
ICANN84 | Prep Week – Key Insights from the Two-Year RDRS Pilot Program
Tuesday, October 14, 2025 – 20:30 to 21:30 IST

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Thank you. Hello, everyone, and welcome to the ICANN84 Prep Week Session for Key Insights from the Two-Year RDRS Pilot Program. It's being held on Tuesday, October 14, 2025 at 19:30 UTC. My name is Yvette Guigneaux, and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read out loud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom, and when called upon, unmute your microphone and state your name before speaking. Please state your name for the record, and if you are speaking a language that is other than English, please speak at a reasonable pace.

Okay. I believe that does it for me, and now I will hand things over to our senior program manager, Lisa Carter. Lisa?

LISA CARTER

Thanks, Yvette. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I'd like to thank you all for joining us for today's webinar. As Yvette mentioned, my name is Lisa Carter, and I'm the senior

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.

program manager and project owner for the Registration Data Request Service, also known as RDRS. I'll be providing the RDRS update for you today. Next slide, please.

So we've nearly reached the end of the RDRS pilot, which concludes in November. Today's presentation will cover a high-level review of RDRS operations, including engagement awareness highlights, system enhancements, and some key usage metrics from system launched through September. The GNSO Standing Committee chair, Sebastien Ducos, will discuss the Standing Committee's findings for RDRS and review the key recommendations and lessons learned as outlined in their Findings Report. Next slide, please.

I'll start with a quick recap on how the RDRS Pilot Program developed. Recommendations were developed for a System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, also known as SSAD during the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2 from 2019 to 2020, and a proposal for the WHOIS Disclosure System was presented in June 2022. That same year, the Board approved launching a ticketing system to handle requests and indicated that they wanted the system developed and implemented by late 2023. The system was developed for submitting requests, logging the outcomes and tracking usage and demand data. It leverages existing ICANN systems and tools, including the Naming Services Portal for registrars.

The data collected is intended to help inform the ICANN Board's decisions on next steps and ongoing consultation with the GNSO Council on the SSAD Consensus Policy recommendations. Data from RDRS Usage Metrics Reports, user surveys, and user experience interviews were also considered by the RDRS Standing Committee for its Findings Report. Next slide, please.

So have we done to this point? This timeline provides some of the key events for RDRS.

Our first Monthly Metrics Report was published in January of 2024. ICANN delivered the Six-Month Operational Update for RDRS at ICANN80 in Kigali. And by August 2024, several enhancements were completed based on GNSO Standing Committee and community feedback. We'll review the full list of enhancements in a later slide.

November 2024 marked the one-year anniversary of RDRS. ICANN published an Annual Report for RDRS in February 2025, providing an operational analysis and assessment of the pilot's first year.

By August 2025, the Standing Committee had published their Findings Report for public comment, and that comment period recently closed on the 29th of September.

In the next several slides, we'll delve further into the current operational metrics and assessments for RDRS.

These are some of the current metrics for RDRS from launch through September 2025. In terms of user data, we have about 12,714 requester accounts. We currently have 79 registrars

participating, covering 46% of Domains Under Management. There were 137,149 domain names in RDRS, 8544 resulted in a message indicating that the registrar for the domain name isn't participating in RDRS. For submission information, we had 3524 requests submitted. There were 3226 requests closed. Closed does mean that the registrar took an action to mark request as complete in the system by indicating it was either approved, denied, partially approved, or indicating the information was publicly available. We'll delve a little bit deeper into specific metrics and review requests, approvals, denials, and denial reasons in a later slide. Next slide, please.

These are some of the current numbers as of September. We have for RDRS engagement and awareness efforts. Prior to RDRS launch, the Global Stakeholder Engagement team initiated outreach to potential requesters in the five geographic regions. Concurrently, the global domains division account managers initiated outreach to registrars to encourage voluntary participation.

Over the course of the pilot, there have been a total of 93 events attended and/or hosted by ICANN across the five regions. With a total attendee count of about 5340, that's an average of about four events per month. The GNSO Standing Committee members also lend their expertise for some of these events, sharing their experiences and feedback on RDRS.

In addition to these outreach efforts, RDRS garnered online visibility through various published articles, paid social media

campaigns, and ICANN-published blogs, announcements, and newsletters. In the next slide, we'll review some of the RDRS events and user data since launch.

Once the system launched, we began to see a ramp-up in the number of webinars to educate and increase participation in the pilot program. Month over month, the number of requester accounts has continued to increase, correlating, at least in part, to the increase in RDRS-specific events and discussions within the community to raise awareness and interest.

Registrar participation did begin to decline in March of 2025, and as of September, reached 79 participants. Some registrars decided to withdraw from the pilot once the RDRS Standing Committee began to draft its Finding Report for the GNSO Council. And by that point, we'd already reached the one-year mark for the pilot program. In the next few slides, we'll review a few of the key usage metrics.

This chart shows the number of times a domain name was searched in RDRS and search outcomes by percentage. Each query result is categorized as follows: DOMAIN NOT FOUND means the domain does not exist in the queried system and is not registered. DOMAIN NOT SUPPORTED means the domain name is not in the official list of generic top-level domains or does not have a valid format. This bucket includes TLDs not supported through RDRS, including ccTLDs and TLDs like .gov, .mil, .ant, .edu, etc. REGISTRAR NOT SUPPORTED means the Registrar for the domain name searched is not participating in the RDRS pilot. And DOMAIN IS

VALID means the domain name is managed by an ICANN-accredited registrar participating in the pilot. Additionally, the total number of valid searches is not the same as the total number of request submissions. As users may search for a domain but not proceed with submitting a request. The search number is significantly higher than the submission number for that reason. Next slide, please.

This chart shows the total number of requests submitted since launch by request category. Canceled and unprocessed requests are included in these numbers. The majority of requests, as you can see, come from IP holders or Intellectual Property holders at 33%, followed by the category of Other at 26%, and Law Enforcement at 15%. In the Other category, we found various information, including users not using the pick list and retyping the request type name or typing multiple request types for one request. We've also seen some domain owners seeking data for the domains they own, and brand protection vendors is one of the largest components of that category, comprising about 75% of requests categorized as Other. Next slide, please.

This chart displays the denial reasons broken out by percentage. Registrars may select multiple denial reasons for each request denied. 28% of requests have been approved since launch, and 61% of requests have been denied. The denial reasons selected most often at 30% is "Cannot disclose due to applicable laws," followed by request is incomplete or the requester did not respond to requests for additional information at 27%. For the Other

category, the most common reasons indicated were misuse of the service such as UDRP cases, technical support requests or test requests. Additional usage metrics are included for your review in the Appendix of this presentation, which will be posted later today. You can also review monthly metrics on the RDRS page of icann.org. Next slide, please.

These are the key themes we've seen in feedback from the RDRS surveys and user experience interviews. Requesters' positive feedback highlights the benefits of a centralized system and a standardized format. Feedback on needed improvements generally indicate the registrar's need to provide additional explanation for denials, including which applicable laws prevent them from disclosure, what provisions of RDRS legal terms have they failed to comply with, and/or what other corrective action is required before the request can be processed? The GNSO Standing Committee's Findings Report supports the need for additional explanations from registrars for each denial reason as well. Next slide, please.

These are the key themes we've seen from registrars in the RDRS surveys and user experience interviews. Registrars indicated positive feedback on streamlined request intake process, reduced number of requests missing information, and the ease and ability to navigate the response section in the Naming Services Portal. However, areas for improvement do highlight the need to integrate with registrar's existing ticketing systems to reduce the double work that is currently happening for the pilot itself, improving bulk

functionality, and providing additional form questions to help clarify specific data points for the registrars to assess, as well as the need for requesters to have more guidance on what constitutes a quality request.

In the next slide, I'll review the enhancements requested by the GNSO Standing Committee over the course of the pilot. New messaging on the RDRS login page and a link to RDRS on the ICANN lookup tool results page. Updated language to promote taking surveys in the e-mail sent to requesters once the registrar has concluded their review. Adding form fields for requester address and phone with additional optional field organization. Increasing the open text field character limits to allow requesters more space to provide the detailed explanations to assist in registrar assessing the request. Updating the Naming Services Portal to allow all requests to be viewed without a filter and including the request date on the response page and the ability to change the Request category. For example, if someone were to submit a request as law enforcement when they are not, the registrar now has the ability to change the request type to a more suitable category. Next slide, please.

With the pilot in right around the corner, it may be helpful to outline what's ahead for RDRS. RDRS will continue after the pilot ends in November, and until there is a long-term solution in place, during this time, ICANN will continue to work with the Public Safety Working Group on an authentication solution for law enforcement and will continue consultation with the RDRS Standing Committee

on enhancements. ICANN will also publish the RDRS Pilot Summary Report in Q1 of 2026 to provide a full review and operational assessment of the two-year pilot.

There are also a few recommended RDRS-related ICANN84 sessions to consider attending for you all. Specifically, you may be most interested in the four working sessions the GNSO Standing Committee is holding to review public comments on their RDRS Findings Report. Next slide, please. Go forward again. Forward again. There we go.

Now I'd like to introduce and welcome Sebastien Ducos, senior client services manager at GoDaddy and the GNSO RDRS Standing Committee chair. He'll be discussing the GNSO Standing Committee's Findings Report and the committee's recommendations for RDRS. I'll turn it over to you now. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Thank you, Lisa. Good evening, good afternoon, good morning to everybody from Stuttgart, Germany. As Lisa said, I am Sebastien Ducos, and I have been chairing the Standing Committee throughout the pilot that she gave updates on. Before that, I was chairing also the small team within the GNSO Council that basically took the result of the Operational Design Assessment that was published four years ago now, almost four years ago, on SSAD. And it's that group that decided to try a pilot that ended up being called

the RDRS after a few names. So that's what I will talk to you about. Next slide, please. Maybe next slide again.

The Standing Committee was tasked by the Council at the request of the Board. The Board, having seen that the SSAD recommendations, as voted by Council and sent to the Board, implied a very high cost of development and maintenance for the SSAD application of site that would take in and dispatch requests to the different data holders, the different registrars and registries, in the case of SSAD. And so, given the very, very high cost of it, the Board sent it back to the GNSO and said, "Hey, can you have a look at this and try to see if there's ways, first of all, to assess what this usage of such product would be?" because it was feared that the cost of usage, the cost of it would be prohibitive, and the cost compared to the usage would be absolutely prohibitive, making it impossible for people to use and pay for it. So that's what we did with the pilot.

So the first thing that we needed to identify was the trends, month by month period, seeing who, how many, who were they coming from, the users on both ends, on the requester side and on the registrar side. It's something that's going to be discussed later, maybe not today, but so far, the RDRS is a voluntary basis, but it's on the registrar side, the requester side. Requesters continue and can continue requesting data directly from registrars. And registrars may, at this stage, still opt to participate or not. And as Lisa has explained, you would have seen that we had a peak of number of registrars participating earlier this year. But as Lisa

explained, as we were winding down the pilot, some of them decided no longer to participate. So, trends—and Lisa has presented a few of them—the last data that we have is from September, if I remember well, and it's available online if you're looking for it.

The next thing that was asked of us was, given that we're running this for two years, is to give a list of possible technical updates that would make RDRS more efficient. This was done on the basis of the experience that our different users had. Some of this sent back through Lisa and the survey that she mentioned on the second part of her presentation, some more directly, and some simply from the committee members that were also users from both requesters and responders who were able to help in that process.

A third chapter of our report was dedicated to lessons learned and how we should consider this pilot with regards to SSAD. And this has been, as you would imagine, a good part of our job and of the report.

Last but not least, suggestions from our Standing Committee back to the GNSO Council on how to proceed with it. Sorry, as the Board asked the GNSO Council for guidance on how to proceed, we were chartered by the GNSO, and so we're feeding back information to the GNSO Council who will then share that with the Board. Next slide, please.

As these things go when you review existing policy, and again, I need to remind everybody that the SSAD policy that we worked

from is policy that went through its full course up until Board approval was approved by GNSO Council was sent to the Board. It's still, right now, in limbo, not accepted by the Board, and thus hasn't gone through the later phase of implementation policy exists and has been approved. So, one possible way to go about it is for the GNSO to say, "Well, this is on your table. Please proceed with the recommendations. We think they're perfect." As you can imagine, that wasn't after two years where we landed.

The second option would have been to say, "Why don't we throw everything out? None of it is in the best of interest of ICANN so let's abandon it."

A third option being that we would recommend for a number of recommendations to be updated, to be modified.

The last, between the third and the last, there's not much difference, but the last being a combination of the above. So there are things that we will suggest maybe not to take forward, things that we would suggest to take forward having changed, and things that are pretty good in the first version and we should keep on. Next slide. Next slide again.

So we came with six main topics of recommendations. As this slide doesn't say, we need to just be slightly careful here in the vocabulary that we use. This was a small team that became a Standing Committee. It's by no means an entire representation of the community, and as such, not a body that recommends policy. In ICANN speak, when we talk about Recommendations with a

capital R, we talk about those Recommendations that end up being voted by the GNSO Council and go to the Board. The recommendations that we propose that are with a small r. This one happens to have a big R because it's at the head of the slide, but with a small r it's our group recommending to the GNSO how to proceed.

So the first recommendation is about the tool that's been developed for the pilot, the RDRS site, which is functioning, which enables users to log in and file a request that gets sent when participating, and Lisa went through those details of how many requests actually are for domain names that we covered and that are sponsored by participating registrars, and so that flows those requests to the appropriate registrar. Our first recommendation is fairly simple. We suggest they should be maintained, that we shouldn't turn RDRS off. Lisa also suggested that, in her presentation, should maintain it at least as long as the GNSO and the Board decide on how to proceed with it later. For intents and purposes, we'll see that later, probably in the future, won't exist in the form that it has now are some improvements to consider. But in general, we would suggest that until we know where we go with it, it should be maintained. Obviously, that's not a like decision. Any systems that we put online for the broad public that we do, there are cost implications and cost for ICANN to cover, so that is also with our consideration. Next slide, please.

The second recommendation is one that Lisa also sort of mentioned as part of an extension of pilot we're working currently

with law enforcement, and specifically with the GAC's PSWG who are proposing a global system to authenticate law enforcement, so that when registrars receive a request from law enforcement, they know that it is indeed a recognized law enforcement body and know which jurisdiction that comes from. That is an enhancement at this stage, it's enhancements that is mainly in the hands of law enforcement. They're working on their existing systems to make sure that we can use them. And so we've suggested that should proceed because it doesn't at this stage require massive development on ICANN's side. Furthermore, beyond law enforcement, if there are other groups of requesters in particular who feel that it would be of benefit to have themselves authenticated, as long as they provide the system and pay for that, we are also potentially interested to include them.

Recommendation 3, next slide. Now, there are a number of system enhancements that we are suggesting. There's finite list in our report that we can imagine further enhancements for a long time. At this stage, these are enhancements that we would strongly recommend. Again, the pilot ending and the budget behind the pilot ending is not for us to force that. It will be with discussion or in discussion with the Board who may decide to extend the budget in order to be able to do this, or may decide to wait.

One of those enhancements is a set of APIs, both for requesters and for registrars, to be able to connect to RDRS. Some of you may know that registrars, in particular, have already in their contract the obligation to provide some kind of a process in order for data

requests to be made to them. The requirement and the contract is not very specific in terms of how that solution should be put, but at least they should have a process. And a number of registrars, my employee included, have already their own forms and their own systems online. Some may decide to adopt RDRS instead, some may decide to keep their systems, and for those at this stage, we are thinking of providing an API for them to be able to continue working with a system while participating in RDRS.

Request improvements to the forms. There's always improvements. Obviously, we try to make them as easy to understand, clear, both in terms of what is asked within the form and what the responses from those forms mean. Lisa mentioned in her surveys that there was general approval of the forms, in the sense that people found them fairly easy to navigate. But there are still obviously a room for improvement. These forms are lightweight in terms of development. The team that is looking after the system and making sure the system remains alive are also those that can do those changes, and mainly because it would greatly help users. And because it's lightweight, we've decided to sort of put this improvement forward.

The last one is actually not a minor improvement in terms of technology. It could be a bit heavier lift. But there was a lot of requests to see if we could invite ccTLD participation. Now, ccTLD in the ICANN world, as you know, are not governed by the same ICANN rules as gTLDs and like an accredited registrar, they're not contracted parties, and so that would absolutely and definitely be

only on a voluntary basis. We could not right now onboard ccTLDs and the way RDRS is designed, but have been looking at solutions in order to be able to do so, and believe that it's something that should be prioritized. Next slide.

I have no idea of time, so, Lisa, if I'm taking too much time, please wave. Recommendation 4 with regards to policy. In one of my earlier slides, what do we do with SSAD, the policies that were voted in by Council that were sent to the Board, and that technically the Board is asking Council to relook at, knowing that these would be way too expensive to implement. I won't go into the details, but we've looked at all the recommendations from SSAD, and this was not a policy development body, so we just looked at him and commented them but didn't go further into deciding what they would need to be. We looked mainly to be able to evaluate for Council the amount of work that would be needed in order to make those changes. We had a cursory review of those and have made a number of recommendations on how they should be adapted to an RDRS. Next slide.

Recommendation 5. Again, I'm repeating myself, I think. Again, part of the package is how for the Board to consider that. Sorry, I'm losing my track here. Basically, in the report, we have all this again, this is not a body that's making policy. So these are our thoughts on those recommendations, but they're all listed in detail in the report. Recommendation 5—I'm losing track of it, and I'm hoping

that I'm not missing any big—sorry, next slide. Next slide. Sorry, I've covered the 4 and 5 bit together.

The last recommendations is for us to stay around. If the RDRS is maintained, if we need to assist the Board or the Council on their proceedings, we recommended to keep the Standing Committee in place, probably lighter weight than it's been for the last two years, but to keep ourselves available and maintain ourselves as available for the Board and the GNSO Council in order to benefit from our learnings and make sure that none of that is lost. Next slide. Is there a last slide? I think there is.

As Lisa mentioned, we closed our preliminary report in August, put it to public comment beginning of September, if memory serves me well, and these comments were open until the end of September. We received 11 comments from all corners of the ICANN community. Good comments, thorough comments. We have been in the process with staff in aggregating them and making them ready for the committee to review, which is a task that we will go through during ICANN, and as Lisa mentioned, there's four sessions to go through it. I don't know if we will need all four sessions. So if you're interested, please, I invite you to show up early. I think the first one is on the first Saturday, because I don't know that we will need all, but I know there is quite a bit of work. So I'm glad that we have that much room to finish it, but let's see how much we use. There is a bit of pressure from within the committee not to have that many because there's a lot of conflicting sessions everywhere.

Then we will focus on putting together the public comments. As these things go, I have always ensured that the mic remains open also for guests in our session, but the work of the committee needs to be prioritized, so we'll see how we go. These sessions are technically not sessions for further public comments, that period has been open and lasted. These sessions are to review the public comments that we received. Again, I'm not against opening the mic. I just need to manage my time.

Once finalized, the report will be shared with the GNSO Council. That also means that it will be publicly available to all. And that should initiate a round of discussion with the Board. I understand from information I received this week that the Board will also have already by ICANN84 a number of statements and vote on this topic, but I'll let them present that in due time.

I am very sorry, Giacomo. I've seen chats but I wasn't able to follow. So I think this is my last slide, and I believe that if anybody has any questions, I should be available to answer. Maybe go back to chat and see if there was any questions for me.

LISA CARTER

Thanks, Sebastien. I think we do have time now for questions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Maybe I can give you the answer, Giacomo, that's not very complicated. There are two main differences. The first is that in the gTLD construct, the responder body is going to be accredited

registrars for multiple reasons, but probably the most important being that they're the ones, the accredited registrars, are the ones that have in their Registrar Accreditation Agreement the reference to having to respond to data requests. Again, they don't have to deliver data, but they have to respond to data requests positively and negatively, but they do have to respond. Registries do not have that in their contracts. In general practice, when a registry receives a request, they send that back or they reference back the registrar and say, "You should go and ask the registrar." If there is a total absence of answer, which shouldn't be, again, because contractually registrars are meant to answer, then sometimes the registry can interact. But it generally is for the registrar to answer.

In the ccTLD construct, it's almost the opposite. Most ccTLDs in their jurisdiction are responsible for the registrations and the data that go behind it, and so the requests go to the registry rather than the registrar. So that's one fundamental change in the way these things should be processed.

The second one is a technical one. For the last two or three years, even more gTLDs have had an RDAP system in place in order to interrogate if domain names exist and who they're sponsored by. RDAP exists in ccTLD, but it's sparse. It's still very much a WHOIS world. And so we would have to adapt both the way the requests are treated and who they're sent to. And we would have to adapt technically how we figure out who's sponsoring a domain name.

So, for ccTLD, the domain name is not very complicated to figure out because it's the end of the domain name. But we still need to verify the domain name does exist, which is, as Lisa described, one of the first filters that we have. And we would have to verify that the ccTLD in question, for example, is participating, and that we would have to go through WHOIS because, in most cases, an RDAP is not yet available.

So, for those two reasons, there's a bit of development to be done there. I think we would also need to understand, to evaluate the interest from the ccTLD community before we throw ourselves into that sort of development to figure out if anybody does want to participate. I hope that answers your question.

LISA CARTER

Thanks, Seb. Are there other questions, Yvette, that you can read out from the Q&A pod that we need to answer?

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Yes, there are. I can just go ahead, I think, and read them in the order they came in. I think some of them were answered. I do have one from Monica. "Is there an expectation that law enforcement or the GAC will demand a mandatory system?"

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

The answer is yes because they have done so already, because they've done so, again, in their public comment. Yes, there's clearly an expectation that will be demanded. I don't want to preempt on

the result of the further discussion, so I don't know how that's going to pan out, but the expectation that it will be demanded is a clear yes.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Okay. I have another one here in the Q&A pod from Jan Jansen. "Is there an indication of the current running costs of RDRS?"

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Yes. It is part of our report. I don't want to misquote, so, Lisa, hit the panic button if I'm wrong, but it's in the vicinity of \$2 million at this stage.

LISA CARTER

It's about 2.8 as of the report that was published for the Findings Report, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Even better. Okay, 2.8 Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Okay. Let's see here. We have another one here from—I'm just going to say Siva because I do not want to mess up the name. This one, I believe, is addressed to you, Sebastien. "Why isn't the registry expected to be accountable, not in a legal sense, even if all the data resides with the registrars?" I can read that again if you need me to.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Why is the registry not accountable if the data resides with the registrar? I think that the question answers itself. Again, as per the contracts in place, the handling of a data request is on the side of the registrars. There is nothing in the registry contracts that mandates it. Whilst registries have historically, again, in terms of ccTLDs is a different world. But in gTLDs, whilst originally registries were thick registries except for .com and .net, first of all, there's been over there the last few years a significant increase of privacy and proxy. This is another discussion that is not under my remit but is happening within ICANN. I won't comment on it, but we all know that it will take part in what final product we'll have here.

So, long story short, essentially, the data is with registrars. Registrars own the data or control the data. It's a complicated picture because, also within registrars, there's resellers and there's privacy and proxy providers that may or may not be affiliated with registrars. The picture is a bit complicated. But essentially, the data is on the registrar side contractually, and that's why in RDRS these requests are flowed to the registrars. Again and again, it's a very, very different picture than ccTLD, so we'll have to adapt for that. But in the case of RDRS, which was only gTLDs and a number of participating registrars, it's the way we've mounted. I hope that it answers your question.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Okay. All right, we will go ahead and move on to next question. I'm kind of alternating. Some have some in the chat, some have some in the Q&A pod. So if everyone can just use the Q&A pod, please, so we don't miss your question. But I'm going to go ahead and keep on the chat as well. This one is from Monica in the Q&A pod. "What are the pros and cons of a mandatory system?"

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

I want to be careful here because this is a discussion. It's a heated topic of discussion, let's say, and I want to make sure that the committee is able to produce the final report that it feels is adequate. It was the subject of May public comments. It's a subject of discussion with the Board already. So I just want to be careful.

We have to note that, as I said, contractually registrars have to have a process in place, and they've had that for years, a process in place in order to take requests and handle requests. And a lot of them have done just that, and a lot of them have the systems already automated and synchronized with their own system and vetted legally in their jurisdiction, etc., etc. There's a lot of work that's been done there. Now, if ICANN comes with an RDRS, it may provide a service for a number of registrars that haven't pushed that particular envelope too far. And for some of them, the process remains very manual, and having a system like RDRS could be useful because we're providing something that is somewhat of an automation. For others that have very developed systems, again, very integrated with it, it's a hindrance. And yes, we may develop

an API for an RDRS, but that's yet another API for them to chase. It's yet another system.

So, the clear advantage for requesters is to have a single address to go and ask that. The clear advantage for registrars that do not have anything that is automated is to provide something that is fairly well automated, and as per Lisa's surveys at least, people find it easy to use and agreeable. For those that have systems that are again very integrated with what they do already, it's an extra cost. It's a hindrance, it's another point and location to look into.

My own personal view, I thought that, yes, we should maintain the aspect of a single point of entry, but it should be a system that is not mandatory, where RDRS is a single point of entry, but where we leave room for everybody to be able to plug into it the way they see best fit, again, against their own systems, their own legal requirements, their own public, their own everything. Again, I want to make sure that remain neutral in my answer because this is a heated topic of discussion and a very much an open topic of discussion, more to come in the next few months.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Okay. That answered Monica's question. Okay. Jan, I see what you said that. You didn't ask a real question, more like a topic of concern. I'll just go ahead and read it out loud so we have it on the record. "If this system has to be 'cost recovering' it feels like

‘getting’ information might become quite expensive. I just want to at least put that on the record if anybody wanted to comment on.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Yes, and clearly stated, that was where the alarm bells were rung four years ago, or three and a half years ago, after the year the year it was published because the cost of a full SSAD was absolutely prohibitive. And you’re absolutely right to note that the SSAD was purely on a cost recovery basis.

The notion of cost recovery hasn’t been dropped. It might need further analysis. The cost involved in SSAD have been drastically reducing RDRS. Now, RDRS is not a finished product. So finished product probably can be more expensive to run than it is now. But at this stage—and Sarah helpfully shared that part of the document—the notion of cost of recovery is an illusion in the sense that, yes, the cost that we’re running this show at are prohibitive compared to the number of requests that we’re receiving. And yes, requesters wouldn’t pay that much, or not all requesters would be able to pay that much to be able to file request. We need to see this.

Again, this is a wider discussion. Cost Recovery from the first penny spent is one thing. Cost recovery on the actual operation is another. That makes a significant difference once you start removing the whole development idea and actual physical development of a system. That might be one way to look at it. Again, these are discussions that are open, ongoing, some heated. So I want to

make sure that I remain fair and neutral here. But it is definitely a topic of concern.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Okay. Thank you. We do have one more question that just popped up in the Q&A pod. “Is the current problem made more acute by the low cost policies of certain actors of the market that allows to have thousands of addresses and sites nearly for nothing? Would not this be a problem to address?”

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Possibly? Not here. It’s certainly not for this Standing Committee, for myself, but a Standing Committee that, again, is not a policy development body to sort of put comments to that. We’ve always wanted to have with ICANN a system where different business models were respected. I’ll leave it at that. Not for me to comment. Thank you.

YVETTE GUIGNEAUX

Okay. Checking the Q&A pod, I think we’ve covered everything. I don’t see any more questions in there at all. So, either Lisa or Seb, whichever one of you is possibly closing it down, unless anybody else has any other questions that they want to ask. I don’t see any hands up, and there’s nothing else in the Q&A pod.

LISA CARTER

I will close it out.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

I'll give it back to you. Yes, I was just going to say thank you very much, everybody, and have a good rest of your day.

LISA CARTER

Thanks, everyone, for attending. As Seb said, enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]