EN

ICANN Transcription

RDRS Standing Committee

Monday, 25 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/QACNEg

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

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 25th of March, 2024.

For today's call, we have listed apologies from Steve Crocker, Becky Burr, John McElwaine, and Thomas Rickert. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand now. Seeing or hearing no one, observers are welcome and will be able to view the chat-only and have listen-only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelist. Members and alternates, if I could please kindly remind you to change your chat and select everyone versus host and panelist, that would be most helpful.

Please remember to state your name for the record. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. As a reminder,

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.

those who take part in ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply to the Expected Standards of Behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Terri. So I have to warn everybody, I am traveling in Germany with my family in a hotel room. So if things start getting a bit loud around me, please tell me and I'll turn off my microphone.

So this is the meeting where we talk monthly about the RDRS results, so we will do that. There is a number of people that are not attending. I think it might be related to holidays. I think there's a few people that are going through spring break in the U.S., at least on the East Coast. That's all right. They'll listen to the recording.

So possibly the first thing I will do is just to go—and I'm not quite sure who from staff wants to walk us through the report. But we can do that either going through the report as we've done in two previous months or if somebody wants to, has particular reactions to anything in particular within the report, please raise your hands. You're going to leave me hanging. Nobody's wanting to take this round. Is anybody from staff wanting to walk us through? I guess not. Okay. Cool. I didn't pick up anything raised. I can see your hand, Alan Greenberg. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I asked a couple of questions on e-mail. I don't know if anyone saw them yet. But I can go through them here if that's the optimal way of doing it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, please do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have anyone on staff from the group here?

MARC ANDERSON: Can I just jump in? I raised my hand because I'm noting all of ICANN Org people seem to be in attendees instead of panelists. So it's possible they're not raising their hand or speaking because they can't.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. I'll go ahead and promote Dee, Lisa, and Odeline to panelist. Sorry, I did not have their names listed as folks who should join panelists. So I went and moved them over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc, for noting that. In the meantime, Alan, do you want to voice your question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Assuming they're on the call, sure. Hold on.

LISA CARTER: I'm on the call. Sorry, everyone. I couldn't even type in the chat. I couldn't do anything. My audio wasn't working. So apologies. Elisa

is not here today. She's actually on holiday. So it's just myself and Dee from the ICANN team to speak to reporting, etc. But let me know what you need and we can chime in. Sorry about that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. I'm just pulling up my questions. Hold on a second, please. The first question is Table 9 does not seem to correspond to the numbers in metrics three and four, I think. Yeah. If you add up all of the requests, it doesn't come out to the same as the number of requests that are reported on the first page. It did last month, it didn't the first month, and again, it doesn't this month. So I don't know if somehow there's a mistake in the error or I'm not understanding what this should be representing. Lisa, please, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Hi, Alan. Thanks for giving that feedback. We can take that concern back to our Metrics team for that concern. It's the first time I've actually heard this on the call. So we can actually take that back, it might just require some additional explanation or clarification in the report itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I did report it for the first month. I think that may have been before you were here.

LISA CARTER: It was.

ALAN GREENBERG: And last month, it was perfect. But this month, the number is out by just two. But nevertheless, number should add up to the same thing since they're reporting the same thing.

LISA CARTER: Got it. Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the reasons that this is an important issue is one of the things we don't report is the number of people who are using the system, number of individual requesters in each month. It can be derived from this table, but it's not reported separately. And that's one of the reasons that I didn't bother doing the calculations.

The other issue that I mentioned is there's a number of metrics that either I don't understand or are missing. We report the number of requests that go to participating registrars. We don't seem to report anywhere the number of requests that are rejected, either because it's a nonparticipating registrar, it's a ccTLD, or one of the obscure gTLDs that don't apply at all. Am I missing that? Are we not reporting that? Or is it hidden somewhere that I'm not seeing it?

EN

LISA CARTER:	Simon, if you want to speak to that, go ahead.

SIMON RAVEH:	The word request is a little bit confusing because for nonparticipant registrar, it's not actually logged as a request. I think we do report on the number of lookups that are identified, if I'm not mistaken. Yeah, the number of domain lookups. So you can see there the type of lookups that happen.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Which number is that? Sorry.

SIMON RAVEH:	Metrics 10, number domain lookups, if you go down in the document.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay.

SIMON RAVEH:	Because if it's a nonparticipant registrar and request is not being launched because we can't, for instance, or if it's a security. Now, we probably can clarify or provide information in a better way, if needs be.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I see. Okay. I was looking at the table at the beginning and this is one of those things that only shows up in a chart. Okay. So now I do understand that part. Thank you.

The other thing that I don't think we report is the number of participating registrars who received requests this month. We know the total number of requests and we know the total number of participating registrars, but we don't know how many of them were involved in any given month. Is that in a number that can be derived somehow? Or is it just invisible?

LISA CARTER: I think we can adjust the request as you guys discussed and agreed to. I know one of the things we've talked about previously was kind of coming to a final decision on the overall metrics that we need to include so that we can kind of move forward and have comparative data. So if those types of things aren't in there and you guys want them, you just need to kind of come to a conclusion and let us know what you need and what the final sort of set of data points would look like, and we can add those in.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that is all I have, the only question I had today. Oh no, one more question. Metric three and four, if we can go back to the chart. When you say new requesters, what does that mean? Is that new people you haven't seen before or the total number of requesters this month?

LISA CARTER: That's new requesters we haven't seen before, if I'm not mistaken. Simon, you can chime in if you—

SIMON RAVEH: Yes, I think I agree with that. I need to look at the actual queries. But based on the language, I would completely agree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It just seems like an awful large number based on the number of total requests we have and given the fact that we know some requesters make multiple requests. I need to do some arithmetic to see if that actually make sense. But thank you. Okay.

SIMON RAVEH: I would agree with you. We can check that as well. Lisa, if you want to take an action item for us.

LISA CARTER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That's it for me. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. I hope that new metric that you were mentioning was probably captured. And if not, it might need a follow up because I'm not entirely sure I understood it myself. But it sounded interesting. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

EN

GABRIEL ANDREWS: All right. First, doing a microphone check. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Perfectly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Absolutely.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: All right. So I just wanted to add a comment to Alan. You had just been asking about the presentation of the requests and which ones went, for example, to ccTLDs or elsewhere. I will note that that's one of the reasons why I was suggesting previously about the particular graphic that I think that was called the Sankey graphic. I think that's the type of chart it was called. But I sent an e-mail on that, if you have had opportunity to see that and you have thoughts on whether or not that would answer the kind of question that you had, I would appreciate other folks to chime in as to whether or not that sort of visualization would be useful. Obviously, I'm a very strong proponent of this. I think I've heard from a few others that they also liked that type of presentation of data. But I have not heard consensus one way or the other as to whether or not we're asking for that to be done. If that consensus does not arrive, then maybe I'll just take it as homework to try to do that on my own time every time a report is published, but it's necessarily going to lag behind the official. And if you need help

seeing that particular e-mail, I can always resend it, put on top of the inbox, but please advise. That's it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel, to be clear—and maybe that's why Lisa raised her hand so I'll let her explain that in details—I think that there is an interest. I think that there is also not an easy bridge from the way the data is being currently collected and obtained. So I could work on it. But maybe Lisa has a better explanation.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Seb. I think we kind of need to discuss what is possible with the team as far as the Sankey graphic. I know you guys had mentioned there's free software available. What we have, which is actually one of the agenda items that I wanted to discuss, is we are able to generate a CSV that we can publish publicly from the summary of data report. If that's helpful to everyone, it would be something that anyone could grab off of the RDRS page of icann.org and using whatever way needed as far as pivoting the data or using it for other types of reports. But as far as having the Sankey graphic available directly, that would be a conversation and a scoping that would have to happen with our tech team, and depending on how important it is, you'd have to make a choice between doing something that's complicated like that versus some other improvement you guys would want. So just something to keep in mind.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think you've got your answer in the chat. There seems to be plus ones and plus hundreds for the CSV.

ALAN GREENBERG: Having typed in a bunch of numbers to do my analysis, I strongly support a CSV.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So it can be a step towards it. And if we want to continue discussing, integrating more fully, we could do that. But, Gabe, you'll have the data to play with sooner. I thought at some point a hand from Marc Anderson but pulled it back down. Did you want to add something? Did you have any questions?

MARC ANDERSON: No, nothing to add, Sebastien. I'm good.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Cool. Very good. I had a question, but it's possibly towards Sarah rather than Steph, because I suspect that this comes from the original form that we're using. I was wondering—and I'm sure we discussed it at some point, but I forgot—the metrics that are under 8, so 8.1 to 22. Is this all self-reported? They requested themselves, put themselves in there. And what are those categories? Or is this something that is correct? Particularly, for example, how do people define themselves as a security or non-security researchers? Okay, self-reported. So, essentially, they declare what they are and we trust them to be who they are.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Do they report who they are or what is the nature of the request, Sebastien. I believe it's the request type and not the requester identity.

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

SIMON RAVEH: The answer is in the chat. It's based on the request type category.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: On the request type rather than the requester. Okay, cool. Thank you. Yeah, I see that. Yeah, absolutely. Thank you.

Okay. Cool. Thank you very much, Sarah. I have just muted myself, continued talking. Any other questions about the metrics? Lisa said it, I wholeheartedly agree, the more we change these metrics… We should have an open mind and better where we can better when we can. But the more we change these metrics, the less we can look at them in time, because then we're no longer comparing apples with apples. So indeed, if there is an agreement to adding or finding a way to extracting the metric, Alan was suggesting great, but let's do this fast, and then agree that this is what we're going to work with the next 18 months, I guess. I see your hand up, Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS:	Sorry, you cut out there for a second. Sarah, calling out that I am expecting you to maybe be able to shed light on this. So just log in your name so you can pay attention to the question. But there was some e-mail traffic back and forth about how the metric… What is this? 14? Yeah. Denial rate by reason type was being treated where the response to the requested data is publicly available in RDRS. Actually, that flag is zero so I'm not sure. Oh, thank you. The responses that will say it's publicly available—and there was some e-mail traffic back and forth about whether or not that could be clarified to mean proxy, and I got, Sarah, that you were hesitant to say that that was something that you would support or that the Registrar Stakeholder Group would support—I wanted to give an opportunity to maybe have you explain that a little more because I was not tracking the reasoning and I didn't want it to go into too much of a back and forth on e-mail and whatnot. But I note that there's some disagreements amongst constituencies as to whether that would be called a success or a failure or whatever. You and I have zero interest in trying to do that. But I have very much a strong interest in knowing having some sort of data surrounding when those responses pertain to an affiliated proxy service of the registrar versus not, because there's multiple types of public available information and whether it is the real data versus the proxy service affiliated or non-affiliated or perhaps even a reseller, I feel like those would necessarily result in very different types of considerations for a future SSAD. I would think that would be tremendously informative but I'm not getting that from this report at this time. So I'll pause there and allow knee jerks and reactions and explanations and clarifications.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Sarah, did you want to jump the queue and take this one?
SARAH WYLD:	I could. Or I don't mind if Alan wants to speak to Alan's point, and then I can come back after. Alan, do you want to? He was waiting.
ALAN GREENBERG:	My point is very simple. It was in response to Sebastien's comment about changing metrics. Changing the metrics that we have right now should be done with great care is a somewhat onerous thing. Adding a new metric, which is not there for the duration of the test, I don't think is particularly onerous. And if it will help us, I think it's a good thing. So I think we need to treat a change very differently from adding a new metric which was missing. Thank you.
SEBASTIEN DUCOS:	Thanks, Alan. I appreciate the difference. Sarah, your turn.
SARAH WYLD:	Thank you. A couple of thoughts. Okay. My hand is up for a different reason so I'm going to come back to that different reason at the end. Gabe, thank you so much for saying my name at the beginning of talking to me, very helpful. I appreciate that.

Okay. So what we're talking about here is whether the checkbox that registrars can use to indicate that the data that was requested is already public, whether that should be changed to be called domain uses a proxy service or domain uses a privacy/proxy |

service, which is a term that we use even though they are two different things that work very differently and have different outcomes. So I don't think we should do that because I just think that they are different. So, reason number one, not all domain names that have public data use a proxy service or a privacy service. So in an increasing amount of cases, domain owners will decide to publish their real registration data. So the checkbox, data is already public, would be appropriate for that circumstance. And if it's a checkbox that says this domain uses a proxy service, then it would not be appropriate in that case. So that's number one.

Number two, sometimes the registrar will know that the domain uses a proxy or privacy, and sometimes they will not. And so I think that that's where Gabe is going with regards to affiliated and non-affiliated. So that leads to actually my primary reason why I don't think we should do this, which is it all relates to, connects to, brings up the PPSAI work which is not yet complete, not yet implemented. I've lost track of whether the Board approved it, I don't know. But we really cannot be making decisions here in this group that would seem to be assuming outcomes of other groups' work or would perhaps make registrars incorrectly think that there are obligations that they might have, that they don't have, or not understand what their obligations are. So I think if we want the benefit of having a better sense of how many domains are in this case, we should use the tools already available to us without going too far into a place where it becomes unacceptable for some of our users who we're trying really hard to keep them in the system. Okay. So that's all my thoughts on that question. I see

that there's a couple of hands up. So what I can do is I can save my other topic, and we can come back to that after. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. I'll just add very quickly that as per the e-mail that initiated a conversation following the CSG meeting, and having an impression that names under privacy and proxy were representing a large amount of the requests—I mean impression that different registrars were answering to those questions differently, we're trying to find a way to make sure that at least registrar's side, things were consistent in order to separate the problem and indeed leave it to the PPSAI, which technically, Sarah, was voted in by the GNSO Council a number of years ago, sent for implementation, and then put on hold because of the whole interaction with GDPR and the work that we were doing there. I don't know where it's at now in the sense that I don't think that all the experts know either, if to throw it back to the GNSO because the policy recommendations are really no longer current and probably need a lot of work themselves or to push it through implementation and see what comes. I don't know where things are going with that. But in any case, I think that I fully agree with you, Sarah, at this stage. Because this is policy in the making or policy in the restarting, I would be very concerned about the interactions there that we would have by trying to—well, not tipping the scales—but by trying to pre-evaluate what is what and number them. But that's my personal concern. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you, Seb. Okay. Sarah, thank you very much for the explanation. I completely am sympathetic. I agree that we don't want to be in a position of making decisions that assume the policy outcomes of the PPSAI, especially given the uncertainties and that return to focus there. I wonder, in the meantime, however, you called out that public—I'm just going to shorthand it—public response, that the category data to this list is public might increasingly pertain to the real data of registrants that are making it available and agree that's absolutely something that can be happening. But it's the uncertainty, I guess, that I'm wondering. We lack metrics in terms of how much that's happening versus how much it might be a proxy affiliated with the registrar. And I wonder if there was the ability when you're responding to market as public just to a subject or a secondary checkbox of public versus public and affiliated with the responding registrar, that could really go a long way for us to have a better understanding of, well, how often are each of these outcomes occurring? And that can then be very informative to, well, then how much of a role does this play in our future considerations without it actually diving into any assumptions of PPSAI outcomes? It nonetheless represents very different categories of data that exists. And right now, we're blind to how much of one versus how much of the other. So my what I'm suggesting here is, to Alan's point, I think previously I think it was Alan that said this, we're not trying to introduce or change the types of data that are being reported. But if we could perhaps put a subcategory under this, I think it can be very informative to our future deliberations to know how many times that something marked as public is or is not affiliated with

the registrars responding, and that would be very useful, at least at least to me. I welcome others' thoughts.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll try to become less vocal as this meeting goes on. Even if the PPSAI does not require any changes, it just has to be implemented, by the time we finish an IRT and the delay that we give registrars and others to implement policy, our two-year period is going to be over. So as much as it would be nice to have the PPSAI settled and we could use it, it's not going to happen during this test. And if there's policy changes needed, it's going to take even longer than that. So I strongly support what Gabe is saying. If we know a huge number of the privacy/proxy domains are a captive proxy provider, if those can be flagged as such, we have a leg up, we have a significant number of information. There's no way we can tell other proxy services. A domain registered name of Alan Greenberg might mean my personal one or I may be a lawyer doing it on behalf of a client. You can't tell that under the current rules. But registrars do recognize their captive proxy provider, and there's no reason why we can't ask them to flag that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I don't want to share my personal opinion here. To raise concern, again, with the interaction of what is suggested here in the interaction with policy work that is ongoing, but I won't

say any more than that. I'll let each party to defend the right. Sarah, I see your hand up and happy to answer any of the stuff that you heard or bring the point that you wanted to bring originally.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Okay. So on this topic, I realized I said the words that an increasing number of domains publish their real data, and now I'm realizing what does that matter? If the real data is published, then there's not going to be an RDRS request. So setting that aside, I don't personally see value in splitting out which domains have whatever available data is already public versus some other domains have an affiliated proxy service. If that's a thing that we want to figure out, I don't think the RDRS Small Team is the place to figure that out. I think this is one of those the perfect is the enemy of the good situations. We already have basically what we need. I think we should leave it as is. So, okay, sometimes we disagree. That's allowed too.

It's not the proxy topic. My hand was up for something else. Yes. Okay. This is just a little heads up, FYI, teaser. I do not yet have actual information. I have heard from registrars that we really want more of the requester's data to be mandatory because this is part of what registrars consider in their determination to disclose or not. So what we have right now is that the requester's name and e-mail are mandatory. And then their address and phone number are optional, and their organization or affiliation is not collected. So I'm waiting to hear back from more registrars to confirm that this is a full stakeholder group request rather than just a couple of users. So I will send a more formal e-mail I think next week after

I've followed up at our stakeholder group meeting. But it seems to be registrars want to make the address and phone number from requesters also be mandatory, because part of what the back and forth is in making the disclosure determination is asking the requester for that kind of information. And because those are already optional fields, I imagine it would not be extremely difficult to make those become mandatory instead of optional. So I would ask perhaps ICANN could investigate the level of effort to make that change.

Then separately, with regard to organization or affiliation, I cannot recall why we are not gathering that in a field. I imagine that it's often discussed in the requester's additional information. I guess it's because we weren't doing any kind of validation as to whether the requester belongs to their affiliated organization. But if we could consider adding that in, I think it would be useful. But I understand that because that's not already requested, it would probably be a bigger change. So I will also ask that perhaps ICANN could start to investigate the level of effort so that we can know if it might even be possible. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. You would have seen in the chat that there's a Paul McGrady comment saying that we want to see pushback from the requester community. Lisa confirming that she will look into it. Okay, good. Stephanie, I see a hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I do apologize if I should have caught this earlier. But I'm quite surprised that you are not ensuring the contactability of the requesters because if a data commission has to investigate a case of wrongful release of personal data—and it might happen despite your best intentions—they will want that contactability and they will be as stunned as I am that you have not kept the name, address, phone number, whatever. This is not a casual thing. You're releasing somebody else's personal information to a stranger. So it just makes sense that you gather that. It should be mandatory, in my view. I don't know how we pass a legal review without flagging that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I will let Sarah answer to that. I don't want to interpret your words, Sarah. But my understanding at least of how it would be done— taking my check up here for a second and reminding everybody I'm also a good ideal employee—I think that that sort of missing information, a gaping missing information in the form would almost certainly result in a denial rather than a sharing data. But that's my own impression of how things are done. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Perhaps I misunderstood. I heard Stephanie to be asking how do we know that requesters can be contacted at the contact info they provide? I don't think that is or should be a question for me. I think that that's a question about how the platform functions. I'm not—I mean, I am. I did make one RDRS request for my own domain just to test that the requests were

coming through Tucows and I'm still hearing complaints about that, but that's fine. So any requester has to create an ICANN account? I don't remember. But I think that probably is part of creating that account, I had to validate that I have access to the e-mail address that I'm using to log in with. But maybe the ICANN staff person would like to answer that. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Sorry, can you repeat the question one more time, Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Does a person setting up in RDRS request have to do something to show that they really can access the e-mail address that they're using on the account?

LISA CARTER: I don't believe so. But, Simon, go ahead and chime in.

SIMON RAVEH: Yes, they do. They create an ICANN account. And as part of creating an ICANN account is actually confirming that you have access to the e-mail address that you provide. So yes.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Simon.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Simon, there could be a number of years between the moment you create an ICANN account and the moment you start playing with RDRS. Is that re-verified when you log yourself into RDRS? At least the first time? It's part of the ICANN contactability in general.

SIMON RAVEH: Yeah. It's not re-verified when you start playing with RDRS.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Go ahead, Sarah. Stephanie, I assume your hand is a prior one. But go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. So this is raised in my mind, it's possible that I misheard Simon. But what I heard is that we're not requiring people to verify access to their e-mail if it was an older account. So if that's the case, I wonder if we would want to ask our security member for input as to the best way to maintain security of the RDRS login page or the access functionality. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm scrolling down in the participants because I'm not sure who is our security member this time. Usually, Steve Crocker will have something to say but he's not present today.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I'll chime in. But just to clarify, though, if all responses are going to the e-mail that's provided, if that e-mail is not actually under the control of the requester, then there have no means of obtaining the response. Correct? So I'm just not sure exactly what the overall concern there is, but maybe I'm misunderstanding.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm seeing Simon, and then Stephanie, and then Paul McGrady. Go ahead, Simon.

SIMON RAVEH: Just to be clear, we don't send any PII data over e-mail to the requester. We only notify the requester that an update had been made on this request, and you need to log into the RDRS system to see the actual result. So I'm not sure exactly what security concern we have. Now, I also assumed that requester that comes to submit a request have the correct e-mail because they want to get a response.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Simon, yes, we all assume that they put their correct e-mail because they want a response. But that is not always the case. And yes, you send only a warning that there is a pending, say that is a request. That's on the request to the registrar. We're talking about the other, the response the other way around, which happens directly from the registrar outside of the system from the registrar directly to the request based on the e-mail that is in the system. So ICANN is not disseminating directly any information,

but it might be orienting the registrar in the wrong direction. Stephanie, I see a hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you. With respect to the security concern, regardless of who's actually releasing or how the mechanism, you're in control of the release of the personal information somehow between the system and the registrar, the request has been accepted. And it seems to me that your security concerns relate to the security of the individual whose personal data you are controlling here. Therefore, you need somewhere to guard against e-mails that are good for a week and then disappear, because you won't be able to reach the requester once they've got the data if they happen to be a fraudulent requester. And they've got what they want and the individual has taken a complaint to the Privacy Commissioner because somebody's got their data and done something bad. So it seems to me that only checking when they subscribe to the service seems not quite adequate, not from your security perspective and your liability for controlling this. Thank you.

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

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. So to a certain extent, I feel like we're boxing with a hypothetical shadow. Not that this isn't a real problem, but it's not a fully manifested issue yet. So I think it makes sense for Sarah to find out if this is a registrar-wide request, and then run it past the requester community, make sure there's no objections, which is

EN

hard to imagine that there is. It would be really bizarre to say, "We want a domain name registrant's full information but we're not prepared to give it to you." For ourselves, that would be strange. Then if there are still remaining questions from Stephanie, concerns or whatever, after we know whether or not there's a proper issue here, then I think maybe we take it up then. But I think we're probably looking at the agenda with 30 minutes left, I expect we probably want to punt on this until we have the picture fully in our heads. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. I see Odeline's hand up.

ODELINE MACDONALD: Thanks. Hi, everyone. Odeline from ICANN Org. I just wanted to chime in on the couple of comments I heard. On Sarah's first request, the reason why the fields were made optional is because they were not tagged as being necessary, but just being nice to have at the time, and from a data protection perspective, we didn't want to collect more information that would be volunteered by the requesters. So if there was a change into that, and let alone, I believe, to the team to assess the efforts, of course, we can reassess that from a data protection perspective.

As to your concerns with regard to the liability of ICANN with regards to verification of the accuracy of the data of the requesters, we appreciate that, but as mentioned in the chat but also in comments, we can't avoid that that there will obviously be any hijacking of accounts, etc., etc. But we also have made it very

EN

clear that we do not go beyond the ICANN account verification. We do not guarantee the data being accurate. We cannot do that. We are just facilitating the transport of the request from the requester to the registrar. Any input is welcome in terms of whether we need to reassess this or just as I see they've mentioned, it might be an input as well for the SSAD. That's a very good point. Both in terms of liability, we, of course, look at that point when assessing and building the tool together with the Legal team, the IT team, our colleagues in this, etc. So but we appreciate the comments. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Odeline. Okay. So we close this for now. Sarah will be looking for you to update us with the discussion within the Registrars and see how we bring that forward. I am looking quickly at the time and the proposed agenda. Whilst we didn't mark the different steps in the agenda, we are going through the questions that we wanted to look at. Am I missing anything? I think that we talked about it all, CSV.

The deny responses and explanations, do we need to discuss that a bit more? Is there still more that we want there, beyond the discussion on privacy and proxy, specifying what type of privacy and proxy? Because I'd like not to go back through that at this stage. But was there any other clarifications that needed to be had on the way responses were flagged? Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: This is actually so as to remind Sarah of an excellent point that she made. I don't remember if it was an e-mail or if it was in the RDRS feedback form. But I think she had mentioned that there was lacking on the registrar end a means of responding with a denial pending further information from the requester. So I'm going to pause now and see if she wants to explain that further. But to my mind, that was a reasonable thing to work on.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Yeah, Gabriel, thank you. A pending status, I like it. Thank you for reminding. I had indeed forgotten that while thinking about other stuff. In the standard ticketing systems that I'm familiar with outside of here, we can send a request to open or to unhold. And then there's a pending status where if it's not updated within a given period of time that is adjustable, then it automatically closes the ticket. I feel like that is very valuable. Because for a registrar, we might receive a ticket, contact the requester to ask them for more information, and then wait. And if it sits waiting for a month, it looks like the registrar is taking a really long time to answer the request, but really, it's that they're waiting for further input in order to be able to make a decision. And we do not have a standardized timeframe to let it wait for, I think. So if we instead had a pending tight status and, for example, if it sits in pending for a week and there's no update, then it automatically closes the ticket, then that way we have a better understanding of the current status of tickets and they don't sit around waiting forever for no good reason. Well,

I guess no good reason is not fair. They don't sit around waiting for more information, which is beneficial for tidiness in the long term. Thank you. I'll agree with Gabriel's point that, yeah, instead of saying, "No, you can't have the data," I would rather say, "We waited for two weeks for you to explain why you think you should have the data and now you didn't explain it." So there you go.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I was waiting for like if Gabriel wanted to—but I guess not. Good. Stephanie, I see your hand up, and then Lisa.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I'm a complete know nothing when it comes to ticketing systems, but it seems to me I've encountered a ticketing system in the past where we counted whose court the ball was in so that we would not be accused of long processing times. Maybe this is just a government thing. Sorry, but I think it would be very worthwhile here because there's been an awful lot of noise about nonresponsive registrars and registries. Knowing how quickly you get the ball back in their court and how long it takes them, or if they just give up and go away because they can't justify further, that would be good to know and make your statistics more reliable. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Stephanie. Just before I hand to Lisa—and I like focusing on the positive maybe—but this is something I have to say we as a group discussed at length the sort of duration or hypothetical duration tickets before this was launched. And it is

definitely not something I heard during the CPH session as one of the gripes, and I thought it was a very good sign. And indeed, the stats show at least something that, in my humble opinion, shows that there are no massive delays, registrars are responsive. So if we can fine tune, that would be fantastic. Lisa, I see a hand up.

LISA CARTER: In listening to everybody's sort of commentary and feedback, I just want to make sure that we at ICANN get the list of actually what you guys do want us to take into consideration and investigate as far as the pending and some of the other updates you're indicating so that we can focus on those. Just to make sure we're highlighting the right things to focus on for you guys, I wanted to say that, number one.

Then number two, with regard to the privacy/proxy, I know there was an ask for ICANN's help in updating user guides and FAQs. And there was some potential language, I think, provided towards what you guys wanted us to say. I just wanted to reiterate that the way we would need to explain it in an FAQ is really based on the requirements for privacy and proxy separated since somebody did bring up that they are different. So I kind of want to also maybe get together with a small group of people to just go over sort of how we would update those so we can all be on the same page for what that would look like in the user guides and the FAQs. That was all.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Lisa. Obviously, I don't want to stop anybody else from participating. But that conversation initially was with Sarah and John McElwaine, who might be the best person to talk about. Sarah, I see a hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Lisa, completely agreed and understand. Of course, you need a list of what is being requested so that you can triage it and make sure that everything's addressed. Of course. The specifics relating to the registrar requests, actually, I think it's all already in the Impressions document. So I've just opened that one up. The very first thing that the registrar submitted was address is optional, it is necessary, it should be mandatory. I just changed it now to add in the phone number also, but the address. And then I think there was something in there about like a pending or an in progress status also. So maybe what we should be doing is go back to our Impressions document and figure out what order are we going to approach all of those things in? Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Yeah. Agreed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Obviously, the corollary to that is that everything that came up today by the different people should be added to the document. Stephanie, I see a hand up.

EN

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I completely agree that there's a difference between privacy and proxy registrations. But since the policy work in the previous Privacy/Proxy Policy Accreditation Group did not differentiate. Are we completely sure that we have definitions that would work? I don't think we do. I could, of course, be wrong that that group met in 2014, 2015. My memory is not what it used to be, but I don't think we can work without a legally defined policy on what's a proxy and what's a privacy registration, unless you guys tell me, "I've got it all in your RAA." Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, absolutely not. We do not. And that's why we were concerned with separating these answers from the rest of the batch because we're not going to be able to treat them or look at them seriously. Again, my humble opinion here. Paul McGrady, I see a hand up and then disappeared. Well, hand down. Possibly because he saw there was time and I know how much you love finishing meetings right on time. Not exactly, got to stay on time. So if there are no other comments, we will see each other in two weeks and continue the discussion on the wish list and the—sorry, the name escapes me, we just talked about it. But going back to the document. The Impression document. Thank you very much, Sarah. And looking at that. With this, I'm waiting for the clock to turn to 7:30 pm here and wishing you all good end of your day. Bye all.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]