

---

## ICANN Transcription

### RDRS Standing Committee

**Monday, 11 March 2024 at 17:30 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/PgCNEg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee Call taking place on Monday, 11th of March 2024. For today, we have received apologies from Thomas Rickert, who will be joining late. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or unmute your mic. If assistance is needed in updating your SOI, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

Observers are welcome and will be able to use view chat only and have listen-only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. 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, those who take part in the ICANN multi-

---

*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.*

---

stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you, and back over to Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Devan. And hello, everybody. I hope that everybody that attended were able to get back home safely with all their luggage. Apparently, that's also a new criterion. And as I said, I haven't moved one inch because I was there listening to you in San Juan, and now I'm still here from the same chair.

Anyway, somebody proposed agenda, and then Steve Crocker pretty quickly reacted and said, hey, can we fit in some discussion about the CSG working session, which I think is a wise idea. And so, I would suggest that as item 1.1, before we go through the enhancements, as proposed or planned for by staff, we go through that session. Now, last time I had a quick look, I didn't see Steve Crocker yet on the call. I don't know if he's there, but there you are.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Oh, yes, you are. Did you want to walk us through the comments that you want to make? I took a few notes too, and other people might also want to note a few things out of that session.

---

STEVE CROCKER: I'll be very, very brief. Thank you. There's a draft report that is summarizing what's in the transcript. I'm going to summarize the summary. And so, it's just two main points. One is that there's a number of comments related to how the RDRS itself, the ticketing system, could be easier to use. And so, there's a lot of specifics. One that stands out to me is it took 37, somebody reported it took 37, maybe 35 clicks for each submission, and other things like that and above. And then the other set of comments have to do with the registrars, that it would be helpful if it was clearer what their responses meant, it would be clearer what it would take to submit a successful request.

And if the registrars were to get together and provide consistent advice across registrars, that would be ever so much better. The details will come out. There's a little bit of editing and coordination going on behind the scenes. And I expect within a week, this draft report, which only runs a couple of pages, will be available. But there's nothing in there that isn't also available directly in the transcript.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And I've taken some time today to go back to it. So, yes, absolutely. You seem to be driving. So, please do that safely.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm in the passenger seat. And so, it's even riskier than you think.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:           Okay, good. Paul, I see your hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY:           Thanks. Paul McGrady here for the recording. So, Steve, I appreciate that report coming in a summary. I was at the session. I think we got some good stuff out of there. I do think there were a lot of hurt feelings, though. And a lot of registrars later in the week indicated that they felt named and shamed.

And so, I might suggest that although we obviously can't control any C or SG that wants to have their own session, I think that it might be helpful, if we had a session as a standing committee to invite community feedback on this kind of thing, so that we could lay some ground rules like put in fake registrar names or something like that where registrars can get the feedback that they want but don't have to feel like they're under attack or worse have their bosses back home listening in feeling like they're being attacked or something that was voluntary. So, anyways, that's my only suggestion. Good session, but I think that maybe this committee can build some guardrails around the next one. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:           Let me just offer a comment about that. There clearly are some divisions within the entire community here, some polarization, which is unfortunate. The session was really intended to provide a way for the requesters to say whatever they wanted to say. And I would have hoped, maybe too hopefully, that the registrars would have been eager to hear what they have to say. This is the kind

---

of feedback in a marketing process that is pure gold. And you get whatever you get out of that. But to try to suppress it or tape it or control it undermines the whole value of that. So, that's just another point of view. But clearly, anything we can do to knit things back together again would be great.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you. So, I raised my hand, so I'll recognize myself. So, I obviously wasn't in San Juan, so I wasn't in the room. And I specifically also wasn't in the hallways afterwards. So, that whole part of people that might have felt, well, adversely from the discussion, I didn't see. It wasn't on camera. I also note that my employer was named several times during that session, not always in the best of lights. But I'm not part of the registrar side. And I didn't personally take offense, but I haven't discussed that with the rest of the team. So, I don't know exactly what the position was.

This said, I heard a number of things that I think are good takeaways. One of the first things that I was sort of expecting to hear, but did not, is people saying, I've submitted a request and got crickets, got nothing. I was pleasantly surprised by the fact that people got answers showing that participating registrars are actually on the ball and answering requests positively, negatively, that's a different problem. But they're answering. And I was really, really pleased to hear that. Maybe this is something that was discussed also in the hallways. But at least on camera, none of it showed.

The other thing is, and I think that it's definitely worked for this group to do, we need to absolutely do a better job, both towards the registrars, but also in the interface, making sure that we make it absolutely clear and easy for registrars to pick an answer as to why they disclose, don't disclose, partially disclose, and not leave it so much to their interpretation, because that creates bad stats, creates confusion on the request to the site. So, we need to do a better job. I don't know if it's revising the list of possible options, or talking to registrars and say, well, in this case, you shouldn't be answering this or that. Again, not on the disclosure itself, but in the way you answer or feedback the decision that you took.

And I think that, that would be a good point made. I heard also that 35 click, I don't know exactly what it corresponds to, because I didn't try to submit a request myself, would be my mistake. But that was a bit worrying to me too. But it might be, because there's a lot of drop downs to choose from, and a lot of options to take in there. So, we could get into quick, rapid clicks there. I saw also something I hope was captured about the 1000-character limit, and I'm not quite sure that it should be much higher or much lower, or possibly not lower. But I don't know to what extent we want to have a whole novel sent for each registrar to go and check. But I thought that it was at least to have enough space to be able to present the case professionally is important. And I'm looking quickly.

Obviously, there was comments about privacy and proxy. This is not something that we're going to resolve here. And the way it goes, it doesn't look like something that we're going to resolve in the timeframe of this pilot. So, I would strongly urge to find an

---

---

elegant way to respond when that is the case, when a registrar can't respond because it's behind privacy and proxy, and making sure that everybody answers the same way. So, we can at least set that aside. We know that it's a problem. We know that's a problem that we can't resolve, but at least we can quantify it correctly. And that's all. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. This is Sarah. I wasn't really intending to talk about the CSG session, but I guess some of what has already been said just made me want to respond. So, I think that registrars would likely have been a lot more eager to hear that feedback if it had been provided directly to the registrar or in a context where that feedback could be taken as constructive and collaborative. And instead, because of the form of the session, it came across as really accusatory. And again, I wasn't going to bring it up because we did already discuss it.

And in my mind, this has been addressed and will be resolved when the report comes out. But just so everybody here is aware, there was a number of registrars who were mentioned in that session who expressed that they feel that they are being shamed for the way that they have participated in the RDRS, shamed for not disclosing data in response to every request. When we all know, we in this group know that not every request will result in a disclosure, and that's how it works.

And I would hope that we all want to encourage registrars to participate in the RDRS. So, I do hear feedback that requesters are not always clear on why their requests are denied. I expect

---

that within this small team, we will look at that process of sending the update or the outcome to the requester and clarify what information is passed through to them and what can be improved so that they understand what's going on and why. But as to how the CSG session went, I would say that there was a lot of very useful information and just some of how that information was conveyed perhaps could have been done a bit differently, but I think we're all sort of ready to move on and use that information together now. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. Any other hands up? John McElwaine, go ahead.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Hey, John McElwaine for the record. It's somebody who did present there. I mean, I just wanted to state that nothing that I've said was meant to be accusatory. I'd anonymize my information, although verbally mentioned a couple of registrars so it would make sense in presenting. But the important thing, and hopefully people took away from my presentation, is that we're seeing two trends that are really one and the same. And Steve kind of hinted around about it, which is there is difficulty in communications. In other words, I certainly am communicating adequately to some registrars and inadequately to some because I'm virtually getting 100% acceptance by some and 100% refusal by some. Now, that could be also because of the privacy proxy, and those denials are coming back as denials only because it's behind a privacy proxy. So, that's the takeaway that I've presented on.



And certainly, I don't know if any of this is directed at me, but certainly didn't mean to be accusatory in that really, hopefully people got out of all my comments, literally all week long, that I think we just need to communicate better so that we know what information as a requester is being sought after. And then if it's being denied, what the reason is for, and then we can have a better, a system that's working better. So, that you won't get requests that won't meet certain criteria, and you'll understand better why a request was granted. So, thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, John. Again, on my purely personal capacity here, because I did not have since a discussion with the team on our side, I suppose that, again, privacy and proxy are a heavy weight in the balance and the way things were answered, at least on our side. Because they're very present in particularly new registrations for the past few years. And to that extent, the fact that the experience seemed to be that depending on the registrar, people are answering differently from privacy proxy. Some consider that as a dial. Some consider that as having given the data, but no data was shared because it was under privacy and proxy.

That's what I mean. We might need to categorize that separately to understand that this is not a problem that we're going to solve here. And then look at the rest and be able to better quantify it. Oh, I see Marc Anderson's hand up. And then afterwards, we'll go to staff who can talk about the point two of the agenda as on the screen. But go ahead first, Marc.

---

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson. I raise my hand to say the same thing you just said and what Sebastien and Sarah are saying in chat. It seems like on both the requester and the registrar side, people are treating privacy proxy differently. And it would perhaps make a lot of sense to just take that off the table and have it as its own category. So, I think I'm agreeing with what you gave and Sarah are all saying.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Okay. With this, and seeing no further hand up, Lisa, I'd like to give you the mic. Actually, I don't know if it's Lisa or Elisa presenting this time.

LISA CARTER: It's Lisa. It's going to be me for the first time. Thanks, Seb. I just wanted to go through some of the items that we have.

STEVE CROCKER: There is a message from Katie.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve Crocker, it sounds like your mic is open. Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Okay. Sorry about that. Yeah, I just wanted to go through some of the items that we've discussed internally as far as what we'd

---

like to focus on for the first round of enhancements related to our enhancements meeting. That includes error messaging. So, I know some of you participated in the EURALO Roundtable. I think that was back in January where there were some concerns about error messaging not mapping correctly to the searches that were happening. So, what we're trying to do now working with our technical team is focus on clarifying some of that messaging so that the searches and the error messages you receive for things that are not supported match more appropriately. We also want to make sure we identify--

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Can I stop you just one second here, Lisa? For those who didn't participate in that discussion, it was Olivier Crépin-Leblond who had tried a bunch of domains that he suspected wouldn't be taken care of by the system. So, .gov names, ccTLD names, names that weren't registered and so on and so forth, but had picked up the fact that the system wasn't answering accurately. He knew he was pushing it and the system itself had nothing to do with registrars. It was at the very, very first stage when you do a lookup and are confirmed if you're with a participating registrar and so those are the bug fixes that Lisa is describing.

LISA CARTER: Yes, thanks for clarifying, Seb. I wasn't here when that discussion happened, so it's good to hear that feedback too. So, yes, we will be hoping to clarify some of that messaging that was pointed out in the EURALO Roundtable, including around non-participating registrars and also related to the TLDs that are supported or not

---

supported in the system. So, we're coordinating with ENIT currently on verifying exactly which TLDs are not going to be supported for various reasons. For example, IANA has a reserve list of TLDs that wouldn't be supported. Obviously terminated TLDs would not be in that list and then there's some special legacy like MIL and Inter ARPA that also wouldn't be supported.

So, we want to clarify what that list is to make sure we have the right error messaging around those specific domains for those TLDs when they're requested in the system. And then we're also hoping to address third-level and which third-level domain names would be able to be presented and supported in the system versus which would not. So, I just wanted to kind of go over that. I don't know if you have questions or comments on that. We can talk through that and then I can move on to the next enhancement that I was going to talk about or I can keep going. Just let me know. Any questions?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm going. I see no hands. Go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Perfect. Okay. Another one of the simple enhancements that we thought we could do really quickly was there was some concern about the user experience when you click the help link at the top right on the landing page when you're first in the system. What we'd like to do there is actually make that a little bit better experience by anchoring to the resources section of the RDRS page on ICANN.org. I think currently now it just takes you to the

top of the page where you're not really seeing anything that would be helpful. So, if we can anchor it to the resources section, it would at least bring you to the place in the page that actually gives you some more information to search for help. And then obviously the other thing we would like to do as part of all these enhancements is update the FAQs.

So, we'll try to include in the FAQs the list or links to the list of unsupported TLDs so that people can go to those as well as things that are actually supported to make it a little more clear. And also, it probably enhanced the question on ccTLDs and those not being supported as well. So, it makes it a little bit easier for people to understand what they can and cannot search for in the system. And those were the main ones we have in the queue with ENIT right now. Did anyone have questions or do you have comments?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Go ahead, Seb. So, yeah, I've raised my hand at least on camera. So, I just wanted to ask you a question and then clarify also for the standing committee something I said last week or the last time we spoke. So, I mentioned the fact that we do not have attached to this project a permanent dev team that is permanently going to go and draft enhancements. And when I'm thinking about this, I'm talking about add-ons that we mentioned before in our discussion, such as an API or other add-ons. We don't have a team like that.

We will have access to such a team and we're being asked to make sure that we can prioritize and propose a list of

---

enhancements or add-ons that we will ask for ICANN to go and develop at regular intervals. Right now, the first interval that we'll have is Kigali. So, we've got a few months until Kigali to come up with a list, a prioritized list of things that we believe need to be developed to enhance this pilot before the end of it, because they're relevant and they're going to make a difference in our study of it. And that's for us to choose.

This is not to say that in the meantime, nothing is going to be done on the interface, on the DRDRS and all the elements that Lisa outlined there, I think they're going to happen before. Because whilst we don't have a dedicated team, there are still people working on it and it will be included in an earlier iteration. Now, my question here to you, Lisa, is provided that we all agree that these are important to do, and I personally do, clear the bugs. Do you have a timeframe as to when this is going to actually be done and released?

LISA CARTER:

So, I currently need to still speak to ENIT about when this can be slated into a sprint. We do have the two-week sprint cycles happening. I know there's delays based on the fact that we just came back from an ICANN79 meeting, so that usually pushes things. But I would like to talk to them this week about that, so I can definitely get back to the standing committee with a little bit more detail on when these might be ready to push to production after our meeting this week.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We're talking about a cycle or two of sprint, and you mentioned, I mean, in that timeframe. So, two-week sprints, and we're talking a cycle, two cycles, maybe three cycles to get that ironed out, right?

LISA CARTER: Potentially, yes. Like I said, I can confirm with them, but I'll get back to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Obviously, I'll ask you to sign it, particularly sign it in blood. All within reason. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you, Seb. So, two reactions and questions, I guess, too. So, Lisa, thank you for reading that out to us. I'm wondering as we go forward, for this work that you're talking about now as well as, I guess, future sprints and whatnot, is it possible to have in shared via that email list that we all are on just, I don't know, every two weeks, what the recap is of the anticipated work or whatever it is that you just read off of? And I say this because I don't trust myself to remember or even accurately reflect what you just described. So, I'm going to pause there. That's question one. Do you think that we could maybe have that kind of thing as a routine in writing to have in our inboxes?

LISA CARTER: You mean just like the list that I prepared today for the agenda kind of dropped in?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah. It doesn't have to be super formal at all. But that list. And then as we go forward in future work, if we all have discussions and it gets prioritized for work, I guess just to have something saying like, yeah, this is what we, as I can understand, is going to be the work for the next whatever period is. And I say this being woefully ignorant about what the actual processes of work are, but mostly just so that we have something on paper to look at when we need to.

LISA CARTER: Sure. Yeah. We can definitely provide something either before or after the meeting itself to say, here's what we're working on. And ideally, we'll have a little more information going forward as to when these things can be implemented so that we're kind of on a cycle where you guys get to understand when things will be.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: That's awesome. Yeah. Just seeking to better understand. And so, then the second question is more for the group here. But I think, Seb, as I understood you to say, we're going to be going through the process of sort of looking at all of our joint feedback that we've all been gathering and putting into that document and sort of providing what we think is the most important stuff to work on.

But I really just wanted to call out and make sure that I'm not misunderstanding any omission here, but we probably would need at least someone from ICANN staff to be part of those discussions



---

to help us have a better, clearer understanding of what would be light lifts versus heavy lifts as part of that. Because I think that that really has to go into our analysis of what should be targeted. The number of stuffs might be important to us, but knowing whether it's hard or easy probably will impact how we rank it, right?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely. A hundred percent. I see Lisa raise their hand immediately when you said that. So, maybe she liked that.

LISA CARTER: Yes, I just wanted to indicate that we are tracking internally ourselves feedback that you guys provide. So, we're trying to capture what's in your impressions document and then other areas where we get feedback. And in that way, when you guys prioritize, we can actually kind of tick off on our boxes too that these are the things that the standing committee said are important. And if you guys prioritize them in terms of numbering, we can do the same on our side so that we can kind of match what you guys have in your documents as what is priority.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you kindly, both of you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, I think one element that Gabe mentioned, which also is important in our way of prioritizing, is if you say that there is

---

something that is going to take what are the three weeks easy to be done, will not fit in this crumb, needs to be part of that bigger development planning that we're talking about. But it's only three weeks versus something is going to eat up six weeks, six months of work. We need to know that too, because that's going to influence our, obviously our ability to prioritize. Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks, Sebastien. Marc Anderson. I've been trying to think how I want to afford my next intervention and I'm not sure I've got it all straight in my head. So, please bear with me. I guess first, I get the sense that there's maybe two categories of work being considered. One would be maybe like care and feeding tweaks and quality of usage enhancements the first example on their error messaging just tweaking the error messages to make it clearer, easy to use better to understand. These are maybe light lift work that makes sense over the short term.

The other would be sort of major enhancements, something that would take a lot of work. And I'll just use adding an API as an example. This is just an example, but something that would be much, much larger and would likely take much longer to complete and maybe and again, just an example, maybe does not make sense over the course of a two-year pilot, right? And so, I think we have those two types of categories to consider. And with that, I guess I think this is something Sebastien was getting at a little bit his intervention I don't have a good feel for what the capacity or appetite is for ICANN org to support either of those things you

---

mentioned a little that we don't, we don't have a dedicated dev team working on this.

And I think that's understood and appreciated. But I was wondering if we get a little bit better sense of sort of what is the capacity and appetite to support my minor tweaks and like error messaging and what would be considerations around larger work. And just because I want to try and complete the thought here. You know, I've heard I was not at the session, but I've heard from other sessions at ICANN79, that there was at least the capacity for ICANN capacity and willingness for ICANN to support the RDRS after its two-year pilot period.

And I was wondering if that's accurate and maybe we could get an understanding of that here within the standing committee. I think I touched on a number of things, but I think they're all interrelated. And I think I'm just trying to wrap my head around what is our capacity for fixes and enhancements and what we should be considering from the sort of a short-term and a long-term perspective. So, again, sorry if that was a little rambling. I hope that that makes sense.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Marc, I'll give my understanding and then Lisa, you're very welcome to correct me afterwards. So, going back and it's only one example, going back to the session and the things that came out of that session. There was a point, for example, about the 35 clicks and whatever, and the type of answer that we would want for that is some kind, if not an API, some kind of a high level of automation where a registrant could also, for example, record,

---

sorry, not a requester, wrong term, a requester could record a series of elements that are repeated in every request and making sure that all these things, that's development.

That's the sort of stuff that I see post Kigali. And it will be because then we'll give it blank. It changes majorly the way this system functions being in an API or within the interface, it will require to fail. On the other spectrum is for example, the privacy and proxy and that sort of answers also, Stephanie's questions there. There is no easy way to automate this the privacy and proxy because whilst it's very present, there is no one way to recognize or at least have a machine recognize a privacy and proxy for something that is not, it's easy to make a list maybe of all the different way. My registrar and other registrar answer it and et cetera, but it's never going to be something that is fully black and white automated, or not at this stage and not unless until a PPSI or another relevant policy will be able to have us add a tick box somewhere that says definitely this privacy proxy or not.

So, in the meantime, what we need to do is to make sure that the registrar's answer the same thing when they're talking about the same thing, the registrar is going to recognize that as being a privacy proxy. We need to make sure that the answer consistently, all the registrars use the same item in the answer dropdown to say, no, I can't give you that because it's privacy proxy. That is both education and making sure that in that list of possible answers, it is so clear that that's the answer that should be used, that there won't be any wrong answers. And you won't have people to say I've disclosed, I've not disclosed, et cetera. So, it's that consistency.

---

That is work that we can do immediately. That is work that could be included in a recent script. It is for us team to decide what that list should be in the end and how to make it clear for the registrars. And I'm not putting it solely on your table, Sarah, but I will definitely need help from the registrar's side to say, how can I make that list absolutely clear? So, that, that answer is going to be given consistently using the same series of tick boxes in our answers. But that's something that we can do way before that. That's not development, that's adding items in a database of answers, of possible answers and whatever on the interface too. Thanks. I did promise Lisa a right to answer to that immediately. So, I'll put you ahead in the queue and then we'll go to Steve Crocker and Alan. Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, Seb. Yeah, I just wanted to go back to the general question about cadence of enhancements, small versus large. Obviously smaller ones for, as an example, I think someone mentioned, we'd like more character limits available to us when we're typing into those text boxes, something like that.

Super easy. It's easier to get slated. A larger enhancement, like an API, I think someone mentioned, obviously would depend on the requirements, the timing, availability, how long it would actually take to implement versus the 18 months I think we have left in the whole pilot itself. So, those are all considerations, but the smaller ones that help it, help the system be more clear, easier to use. Those are the easiest to get done. And then we would have to discuss internally for the larger ones.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And now I see Steve Crocker's hand. Steve, if you're speaking, you're still muted. Is anybody hearing Steve? Cause I'm not.

PAUL MCGRADY: Negative.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So, there was another hand and now I'd lost it because it went back down. Who had their hand raised while Steve was trying to figure out how to unmute. I'll just keep it as an awkward moment then.

STEVE CROCKER: You have to speak. Can you hear me now?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: There you go. Yeah, absolutely.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead Steve.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Sorry. So, two points with respect to the API, quite some time ago, I suggested that an alternate way to accomplish the same thing would be to have an external process, not developed and not intruding on the development time and resources of ICANN, but to have an external system that is simply agile with respect to filling in forms and so forth. That would require a limited, very limited, but nonetheless a non-zero number of resources provided from the community, as opposed to provided by ICANN.

I sense that there's no interest in that because there's a kind of a strong orientation to any work that gets done has to be done by ICANN and has to be done within the resources and facilities that they have. But I nonetheless raised the point that if there was urgency and a strong desire to make batch processing and other things work that dependent upon API, that is doable without the involvement of the ICANN staff and resources. Second point is that the privacy proxy thing is actually a very large and complicated issue because there is, so far as I can tell, no requirement on the system, on the registrars to actually get accurate data about who the registrant is. And so--,

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We're losing you, Steve. Yeah, we lost Steve on audio for a minute. Steve, I will ask you to repeat your second point. You are back. You have to go back to the top of your second point.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Sorry. Okay. We're in transit, so it is variable. Just that the privacy proxy problem is a very big problem and I'll just cut it off at that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, yes, I think everybody agrees and we've all heard that there's some efforts, particularly from Dennis Chang on ICANN staff, to try to revive this in one way or another. But I don't see this being realized quickly and certainly not within the timeframe of this pilot. So, again, that's why I believe we need to table that for now. On your first point, yeah, I haven't forgotten at all. And so, it's not a question of appetite or no appetite. We're just using API to say something big because we don't have another example of such a large enhancement.

There're a million small things that can be done that don't need an API. This said, having a third party providing an API does cause, at least to me, some concern about the privacy of the information that will go through that party in order to be added. And depending on the solution they take and how easy it is, there might be issues there that ICANN might frown upon and I would understand receiving the information. But no, it's not like this group has said, no, there's absolutely no way that a third party that proposes an interface to ease the input, we would say no, because we want absolutely ICANN to do an API. That decision has not been taken.



---

STEVE CROCKER: Well, if I might. The kind of timeframe and effort that I had in mind, I would say two things about. If we had said yes, it would have been done by now. That is, it's not a large, big project. It's a quick agile project. Second thing is that at least what I had in mind is that it would be a small contained piece of software totally under control of the requester and that the privacy issues would be totally transparent, that there'd be no issue of it going through a third party.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Again, to be seen with a requester community, I can only encourage you to talk to them about that specifically, unless the group decides that, no, that's an absolute no, but I haven't heard it. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. I know this is not the right group to address this, but I was a little bit disturbed at the suggestion that I think I heard, maybe due to sound being cut out, but there was a suggestion that the registrar does not have an obligation to verify the accuracy of registration data if there's a privacy or proxy service turned on. And so, I want to disagree with that since that was on the transcript, my disagreement is similarly out loud instead of only in the Zoom chat. But I kind of, it is a complicated issue.

The PPSAI or privacy and proxy accreditation is complicated and it might be that just as a group, we all need to agree that that is out of scope here. I think we do all agree that it's out of scope.

---

And so maybe it would be helpful if we just decided instead of even considering adding a different type of outcome, maybe we stick with what we have in the platform. We agree that the registrar should be directed to use an outcome that says the data is already public if they're not able to release any further data, instead of, instead of trying to figure out under what circumstances would we add a privacy or proxy outcome? Because that seems to be adding a lot of complexity here. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

If I might, Sarah, thank you very much for that. I think the crux of it is this, and it's pretty much what you said, that by making it out of scope, it means that then the natural question is, well, where is it in scope? And so far, as I know, there's nothing in scope. And so, there's no anticipated time at which the idea of actually knowing who your customer is will ever be treated as a requirement. That's the state of affairs as best I understand it. And so, there is no accuracy requirement and as you said, it's out of scope to consider an accuracy requirement within the two years. So, that is a kick the can down the road kind of response. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So, first of all, I applaud Steve Crocker for the permanent hand up position because it allows you to respond immediately. But let's not do that. Second, Sarah, if I may, so I agree with you, it's out of scope as far as I'm concerned. And even more so because there's a different policy effort that is being restarted there. So, we

---

need to let that happen. What I do want to insist on is that being out of scope doesn't mean that we need to let it allow confusion.

So, we really need to work on the fact that the answer given by registrars in front of a privacy and proxy needs to be consistent so that the requester community understands that what we're talking about. And we can't have two registrars considering the same problem and the same answer. One saying, I've given you data because I've told you that it's publicly available somewhere else and somebody else saying, I haven't given you data because it's privacy proxy.

So, we need just to align the answers and making sure that we, that we have consistency because otherwise it all gets lost in our stats and lost in the communication to the requester community. I now see Paul's hand up and Steve didn't lower his hand. I'll ignore it for now. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Seb. Yeah, just, I mean, I know most people who are following along on this issue in San Juan know that it's not like the privacy proxy work is going nowhere. Staff had an informal session, which I thought might've caused more questions than it answered, but at least it was Board movement. The GNSO Council leadership, along with Stephanie and me, who seem to be the most interested in this topic are going to be meeting with staff and we're going to figure out like, what's the plan.

Can we implement some of it? Does Council need to rework some of it? What we know sort of what's happening. But I really

---

have concerns about us conflating that work, which there is in fact a path for, and is in fact being worked on with our very narrow thing we're doing over here in RDRS. And so, I do think we can find creative and fun ways to reemphasize the fact that if it's privacy proxy, it's considered already publicly available data. And if people complain, redirect them to the other work that is going on in the community. But I sure would hate to see us get derailed on something that was never meant to solve that problem. But council is aware and doing things and so staff. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. I see Alan Greenberg's hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, sorry. I had to drop off the call for a few minutes. So, I hope this is still a relevant comment. There's no way that the system can tell definitively that the registrant listed is a privacy proxy service. But for the huge number of them, we could tell. And if we simply did something as simple as and it's a modification, but a simple one of each any registrar who chooses identifying the name of their privacy proxy service.

And at that point, that can at least be passed on to the requester whether it's sorry, I'm lost my train of thought in whether it's in the answer in the confirmation saying noting there is a privacy proxy server or whatever, just give the requester that knowledge. Obviously, most requesters will figure out who GoDaddy's privacy proxy service knows that, but the other ones may not be as obvious. So, although it can't be a definitive answer, yes or no, it

---

is privacy proxy or not, it may put us in a better stance. And that might be a lot easier than trying to make sure every registrar answers a question in the same way. That sounds like more of a challenge to me. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. So, again, I've heard many voices saying privacy and proxy is not the task of this team. I'm all for doing anything that can help the requester community know where they're getting into. But again, I'm not sure that this is a job for us. We did in discussions ages ago, and I know where we've landed with this, but I don't know how I applied. It is actually in the requesters we did mention the fact that it would be strongly encouraged for a requester to first try who is an RDAP or a request on the name to see what would come out in order for people to see them for themselves before even requesting that it could be a privacy proxy just by the wording what they get on there on the response form.

I don't know that we need to get into many more details. The vast majority are, well, at least to me, humble user, pretty straightforward. If you take care of actually reading the response that you get from the WHOIS RDAP. But again, yeah, it's true, some of them are a bit more obscure and less explicit in their answer. Gabriel, I'll set your hand up again.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I have a separate point, but just very briefly responding to what you just said. Yes, there is an instruction on the RDRS confirming

---

factually that it does give instructions to the requester to do that precursor search elsewhere through ICANN's lookup tool. I think given though that some of the registrars themselves are telling us that they can't make a determination as to when proxy exists, I think it might be a bit of a bridge too far to expect the less educated and expert requesters to be able to make those determinations with any degree of accuracy.

But that said, the actual point I wanted to make when I first raised the hand was knowing that we're running short on time and very, very much wanting to know what our path forward is for our discussion of how we're going to triage what we think is important and isn't important with these suggestions that were collected so far. I'm just wondering if you can help maybe explain to me, is that going to be in that every other week call that we had previously discussed? And just wanting to know what we should be expecting when we jump into that. How much homework would you like to have us done in advance, that kind of thing?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, good question. All questions are good, but this one is particularly good. So, on the items that Lisa went through in item two of the agenda, I expect to have in our inbox and possibly also in the Google Doc tracker that we have for those elements that were already in there, to have in the next two weeks an estimation as to when things will be taken care of and implemented. Assuming, and I think that was the last bullet point of Lisa in the agenda, assuming that the reaction of the standing committee is, yes, Lisa, go ahead with all the changes that you mentioned.

---

All those changes that you identified, which are within quick cycles, please go ahead and do it. And that's an answer we should be getting today, by the way. Then afterwards for the call in two weeks, I think that we should start the call by grabbing that tracker that we have. Start making sure that we're identifying each item clearly, that everybody understands what we're talking about. Start highlighting the things that are of interest of this group. Those are the ones that either have already been taken care of or just have one person putting it and nobody else is in favor. And start asking ICANN to evaluate the effort on this so that we can have an idea of what we're asking them really, and start prioritizing. Again, I don't need an answer in two weeks.

This is going to be a process. We're still in data gathering phase, but the tracker is starting to stabilize, at least from what I saw when I last looked at it, which is not immediately before this call. So, maybe somebody added a bunch of things since ICANN hadn't seen. But we have whatever it is, between now and Kigali, so about three months, to make sure that that list is prohibited. And Kigali will have a last cursory look, but I expect by then to everybody to be agreed and including ICANN on the list of enhancements that we'll ask for the next big cycle of development. Does that answer your question?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I think so. Just wanted to make sure that I'm showing up prepared and productive.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. That's the best way to do it. With this, oh, Lisa, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: I just had a quick question. Do you want me to drop in the list of what we plan on working on right now after this meeting without getting the information on when the plan is? Or is it okay if I wait until I get that question answered from our tech team and then put it all in together?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, because you're going to probably use the same list to send to your tech team, why don't you just put it now and then use exactly the same list and add the information that they give you when they get it to you.

LISA CARTER: Perfect. Yeah. Cool.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Any other questions, comments? Because I'll be more than happy to give everybody four minutes back.

LISA CARTER: Really quickly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead.



LISA CARTER: Just something else to consider for discussion. I know we talked about it in previous meetings, the denial reasons and wanting more clarity around that. I wanted to understand if you guys wanted to get together to make suggestions for denial reasons, or if you'd like us to come up with another proposed list for that that we can work on. Just something to consider.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah, for raising your hand because I would suggest that it's something I should look at with a registrar's post. Sorry Sarah, go ahead. Thank you.

SARAH WYLD: This is Sarah. I think it would be very helpful indeed to look at the current list of what the denial reasons are. I don't know if we have information about which ones were found to be confusing. I don't know if we can ask requesters, like give me an example ticket number that we could look at. But if we can look at what the reasons are, and also remind ourselves what the process looks like for the requester.

So, they submit a request, and eventually, if the registrar marks it as denied, what exactly does the requester see and how is that presented to them? Is it all the information that the registrar inputs or some part of that information? All of that together, I think, will help us figure out the best way to proceed. Thank you.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastically put. I saw John's hand immediately up, so I'm sure he's going to offer his help.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I am glad to help out on that. Lisa, when we were chatting as well, I think that as a requester, I'm not sure which of the boxes need to be checked to make a legitimate request. My mantra is better communication and so, I'd be glad to talk about not only what information we're getting back means, but also what the information we're providing means as well, or the questions we're answering to provide the information means. So, I'm happy to be on a little subgroup to do both sides of that.

LISA CARTER: Okay, that sounds good. We can probably provide some sort of high-level kind of mock of what those denial reasons are, what that looks like, and then get sort of feedback on that. Obviously, the clarity needs to happen between when someone denies the reason and kind of consistency for what registrar is selecting for the denial. I think that's part of it. So, I'm happy to provide at least a list of denial reasons we currently have in some sort of mock, so everybody can see what that looks like, and then it can be talked through.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. So, I know that at least, at the very least, Sarah, John, and I will look at that process and come back with a suggestion. And no, I haven't said on the mic that we're creating yet again a new small team within the standing committee. That doesn't exist.

---

We're not doing that, but we're still going to look at it, the three of us, before we come back to this group. And anybody else that wants to join us, by the way. With this, we're at time. So, thank you very much for your time, and talk to you in two weeks, but this time about the report that will be issued for the month of March. Thank you very much.

DEVAN REED: Thank you. Have a good day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**