people actually can comment on it.

With this, Feodora, it's back to you. And I see you … Are you trying to drive us to the next point already?

FEODORA HAMZA: So I just added to what we discussed right now (that we want to discuss it again), and staff won't make any changes to the current text, but Gabe will provide some more language to be considered again. That's my current understanding.

As for the next comment to be discussed—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, before we get there (because I see the comment on the chat from Farzaneh), yeah, it's going to be very hard. And so if there is no consensus, it just doesn't make it to the consensus section of the document. We'll still find a different point of view and what we've heard in the other parts of the document, but on how it works, people are going to read the executive summary.

They're going to read the recommendations. And all the rest is going to be there for those that do take the time of reading this with a fine-tooth comb. It does make a difference, in the message that we pass, where that lives. And if we can't find consensus, then it can't be on the top of the document.

Yeah, it would [bother] me that an aspect that important is shunted out because we can't find the proper wording. So let's try again.

With this, Feodora, take us to the next point.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Yes, this has been addressed, and if we have time at the end, I'm gonna […] But yeah, in the recommendation related to privacy proxy, Sarah suggested one small change in the rationale, where we say the whole standing committee … She suggested to add some members. [I] believe this should be in scope for further work on SSAD. I think it's best, since we talked about this last time quite a lot, that if you have a comment on this or disagree, just continue commenting on this document and in the comments here. I think that will be easier to be addressed so we can move on to the next comment.

Yes, Marc, I see you provided additional language. I didn't have time to review it, I think because you edited … So maybe you want

to present, and then the standing committee can discuss if they agree.

GABE ANDREWS: Sorry, that's actually from Gabriel, I believe.

FEODORA HAMZA: Sorry. Then Gabe, I would hand over to you.

GABE ANDREWS: Oh, I'm trying to see where we are right now. Apologies for taking just one second here. Oh yeah, okay. So it was listed as line 164. I was suggesting text that might follow in line 158 under Rec 3. But I think that I was being asked to provide some language that referred to what I called the wall of text. When you log into RDRS and you click the button to submit a new request, there's an almost full-screen warning text block that appears and blocks everything else out that says, amongst other things (I'm going to try to quote the language verbatim), "In some cases, the domain name may have been registered through a privacy or proxy service, in which case the RDRS may not be the right tool to request the non-public registration data."

The reason why I was suggesting that this be added or referred to explicitly is because we've observed, as part of the RDRS Standing Committee, a change in behavior by some of the participating

registrars to start responding to RDRS requests on behalf of their affiliated privacy or proxy services. That change is both something that we're grateful to as requester constituencies, but also noting that it deprecates the utility of this wall of text and that the prior recommendation to remove the text is even more important now because now this text is providing guidance that is contrary to ground truth.

So this language that I put in there is a suggestion on how to capture that comment, but I'm open to other viewpoints.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Gabriel. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien and Gabriel. I support Gabriel's suggestion, but not the location of it. He suggested putting it in Rec 3, which covers new policy work. And I think the more appropriate place for this is under Rec 2, which would be system enhancement, maybe even a subsection of 2.2: user experience redesign. So I agree with Gabriel, as I noted on the last call, but maybe hopefully he'll take that as a friendly amendment to shift the location of where we're putting that.

GABE ANDREWS: Yes, indeed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Ooh, did I hear full agreement? So, yeah, we're lifting the foot here on trying to discuss other policy going on somewhere else in the community but taking this opportunity to review the RDRS interface and correct assumptions made over a year ago when we dropped that text. Well, actually, I think it was about a year ago that that part of the interface was reviewed after the first few weeks of usage and put that in Rec 2. If that works for everybody, that's a win. But let's see what Alan has to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: What I had to say is I suspect this should not be a recommendation at all, but simply if we can provide replacement language, it can be dropped into the current system today to fix what is essentially a bug. Right now it's saying something which is not true, but perhaps changing something to "may" or ["]some registrars may well be able to fix it without making a formal recommendation and waiting n months for it to be done.["] Just sounds like we're talking about a bug because of changing environment and it could be fixed easily. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So then if it doesn't appear or doesn't appear more than that, then also maybe [there'll be] a recommendation in our communications about the system that is disseminated and

explained a bit more widely to registrars and registrants alike. Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: So I don't have a problem with removing it, but I have a problem with how it's being formulated. So did we really observe a shift in behavior? Last time, I asked Sarah and others, if they receive a disclosure request through RDRS, and if it's like privacy under privacy/proxy, if they can, they would evaluate and be able to respond to the request regardless of the privacy/proxy. Am I right?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, I'm not sure I fully understood. My understanding is that right now there is one large registrar, my employer, GoDaddy, who said, "We will look at the requests regardless of them being under privacy or proxy or not, and we'll give you an answer that corresponds to our evaluation of the request rather than the status of the data." So if it's under privacy/proxy, or if it's not, we would look at it in the same way and give you the same answer.

FARAZANEH BADDI: And you will be able to, if you decide positively in favor of disclosure, to disclose.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes. It's right now the position of GoDaddy.

FARZANEH BADII: Right. I don't understand what this shifting behavior is. So what I think should happen is some kind of like change. I don't fundamentally disagree with what's being recommended here, and I think It's good because data behind the privacy proxy can actually be requested through RDRS. So I think that we are okay in saying that to remove that RDRS may not be the right tool. Right? So I think I would get rid of all this shifting behaviors, stuff like that.

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

MARC ANDERSON: If I could respond to Farzaneh a little bit, hopefully this will help a little bit. With the SSAD recommendations … I should go back a little bit. With the SSAD working group, we considered privacy proxy out of scope. And when RDRS was developed as a pilot, we considered privacy proxy out of scope as well, being based on the SSAD recommendations. And so that language that Gabriel quoted reflects that assumption. But the shifting behavior Gabriel is pointing to is the fact that we know of at least one registrar that does use RDRS for privacy proxy disclosure requests.

And so I think what we previously agreed on as a standing committee is that while privacy proxy disclosure requests aren't the focus of RDRS, based on the shift in behavior, we shouldn't be doing anything that would discourage or otherwise prevent the RDRS system from handling privacy proxy disclosure requests.

And hopefully that's a useful summary. I think that's kind of where we landed. And I think this is a language in a position that could generally be agreeable and supported by the RDRS.

FARZANEH BADII: If the registrars want to pick on this language, they can do so. I'm not gonna do it at 1:30 a.m. I still don't think it was a shift in behavior, although you're very convincing, Marc. Very convincing.

But another thing: So it says that … blah, blah, blah. And so we are saying this suggested text to line 158., Recommendation three … Okay, so these are our recommendation. We are not making changes to others' recommendations. Okay, perfect. Thank you so much.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I'm fine with this suggested change. Suggesting removing that quoted text about "may not be the right tool"? Sure. The wall of text is difficult. Sure. My problem in this moment is that I don't really agree that we as a group have observed a shift in behavior, and I'm not super satisfied with language around making decisions on behalf of their affiliated services. But I know that that's kind of beside the point because the point of the suggestion is to remove the quoted text.

So would it be possible to just take out the first half of that suggestion and just say the SC suggests removing the guidance text? Because I do think we all agree with removing that guidance. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABE ANDREWS: Yeah, just for the record, no objection. I think the important thing is just to update the system so that it's more accurate to reflect current reality. So I have no objection to Sarah's suggestion. Just to reiterate because I did it very fast last time, I also don't object to Marc's suggestion to put it in a different location where he thought it was most appropriate. Thank you.

EN

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, fantastic. So, good. It's a win. I'm sorry, I'm getting a bit excited here. So we're moving this back to a recommendation two or two-point-something specific to the interface. We're removing the behavior change. By moving it to the section two recommendation, [we're] removing the sort of policy development, peer pressure and just correcting our text in the interface to at least not suggest that it's impossible for registrars to answer those two questions at the same time.

I'm very excited too, Farzaneh, and I can assume that at 1:30 in the morning, you would be very much. So that's very good.

Then I'll give it back to Feodora, who might be able to take us to the next point then.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. So the next point is related to a comment that Marc made a couple of weeks ago, saying that recommendation 6 is not being specific enough on telling the council what to do with the SSAD recommendations. So he offered to provide additional language on that, and that he has done here. So maybe Marc wants to present it and then the standing committee can discuss. I hope I understood correctly. So Marc, the floor would be yours.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Feodora. I do indeed want to present it. So on Rec six, I like that the recommendation recommends that Council review the PDP phase 2 SSAD recommendations. And it does recognize that the Phase Two Working Group asked that the recommendations be treated as a comprehensive and interdependent package—Iin other words, no cherry picking of the recommendations. And so I think that's good.

But what I thought was missing was a recommendation on what to do with the SSAD recommendations that have been approved by council and are on hold with the ICANN Board.

And so my recommendation is pretty simple. I recommend that the GNSO Council write to the Board and, in writing them, forward this report that we're working on to the ICANN Board. I think that's probably going to happen anyway, and it's probably pretty standard procedure for something like this. So I don't think there's any controversy there.

But what I am sort of novelly introducing is I'm suggesting that the GNSO Council ask the ICANN Board to reject the SSAD recommendations, sending them back to the GNSO Council. And they further suggest that the that the council could suggest the ODA report and this report on the findings from the RDRS pilot as justification for rejecting the recommendations.

EN

I suspect that there are many other ways to get the SSAD recommendations from the ICANN Board to the GNSO Council. But in my view this is one way, and I'm not necessarily attached to this way. If anybody has a better idea, I'm open to that. But in my perusal, this would be the quickest and easiest way to get the recommendations from the ICANN Board back to the GNSO Council, where the GNSO Council can then go through the task of revisiting them.

And I think that's consistent with the position that we as a standing committee have taken. I don't think I've heard anybody advocate supporting adoption of the SSAD recommendations in whole or in part, and we spend a significant part of our text suggesting modifications to the SSAD recommendation. So I think this is in line with the views of the standing committee, and I'm just sort of putting pen to paper on one possible path forward.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Marc, just to fully understand, you're suggesting being at the Board, sending it back to the GNSO Council, recalling it from the Board, but that it should be done as an entire package (that, for example, on a recommendation that we're making no comments on, the Board should in no way feel compelled to start passing[)] and then sending back the ones that we're discussing, as was the case, sorry, for SubPro, where they voted in a certain number of recommendations and accepted the implementation guidelines

and then rejected (I can't remember what the number was) 30-some of them. You say, "We keep this as a bundle. Please send it all back to the GNSO Council to deal with the way they see fit." Right?

MARC ANDERSON: That is correct. I agree with that. I think council and the Board should respect the wishes of the working group, which asked for the recommendations to be treated as an interdependent package. And I think it could get messy if the Board or council tried to get into a position of cherry-picking some of the recommendations and modifying others subsequently.

So my suggestion and my recommendation is to reject them as a package and recommend to the GNSO Council that they reconsider them as a package.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, fantastic. I haven't heard, on the mic or off-mic, anybody else suggesting, within this group or on the Board, anything contrary to that. But it's good to put it on paper in the report. Gabriel, I see you hand up.

GABE ANDREWS: Not objecting to it, but, Marc, I don't think I've raised this issue with any of my colleagues in the GAC before or flagged it as a way

EN

that things might go. And so I just want to call out for you that I will need to do that because even though I'm not immersed in the weeds of ICANN policy and how it goes forward, others might know things I don't and have comment back.

So I'll take action to that ASAP, copy-paste this, share it. But I just wanted to flag that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And that's why we still have a bit of time until mid-August before we want to publish. But please do, yes. Farzaneh, I see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADII: I didn't know we were doing this. So if we are doing it, I would like to make a suggestion that, with the fundamental rights balancing … I think it's recommendation number … No, it's not a recommendation. It's finding. It's number eight, contracted party authorization. So John copy-pasted the bit about the SSAD recommendation that had something in it to the effect that if all requested … So actually the recommendation said that if the GDPR requires a fundamental rights balancing, then the registrar should do so. And if it doesn't, it should just disclose the data. And we have been trying to make some kind of revisions and stuff like that to that text. But if we can, [we can] also make a recommendation that the standard should not be GDPR-related

but that fundamental rights balancing should apply to all the registrars without considering whether GDPR applies or not. But that might be too controversial for this group. But that's my suggestion. Thanks. Thank you, Marc, by the way.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, it's not quite as late as it is on your side, but now I'm the one that's getting a bit lost. Is this related to this point that we're looking at on screen right now?

FARZANEH BADII: No.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Or to another point that we raised? Okay, okay. To the other point that we raised last week.

FARZANEH BADII: [inaudible] [point].

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I was gonna then pass the mic to John, who raised his hand after your comment.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Not to belabor this point, because I'm not sure if it's totally relevant for where we're at, but the way the GDPR works is a little bit different than what Farzaneh describes (so I think she'll be happy with that), which basically states … It is very GDPR-centric. It says if GDPR doesn't apply, then the registrar should apply the particular law that applies to the request. Now, it doesn't have her fundamental test. So, for instance, if there's a jurisdiction that has a different test, it would apply that. But I just wanted to correct that, that it's not just like "If GDPR doesn't apply, disclose the data."

But anyhow, I do agree that, yeah, having some sort of information about the standard and improvements disclosure of what standards being applied should be an improvement built in. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So I'm getting also private messages in the chat because we've lost everybody here. Can we, John or Farzaneh, point us, in the document that we're looking at (so the document with the table), which item we're discussing right now? Because I'm lost.

JOHN MCELWAINE: It looks like we can take it offline. I don't know where it is. I just heard my name called. That perked up my ears.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Could that be it? Did you find that? Sorry. Okay. Okay. Anyway, this is recorded. We know that the discussion is also one that is ongoing. And we'll find the way. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to respond to Farzaneh. In light of what John said, it may not be appropriate, but I thought the reference in the SSAD was, essentially, that in most cases the registrar must consider the rights balance. In the case of a subpoena, for instance, then presumably some other entity has already considered it, and the registrar is going to be obliged, if it's a subpoena in their own jurisdiction, to respond without doing a rights balance of their own. So presumably in all cases, some entity has done the rights balance. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm not a lawyer, so I don't know how it works on a registrar basis. But I would assume that the subpoena is just a very heavy weight in the balance, but there's still a balance to be done there. And indeed, a subpoena in your own jurisdiction, I guess, would be the ultimate weight. But I think the registrar still reviews it. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:	If I could help on this one, I believe Farzaneh is referring to SSAD recommendation 12. And if you go to the findings report, it's in the table on page 23.
[GABE ANDREWS]:	Scrolling.
MARC ANDERSON:	Yeah, so I think I think this is the place where the … I think it's applicable here on Rec 12 disclosure requirements, unless I'm mistaken, which is entirely possible.
SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Okay. And Farzaneh, right, it's a big yes. So I guess you've nailed it.
	Okay, I see also in the comments that Farzaneh is suggesting maybe to have a chat with John on this. That I would encourage too. Given the literal amount of calls that we have here now until we want to get this published, if you guys want to work out something together that works for everybody, that would be fantastic. Feodora, I see your hand up … Or at least suggest and then let the others review it. Feodora, go ahead.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I just wanted to clarify. If I understood correctly (and sorry that I might not have understood) … So can Farzi just repeat what she wants to add here or will she talk to John first and then they will get back to us and then we can update? Because I understood from the comments that it was related to recommendation 8, but I think it changed position now. So just want to make sure staff has understood correctly.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, I will talk to John and I will come up with something. Thank you.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Farzi.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for doing that.

Okay, back to you, Feodora. Do you want to take us to the next point you wanted us to discuss?

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. Yes, I will. Sorry for all the scrolling. I just was trying to find which comment we were talking about. So I understand the language that Marc suggested will be included in

the report and then the [inaudible] where you can further comment, but it sounded like this has been supported.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, we were hearing a lot of agreement on that.

FEODORA HAMZA: Good. So there was another comment made by Gabe a couple of weeks ago where he also wanted to provide additional language on recommendation four which relates to authentication. So just a question to Gabe, if this can be marked as resolved or if there is more to come here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So there was a message from him in the chat saying that he was stepping out. I didn't see anything saying that he's—

GABE ANDREWS: I'm back.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Good.

GABE ANDREWS: Unfortunately I'm back but not particularly helpful because I don't remember in what context this was. So, let me go back and look at 149 and refresh my recollection, but please proceed with the conversation in the interim.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And make sure to browse a bit around 149 because we're finding that a lot of those lines have moved since text has been added. So it might be slightly under.

GABE ANDREWS: Copy, sir. Thank you. Feodora, back to you.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you very much. So now there are two comments made by Sarah that relate to the table, where we compare SSAD and the RDRS, and also relate to recommendation 8. That's why I was not sure if the previous discussion covered these or not, but I'm going to show you in the report in a bit. But maybe Sarah can just best explain what she meant here. But there's a lot of suggestion, and some members say that it's just repeating what the recommendation is saying and shouldn't be in the column where it says "in status with RDRS" or what should happen to the recommendation in SSAD and the following because it overlaps— not this one, sorry; the one after. It's through the Lessons

Learned, and it has the same text again. So it's all this text here. So I leave it for the standing committee. But I think this text was added by John, so it's best for him to maybe guide the standing committee where he thinks it should be.

FARZANEH BADII: That's something I should talk to John about. Sorry to interrupt you, but I just wanted to save you time. I will talk to John. It's related to the point that I raised.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: To the previous point. Okay, fantastic. Thank you. Gabriel, I see your hand up. Was it about one of the topics that Feodora just related or about your previous because you looked into the text?

GABE ANDREWS: It's about the previous, and I can stand by for[inaudible] .

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Let's go back then very quickly to that, or hopefully quickly, and then we'll try to find Sarah. I think that we need her input or guidance on the comments that Feodora was just making. So on the previous, go ahead.

EN

GABE ANDREWS: It is super fast. I think that is a reference to the very same quote-unquote wall of text suggestion that we already discussed. And so you can mark it resolved and proceed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. And it was already marked resolved, so we'll just leave it as is. Thank you, Gabriel. I'd love that. Ticking things off.

So back to … So the entire thing is for Farzaneh and John to discuss. Okay. Sarah, see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: With regards to the text, if you could I just scroll up a little bit … Yeah, right there. No. Yeah, sure. There is great. Thank you. So as Feodora had introduced, there are suggestions that John had provided several versions [of] back in our report. And I don't understand the purpose of these suggestions because to me they seem to be taking recommendation text and bringing it into the report in a way that doesn't change anything. I'm happy not to change it because I think that what is in the recommendation text is appropriate. I just don't see what it's doing here in the document. So I would appreciate clarification from John. And it is the same question in a few different places, so apologies for that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sarah, do—and John says that he's about to drop off the call. Do we leave it for Farzaneh and John to discuss it and come back together?

SARAH WYLD: No, I don't think this is about that because John has taken text (that might be a separate thing that needs to happen) about what the contracted party should do in terms of how the review works and has put it into the chart where we're comparing the RDRS to the SSAD recommendation. So I just don't understand why it's in the chart or what these suggestions are suggesting to change.

And then the text lower down in 390 or whatever [I have a] similar question [on]. And it's not that I have a problem with the location of the text. It's just not doing anything. Why are we copying the rec? I'm sorry, I'm just repeating myself. But unfortunately, John's timing has not been great. So I was hoping to hear from him on this.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Let me hop on real quick.

SARAH WYLD: Oh, you're still here? I'm so glad.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I got two minutes. So I did put a rationale for each one of those into the document when requested. But essentially, Sarah, what I'm suggesting is that there's some good practices that are ingrained into the SSAD that would make for better requester experiences, better communication, clearer decisions being provided back, which has been sort of my mantra all along.

And so what it's all getting to is … I think we can probably dig up the version where I put a rationale for each and every one as requested, maybe by you earlier. No, I don't think so. Somebody requested I put a rationale in, and it has all that sort of explanation.

So I do have to drop, but I'm happy to pick this up on the next call. Sorry.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. And then for us, Feodora, [we] go back to the previous versions, find the rationale and maybe add at least in this table so we know what we're talking about. Okay. Sarah, I see your hand up again.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Following up with two things. I really appreciate that John is going to provide more information. I didn't see that in the previous version, but there's a lot of versions. And the text that

was added here, these suggestions, are things that the registrar should be doing, but they don't happen in the RDRS. So I would just ask that any suggested changes or input is really clear as to what it's doing in the section of the document.

And so just for example, also, the column that it's in is the status in relation to the EPDP recommendation, but it's not talking about the RDRS in relation to it. It's just copying the recommendation text. So, yes, we should do what the recommendation says, but I don't see how that relates to the RDRS. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thanks. Point taken. Farzaneh, I see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADII: So I think that the reason it's there basically because they want more reasons from the registrar in case of denial of the request. And I would like to see fundamental rights balancing to be as a part of our recommendation because when the registrar receives a request when RDRS triages it, I want the registrar to always have the fundamental rights balancing on their checklist before responding to that. So this is my rationale. This is why I want to bring it here. But I totally get it because they are not disclosing because RDRS is not a disclosure system. It might cause some confusion, which we have to address.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. And in any case, again, John has left the call now, but he will need to go back to this. I'm saying it for the recording, hoping that he'll listen. It's been added anyway in the comments. And again, depending on travel, I see that a number of people won't be able to join next time, but do try to have that conversation with him and feed it back to this group, at least in writing, if you can't participate.

Steve Crocker, I see your hand up and I just wanted to note we're going on to the last half hour. We wanted a bit of time at the end to discuss schedule. So I'll ask Feodora to make sure that she has for the next 20 minutes the last remaining points she wanted us to discuss. But this said, Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I simply wanted to ask Farzaneh how the fundamental rights determination is to be made. What process does she have in mind beyond just citing that it should be done? Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Steve, I'm so glad you're asking this because we are in the process of consultation with various community members, and we hold these sessions on how fundamental rights balancing is taking place among the registrars, how we can improve it, how we can

help the registrars to do the fundamental rights balancing. It's not something that we are pursuing a policy on at ICANN for, and that's not appropriate, but we can have more conversations about this, especially with you and SSAC.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: There was a great session about it in Prague that I was happy to participate in, but that was very good if you want to check the recording, Steve.

With this, Feodora, go ahead, and [inaudible] we talk in the next 20 minutes.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you. And I'm gonna scroll again because some of the comments relate. So this relates to recommendation 14. And it's additional language provided by Gabe, where he said that the first sentence of the rationale didn't provide the clarity that is needed. And he suggested new text, which I have included in the table, but I wanted to make sure that Gabe has a moment to present it if he's in the call and the standing committee can agree.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabe, it's all yours.

GABE ANDREWS:

I think this is actually very much in line with the same conversations that we were having somewhat contentious discussion of in the first half of this call with regards to discussion of the impact of authentication on the ongoing cost of not just RDRS but successor systems. So to the extent that this can be treated there, I can do so with some suggested language. Or if you prefer it to be treated in both places … I don't recall (can you scroll up to see what line this is?) where we are in the document at this point. Rec 14 is still financial sustainability. Okay, so this is very much on that initial topic from earlier in the call.

So my action item as discussed then was to propose some additional text that would show up in the rec five portion of the document. And that's something that I have to do. So I guess at that point, I'll bring it back and we can discuss further then. Sound actionable?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sorry, you cut a bit in the end.

GABE ANDREWS:

I cut out a little bit? Sorry. Apologies. I was saying that I have as an action item already to propose some additional text for consideration under the Rec 5 portion of the document. This seems to be the very same topic. So once I have that text available, then we can return to this then.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, fantastic. Thank you. Makes sense to me.

Any other comment on this? I guess we'll wait for Gabriel's edit to the comment.

I just want to make sure (I'm sure you're doing your homework and you're being super professional and everything) as we go down the document, there's lesser and lesser comments. People tend to get to these things from the top and then spend the time they can spend before or something else pulls them out. So again, this seems to be a very crucial conversation. Make sure that you don't miss the comments and are able to comment on each other's suggested text here.

Next, Feodora. Another 10 minutes maybe.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I don't think we have much left. Yes, this one, but this also relates again to this recommendation 8 that was discussed with John. So I think we will wait for him to get back to this. So we don't need to discuss this one. And that's pretty much it.

All other comments have been implemented because they were not part of assignment four and made a lot of sense. And it

seemed that they would not change anything substantial. So back to you, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay.   Good. Fantastic. Then maybe we can go back.   Yes, that's what I was going to suggest.

So we wanted to discuss a bit this change of cadence.

FARZANEH BADII: Seb, I'm sorry, my hands up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Oh, sorry, I didn't see it. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: So I'm so sorry to bring this up now, and I think that there was some kind of a recommendation about frequent and regular reporting of the triage, like how many requests has been received, by which interest holder, like law enforcement IP stuff. And I just wanted to make sure that we continue that practice at RDRS. And if there's a specific recommendation, then great. If not, we should have a recommendation (just simple) that we need to have these regular reporting on the—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So as it was discussed, and [as] it stands (and I'll have Lisa correct me if I'm getting this wrong), we will continue the reporting. There's absolutely no question around this. And so that will continue up here.

What might change is the cadence. So instead of having a report monthly, we'll do quarterly. We'll bundle those reports and quarterly reports just because it takes as long to produce one month as it takes three months, just to make sure that we were a bit lighter on our feet there, particularly as there's no ... Well, there might be another standing committee following. We don't know about that yet, but at least that mandate of monitoring what's going on might change. So the idea right now is absolutely to continue the reporting, but make it a quarterly, starting in November.

Does that fit your intention? Are you okay with that going forward? Or would you want to recommend something different?

And if you're talking, you're muted. Then I'll take it as agreement. But yeah, if you want to change it, put it in the document. In the meantime, I see that Lisa confirms that we're talking about quarterly starting in November.

With this, we wanted to discuss the cadence if everybody's comfortable with us continuing on this two-hour roll for the time

EN

being until .. It's not for super long because it's until we publish, and it's pretty much the next two weeks, the next two sessions.

I have noted that there's already two people that won't be able to join us next week. So please, please, please put your comments in the, in the document, the thing that you would want to discuss and you can't discuss.

Sarah, yes, I see that Roger will be there to replace you. I know that you tag-team and that … I believe he's on the call right now, actually. Yes, he is.

And the same goes for you, Farzaneh, if you need to send somebody else to defend your points.

But anyway, if you want to flag the stuff ("I'm not here, but I'd like this to be discussed"), please keep it for the next meeting. We can do that too. We want to hear and make sure everybody is as happy as can be with this document before it goes out.

With this, Feodora, am I missing something else? So, yeah, next meeting is two hours. Possibly the one after is still two hours. And then afterwards we're running into our own set deadline to publish for public comments. So then for the public comment period, I don't think that it's necessary to have those two-hour ones.

Too many things going on at the same time in the chat for me to follow, so I'll give the mic to Alan and try to catch up in the chat. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a small thing. For convenience, can we have the document links in the agenda and in any emails referring to them? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can you say that again, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: I said can we please have the document links, the URLs, in the agenda and in any emails related to them?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. They should be, but, sure, we'll make sure that they keep on being.

ALAN GREENBERG: They weren't this time, so I had trouble finding them. In my normal disorganization, I found trouble finding them.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Understandable. Apologies, I'll be corrected. Feodora, I see your hand up.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Seb. I think you were mentioning calls during the public comment period, if I'm not mistaken, but I think, during—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I just mentioned that it might not need to be two hours. That's all. But yeah.

FEODORA HAMZA: I think that the standing committee will have a break during public comment and we might only organize a dedicated or two webinars for the community for them to have a better understanding of the report. But yes, our team will then extend the invitations for the following two meetings to two hours. That's my current understanding.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. Again, if we wrap it all up next week, great. But given the amount of points that are still being discussed, we need to count on that.

I don't need to belabor this longer than that. There's still 15 minutes, but I'm not going to keep you for 15 minutes.

I do, because this one bit is worrying me, want you guys to have a good think and on how we can present something that everybody is happy to present in a report on financial sustainability What I've heard today and what I've heard in previous weeks, are very divergent views on this, and that might be the case, but I think that we can find a way to agree to disagree, but still find something to present there. Again, if it's not in that top part of the recommendation of the report, it'll be read, people will get there, but it won't have the impact, and everybody will be losing a bit on this. So have a think on how we can find a way to present this in the consensus recommendations because it's an important topic and it's taken a lot of our time and brain power. So it's obviously very important and I'd hate it to be missed altogether.

With this, I think it's time to let you guys go. It is 9:16 p.m. here, and so I'll be more than happy to take a break and talk to you all next week. Thank you.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Sebastien. Thanks, everyone, for joining. Have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]