
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GNSO: EPDP Phase 2 (SSAD)
Monday, June 13, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 AMS

JULIE BISLAND:

Thank you. Hello everyone and welcome to the EPDP Phase 2 SSAD session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

All members of the EPDP phase two SSAD team will be promoted to panelists for today's call. All participants in this session may make comments in the chat. Please use the dropdown menu in the chat pod and select everyone. This will allow everyone to view your chat. Please note that private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist to an attendee will also be seen by the sessions hosts, cohosts and other panelists.

To take part via audio, if you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the main room, please raise your hand in Zoom and when called upon, unmute your table mic. In the secondary room, please raise your hand in Zoom and go to the standalone mic when called upon. Attendees will have the opportunity to raise hands and contribute during the time indicated by the chair. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the

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.

record and speak at a reasonable pace. With that, I will hand the floor over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Julie. Thank you for that. Hello, everybody. I am Sebastien Ducos. And, sadly, I'm not sitting with you in The Hague, I am also close and also far from the center of France. But this is a new exercise for me like it is for everybody else. So specifically, because I'm not in the room with you, make sure that indeed, as Julie said, raise your hand through the system and through the Zoom, and for those present in the room to stop me if I'm missing something crucial.

So again, for those that don't know me, I'm Sebastien Ducos, I'm a GNSO Council member. And I was tasked with leading small team for the analysis of the SSAD ODA, the EPDP ODP and ODA that was released earlier this year. We'll have a slide for that.

So today, we'll go through a bit of what we've been doing for the last six months, going through status reports. I'd like to go through that as quickly as possible to be able to get into the actual discussion of interest today. And I believe that we will have a presentation from staff on what they believe that SSAD Light could be before we actually start working on scoping that in earnest.

We need to also discuss what impact that will have on the work that staff is currently tasked with. And I'd like that discussion to be as a small team, but because we're today within ICANN [inaudible] discussion, I want to make sure that the mic is also open for this. And because we are in a Zoom webinar format, I will ask for your patience. If you want to intervene, please do so as much as you want on the chat making sure that you share it with everybody. But if you will want to speak on a mic, we will ask you to raise your hand and give a bit of time to be able to promote you as panelist and open mic for you.

And again, this is my first time so if I'm doing any of this wrong, Julie or anybody else, please correct me. And we'll finish the session with a presentation from Edgemoor research, Steve Crocker, who's a member of our small team asked us on our last call if he can have some time to do a presentation about a software that is in design and development from their end and Steve believes would provide a number of solutions to our problem.

Now, without further ado, and again, I don't want to rush through this but I do want to devote as much time as possible to discussion. So could I have this slide on background and go through this fairly quickly?

So the GNSO Council asked us to start this small team in early February, just as the ODA was released. [It appeared very] quickly

from the ODA, even before it was released, that the policy recommendations that were made on the SSAD, which would mean designing a tool, a piece of software that would be both extremely costly to develop and to run, and possibly, we were, let's say that we were alerted early by ICANN, by Göran in particular, as to the fact that it was going to be a very expensive exercise and that we would probably need to look into ways of either simplifying it or reviewing the policies. I don't want to go too much into the weeds here.

Because of the nature of the discussion, the fact that this EPDP Phase 2 hand involved the whole community, we didn't feel that it was a GNSO Council only matter and made sure that the small team went beyond the Council into the GNSO SGs and Cs but also other versions of the community to make sure that everybody was able to interact and follow.

This small team, which grew over time, also grew to include a caucus of the Board, the GDPR caucus from within the Board, who are members of the Board that are particularly in tune and alert of all the problems of personal information and personal data and handling and etc.

So, initially, we were tasked with verifying that the ODA—so the report that the ODP team produced in late January was indeed in line with the recommended policy recommendations, it corresponded to what the policy had recommended and

intended to recommend and, again, as I said earlier, given the price tag that had been put as a result of the ODP on to this project, possibly see if it was of concern to us and if it was a concern, see if there was ways to provide remedy.

A small team is not a policy development process team, it works outside of that remit. So we weren't tasked to change the recommendation, change the policy or even comment at this stage. We were again there to review the ODA, review the work of the ODP team and maybe offer our views as to the result of that.

The policy recommendations as were drafted and shared and submitted ultimately to the Council who then voted them to pass them on to the Board are still exactly [inaudible]. So between Council and Board.

We delivered an initial report. And I don't have the date in mind. But that was month and a half ago. And in that report, we suggest to develop what we call a proof of concept, which has been called also an SSAD Light, which I believe staff will propose another name today for. But all this is the same idea. So this idea is to divide the task of the original SSAD as per the recommendation and in particular, to remove the section of where the users would be accredited by ICANN.

And this based on to two things that we realized very quickly. The first one, that it was at the very least half of the cost of the original solution described in the ODA and a lot more in terms of cost of

operations. Operationally, it was a very significant cost of the tool. And two, because it became very quickly apparent that the registrars, so part of the Contracted Parties House, sort of the people on the coalface who will be taking the request transmitted through the city. These people felt that legally they had no other option than having to reaccredit everybody and that they legally could not take ICANN's [good word] for it.

And so we very quickly decided to separate or to look into a solution that might separate that from the problem and focus on the part of the SSAD which [consisted once] these accreditations were made, to pass on the information, the request, properly formally request to the contracted party in question. In most cases, the registrar sponsoring that domain name.

And so we turned to staff, Eleeza Agopian and team, to ask them to look for us into what it would take to be able to develop this SSAD Light, essentially to review their ODA report, at least in the section of the report that described the tool, and the amount of effort and work and investment that would be needed behind it. And for them to look into this and help us better scope it.

the exercise of scoping itself. The ODA took nine months to produce. [The exercise of scoping is nine new months] of scoping, because we're not starting from zero, but [inaudible] to take at least six weeks. And to take six weeks also with impact on other work that staff was busy with.

Initially, we asked for that work to be done in preparation of this, ICANN meeting. But it very quickly became clear, first of all, it's not for the GNSO, let alone our small team to decide what staff does. We asked the Board to be able to authorize this work. And it became very quickly clear that because it had a domino effect on other work that had to be done, the Board wanted us to help them—if not decide, at least advise as to in our view, what would be prioritized and how.

So we immediately decided to postpone the deadline on this work and not to have it for this ICANN but to have it for ICANN 75 in roughly three months' time. And so now today, we will hear from staff, first of all what their initial idea of the project is. And again, this is before scoping anything, it's just to make sure that we are on the same line. And then beyond that, re-explain the effect that it has on existing work, what work can be postponed, how and what work will need to keep on going on.

Now, I understand that before I'll pass on the mic to Eleeza and Ash, I think I believe that Göran wanted to maybe introduce the team again for everybody and explain where things are at. So if you're ready, I'm very happy to pass the mic on for you. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you. Good to see you all. I'm going to be very short. So Ashwin is going to do a presentation on potential technical

solution based on the discussion we had before and how we can integrate that in the current systems we already have. So it's going to be a little bit of a technical thing. And we think actually, we do have a technical solution to build what we now call the WHOIS disclosure system, mostly because we never remember what SSAD stands for.

So in that, the time we need to do the next step is really to make sure that the technical solution actually supports the recommendations. That's why we need some work. And the six weeks is to check that the assumptions are right. But please have a look at this technical solution. I will ask you to go through. You will recognize many of the acronyms because the idea is that we are going to use already existing systems in ICANN that we have up and running. So with that short introduction, Ashwin, the stage is yours.

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Thank you, Göran. Thank you everybody for giving me an opportunity to present this. My name is Ash Rangan, and I serve as the SVP for Engineering and Information Technology.

What we will be sharing with you is quite brief. I'll summarize in executive format what it has to say and take you through a brief design overview within a single chart, and explain with a backup chart how we think we can leverage existing ICANN technologies that are proven and have been in production for a number of

years that we feel very confident with, so that you have a clearer understanding of how we're thinking about the technology solution.

And to Göran's words prior to my jumping on stage here, we still need to go backward and make sure that the recommendations are being checked off with the proposal that we have. So with that as introduction, next slide, please.

So in summary terms, we've developed what will be termed in engineering as an MVP, or a minimum viable product. It's a proposal for the centralized request and processing system for entities which are seeking registration data. And we're calling it the WHOIS disclosure system, so that it is self-descriptive, the term, rather than SSAD or some other variation, three-, four- or five-letter acronyms.

The proposal is to is to leverage existing and proven ICANN design patterns. So we have multiple systems that we make available for use by the community. Each of those has a unique design pattern to it. And in reusing an existing design pattern, most of the learning curve benefits will accrue to us. And therefore we want to use known design patterns and also to leverage existing technology stacks that we have used for creating various services.

The proposed approach is to be delivered with existing ICANN resources. So we're not looking to an external third party who may be an expert. But instead we're leaving on expertise that we

now have inhouse. And that approach, the combination of known design patterns, known technologies and proven technologies, and inhouse resources, could potentially lead to reduced time to develop and launch. And part of the design patterns that I'll describe will also show that we're thinking of this in such a way that it simplifies the adoption by old users, because we would be using similar or existing user interfaces. Next slide please.

So from a design overview perspective, without making it go into the details of technology at a high level, what we envisage is that WHOIS requestor logs into an existing ICANN account, which is backed by technology—we'll talk about that—the ICANN account is a user interface that's proven and available for a number of our services.

So the user would log into an ICANN account, and they would submit a request. The request, we would work, of course, with the community to harmonize the request form in such a fashion that all the required fields as considered necessary by the providers of information are captured. We would create that form in that fashion so that any request that we get is validated to have the information necessary to fulfill the request before it goes anywhere.

The intention then is to automatically route that request that has now been captured with the front end to the appropriate registrar. And to do that, we're thinking that we can reuse the

case and ticketing system capabilities which are inherent and a part of the naming services portal.

And for those that may not be familiar with the naming services portal, it is the portal that is used by all contractor parties today for cases that they are involved with in conjunction with ICANN the Org. So this is not a new system. This is an existing system. And this functionality is not new either. It's existing functionality. It's a matter of cloning the functionality and making it available.

Our thought then is while the case is active, as in it has been created and it's awaiting a response in terms of a disposition, that the privacy identifiable data that's associated with that request is taken away from the mainline system and stored in an appropriately encrypted database so that we are storing it in a secure and a private fashion.

We then think of the next step here, that the contracting party would directly send the information that has been requested outside of the system to the requester, but would then come back into the naming services portal and disposition that request, as in, did they fulfill the request or did they not fulfill the request? In other words, they denied it.

And from our perspective, once that last step has been taken by the contracted party, we would close out internally to the system the case and associated PII data would then be disposition appropriately. But we will retain enough metadata that we have

the ability to report on cases and case statistics, how many cases came in, to whom were the cases directed in terms of the backend contracted party, over what period of time, what was it that was done with the case? Did they say yes, they fulfilled the request, or did they say no, they denied the request? We'd be in a position to gather that metadata as a part of this system, and be in a position to extract that metadata and turn that into reports and provide that as visible reports in whatever format is desired. Next slide, please.

I said that we would be leveraging existing ICANN tech stack. I wanted to dive into that to make sure that there is a clear understanding of what we're talking about. So when I said ICANN account, ICANN account is based on the OKTA identity platform, which has been in production within the ICANN ecosystem for almost five years now. We have tens of thousands of accounts that are registered and regularly exercised and used primarily by the community members who far outnumber us relative to the number of people that we have internally to use it. ICANN Org is also a user of the OKTA identity system for our own purposes, but on a different and separate instance. So we're very familiar with how the system works, and how to integrate it on the back end with other systems.

Similarly, the naming services portal, it's based on the Salesforce platform. Salesforce, as you know, is a very thoroughly established software. It offers enormous breadth of services.

Inside of that, case and case tracking and ticketing and ticket tracking are inherent. And our proposal is to use that. We have of course been using Salesforce for a number of years. And it's licensed and available for use by us and for the benefit of the contracting parties already. So from a ticket capture perspective, Salesforce only becomes a receptacle, we would just take what gets entered and put that into the NSp accounts, into the NSp system. So each request does not then become a user. In fact, the ticket becomes an entry into an already available contracted party which is registered as a user in the NSp platform already. We have 1300 plus contracted party accounts which are active and used regularly.

The WHOIS disclosure system that which is really the capture front end and the sort of traffic cop in the middle is a system that we'll need to write, it will be a Java custom app that we will write and make available between capturing between the account and the NSp system that's already available. And the encrypted PII data, our intention is to put it into a MariaDB. It's a database that we're very familiar with and use for many, many other services that we provide to the community. That really is the sum and substance of the proposal that we have.

As I started out by saying, to summarize, this is a technology proposal that we feel can be stood up in light of the needs that have been expressed to the small group. I think it fits most of the requirements if the front end of authentication is removed and

what's left is authorization and access. So this provides that authorization in terms of the ICANN account, and access in terms of how to get to the right contracted party. The authentication piece is the most difficult piece as it was observed in the introductory comments. So with that, let me pause here and pass the microphone back to I guess it would be to whoever's RPMing this meeting. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Ash. I guess that would be me. Thank you very much for this presentation. I just would like to understand, because I understand that some members of the staff had to walk out the room. But I think [inaudible] you're staying anyway, and Ash, you seem to be available for questions.

I've seen many comments in the chat, I was listening to Ash, I'm not very good at doing two things at the same time. So I want to make sure that everybody that has a question is able to formulate it. And in priority members of the small team.

I just want to make sure that everybody fully understand that what we are asking staff to provide today is a system for a proof of concept. This is not the end all and be all of this product. We may find, once the concept has been proven, to function, to work, that we want other features and other systems and whatever. But all the actors that I'm seeing here are saying potentially that it might be too slow and might be too we really want to keep in

mind that we are looking now to a solution that we can deploy fast. And that will be my first question to Ash, that we can deploy efficiently, that we can afterwards tailor as we see usage. And obviously, in the meantime, because we do want to have this, if the usage of it won't be immediately the life size of the full market of its usage—and we're very cognizant of it—we do want to have something that is fully secure.

And so maybe my first question, and then I'll open to anybody else that wants to intervene to Ash, is first of all, in terms of security, can you update us a bit on the situation that we had maybe 10 years ago and 18 years ago is a very long time. But we're we had a few hiccups at the beginning of the new gTLD program with data being wrongly accessed. And that will kill the project immediately. So I'd like some update here, and then quickly and without any particular commitment, but an idea of, given the fact that you're reusing tools that you know well and etc., from the moment you have the time—and we'll discuss later when that could start, but how long do you think it would take to develop such a product?

ASHWIN RANGAN:

So there are two questions that you asked me. One is to provide a perspective on the state of security of the Salesforce environment. And the second is how long of a level of effort this would be in terms of time.

So on the first topic, indeed, your memory serves you well that it was about eight years ago that we had the implementation when we first sunrise the gTLD program of many different security-oriented concerns with what was then called the GDD portal. We subsequently shut down the GDD portal in its entirety and made it unavailable to the contracted parties, and went back from a ground up perspective and constructed what is now known as the naming services portal.

In doing that, all of the security concerns were thoroughly handled, and to reconfirm that we were as secure as could be, we have instituted a practice whereby when large payloads are made available in production, before we promote things to production, we get a third-party firm to come in as experts and audit us so that we know for a fact that what will go into production is safe and secure.

After we have sunrised the naming services portal, we've not had any reported incidents. And to confirm that we've also engaged in an open-source platform called Hacker One, where we invite security-oriented researchers to come into our environment and see if they can hack into our system so that if they can, we learn from that and remedy the situation. In this specific case, we've marked had even a single thing turn up from a naming services portal perspective. So I think between those two actions, I can confirm that this is a secure portal.

As to your second question about how long of an effort this is, we've taken an initial swag at this. We think that this is a relatively modest team of five to seven people. And it's also relatively modest time period of months within which we can express the system and make it available. And from a scalability after the fact perspective, which you alluded to, we will need to understand how much of usage this has before we decide on any specific course of action.

For instance, if there is enormous use, there might be a use case here where the backend of manually transacting with contracted parties might need to become an API driven contracted party interaction. And if there is an API interaction, that presumes that the contracted parties will have their own work to do. If you think of this as a pitcher and the catcher in a ballgame, an API for us would be a pitcher, we would pitch to somebody, the catcher has to be ready on their end to catch what we're pitching so that it's an indeterminate amount of time. I can't answer that yet.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much. I have seen a message from our friend Berry Cobb inviting comments and questions to be formulated in the chat if you wanted them read. Otherwise, again, I keep on repeating this. I'm very bad at following the chat. If there are any questions that somebody would like to voice, I would like to open the mic at this stage for questions on Ash's presentation.

Thomas Rickert, I see your hand up.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much. And hi, everybody. Great presentation. Thanks so much for putting that together. I was just wondering, Göran, I think you mentioned that the encrypted data of the requestor is not going to be stored. And I'm wondering whether it would actually be a good idea to retain that data for at least a certain period of time to be able to monitor who's requesting what, because in during the EPDP deliberations on this, we spent a lot of time on establishing or considering mechanisms that would avoid abuse of the system. So if we could keep the data for a while we could put in some checks and balances for folks not to abuse the system. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

All right. So we've done this over the last couple of weeks. And we looked at it from a data minimization perspective to make sure that also the system is possible under GDPR. Because it's like the question why does the contracted party send the data back directly to requestor. It's because of data minimization in GDPR. We can look into that, but we don't want to end up in another GDPR issue when we're trying to build a disclosure system for WHOIS. But well taken.

There was another question also from Wolfgang. And this is where we also have—some of them will slide into policy. For instance, the contracted party makes the decision about the disclosure of the data or not, and they send or do not send the data out to the requester. And then the question is, how do you report back that to the system? And how do you make sure that there is a sort of a tracking of it? So there are things that if the policy said it should be a tracking of that.

One of other things that is also—as you know, the policy is not only verification notification part, there's also questioned about, is this a mandatory system versus can you still go around to the contracted parties around it? In the current policy, it says that the costs will be paid by the receiver. In this system, as you see, there is no billing function. So, there is a lot of questions around this that still has to be engaged with you guys.

What we decided to do really was, as we said, when we had the conversation, we sort of turned the whole question around, looking into what can we possibly build with the least amount of effort, with this speed? And then we have to go through if there are any essential parts of the PDP recommendations we would miss. And the one who makes that decision is primarily you, not us. But it's a good point. Thomas, and everything can be discussed.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZU: I think this is an excellent presentation. I think we lack another flowchart that would be helpful or two. And that would be what are the steps the contracted parties and probably specifically registrars have to take in this scenario compared to another flowchart of what they do now.

So at first glance, it seems like registrar would have to do two tasks here, one is respond to ICANN and two is to respond to the requester. But there might be efficiencies gained if the requester has to fill out the request for information in a very specific style that would expedite the request. So maybe an interim step would be consultations with registrars or consultations with all contracted parties to map out their flow in this process and contrast to that to what they do now and see if any efficiencies can be gained so that in addition to implementing the system, we might also design in a way that's most efficient for the contracted parties. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you, Kurt. So on the first thing, now, I have to admit, it was a long time I read the phase two recommendations the last time, but isn't it so that inside the policy, it says that the answers go

back directly to the contracted parties? and that was taken on board because of data minimization.

But you're right in the fact that there is one piece of work here, I think that the requester and the contracted party has to come together. It's a legal issue, but also a process issue. And Ashwin mentioned that in the beginning, that we have to find a format for the questions so the system could say that someone checked the boxes in there.

But as you know, it's not easy because the law enforcement in one country can have a different legal reason than the intellectual property lawyer in another country. They can have different basis of why they want to have access to the data. But to find that format. And that would simplify—which was one of the attempt. So the contracted party would always get the same sort of questions when some of the boxes are checked.

On the other hand, the requesters requester has to identify themselves into the system in such a way that the contracted parties feel sufficient to give out the data. And that's a part of the balancing test.

But I think that if we can work together both from our dear friends for instance in the IPC, in the BECAUSE, law enforcement and other ones so they feel that they've got something that simplifies their life and on the other hand, also the contracted parties, registrars and registries feel that the actual question comes

streamlined to them as well, I think that's going to be a big win in the system. So thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Kurt and Göran. And to Kurt also, this was a discussion that we opened, we certainly didn't find all the solutions. But it is indeed important to have efficiency in that loop back information, making sure that that we capture when the contracted party has given, an answer just to make sure that it's done in a timely fashion. It captured within reason also the satisfaction of the requester, knowing that not all requests can be fulfilled with delivering data but that all requests should be taken, acknowledged and an answered to.

I have a bit of a queue here. In the attendee section, I have Milton Mueller, and I'm not quite sure where Milton is and how he can be included, that I'll let people locally figure it out. And then afterwards, I see Marc Anderson and [inaudible] hand raised. Milton is in the room, so maybe he could be given a mic.

MILTON MUELLER:

I can't hear exactly what you're asking. But if you're wondering why I'm here, it's because Manju wanted me to be here, because she couldn't be here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, I'm not questioning you being here. I'm questioning where you were in order to be able to give you a mic. Go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I'll just ask my question. So I think this is a pretty good outline of a solution. I am concerned about the way in which what is perceived as a temporary solution might become a permanent or become the default from which any further improvements are made. And for that reason, I am very concerned about the absence of a billing function.

First of all, there's just the obvious point that if this is a proof of concept to test the demand for the number of requests you're going to get, the scale of the system, if you offer something for free, you're going to get a very different level of demand than if you have to impose some costs on the people making the request.

We had a big debate about this at the policy level. I think there was an agreement that there should be some cost. I think you could bundle request subscriptions and say give us some fee, like \$100, and you get 100 requests or 500 requests for the next two months or something. But my question for Ash would be how difficult would it be to include a billing function within this system?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And if I may, the questions still stands, but we discuss this in the small team, Milton, and the idea was that we would possibly, indeed—and I personally think it's a very valid question to ask, the reaction of the usage on a paid model, but that we would try that in a second instance. The idea of the proof of concept, it might be staged. And we will try for a few months one thing and then adapt in a sort of iterative way until we get to a product we feel is stable. This said, Ash, please go ahead with the answer on the billing.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, Sebastien. Thank you, Milton for the question. It is difficult for me to answer that question. It's one thing to answer the question if the parameters of payment are clear. In other words, if you were to tell me build a credit card interface, that would be something that I could work with. But seeing as this is meant to be a global system, I'm not in a position to give you an answer that says we know exactly how to do this. It's almost like the authentication system in that regard, where the scope without being fully defined could be a reason why the system becomes enormously complex. So if we get to understand that with greater clarity, I would be in a better position to say it's this kind of a level of effort, is bigger than a breadbox, smaller than a room, at least give you a sizing parameter. So I know that this is not an optimal answer, but that's the most satisfactory answer I can give you, honestly, right now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Ash. In any case, I hear you not saying but saying that putting a payment option if we're able to define it clearly enough is not impossible with the solution that you propose.

ASHWIN RANGAN: That's correct.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I see Marc Anderson's hand.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. First, let me thank Ashwin for the presentation. That was very informative. And I appreciate that. When we as a small team first started talking about the idea of an SSAD Light of some sort, we had a lot of assumptions. We were assuming that something like the naming services portal, or CZDS could be leveraged or reused to produce some kind of solution in a short period of time.

But those were all just sort of assumptions that we were making. We didn't actually know if that was the case, which is what led to this initial outreach to ICANN Org to ask, hey, is this even a viable path forward?

And what I think I've heard, I think what we as a small team are getting back in responses that, yes, it is possible for something like this to be implemented, leveraging existing systems and known technologies.

So I think that gives us the answer we're looking for. As Göran and others have pointed out, we have some other questions that we need to answer, I think we as a small team have some more work to do. But this I think is a very important data point in moving forward.

Sort of a second point while I have the mic, there's a little bit of a discussion about how a contracted party would return a response to a requester. Particularly when you're delivering the data. As a contractor party, we have an obligation to deliver data, particularly in this case PII in a secure manner.

So without getting too much into the weeds, one option would be to deliver a token to the requester that the requester could then use to access an RDAP solution hosted by the contracted party. So I think maybe this is a little bit of a follow up question for Ashwin. Would it be possible for such a system to facilitate the contracted party passing the token back to the requester via this portal that the requester could use to then get the data itself in a secure manner? Thank you.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you for the question. Indeed, it's possible. Tokenization of the request is relatively a straightforward function. The challenge there would be to have a counter token also issued to the contracted party so that they can validate the fact that the requester is coming in with the right token. Those are transactional details that need to be ironed out. I would submit that those are the kinds of questions that the small team should take back to the contracted parties. If you can come back with a requirement that also fulfills what has been developed as part of the policy and tell us what the parameters are. To do the tokenization is one of three different options that my team and I brainstormed. So one of them was tokenization. And indeed, it can be taken care of. So technologically, it is not an insurmountable barrier. But there are nuances that we will need to work our way through. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. I have a small queue that I would like to close on this particular topic of a technical discussion, because I would like to discuss prioritization afterwards. But I see Steve DelBianco, and I've got Göran. Steve please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Sebastien. Steve DelBianco with the Business Constituency. It's a caveat. And then just one quick question, Ash. The caveat is from the BC and IPC, and to an extent Steve Crocker,

we said over and over again that this ticketing system would not likely be a valid gauge of the volume of requests. I know that our preliminary report made that point but there was a significant minority in the small team who felt it would not.

Why? Because requesters are not likely to see greater reward for making the request to the central system since there is no greater assurance of having a [inaudible] disclosure or an explanation for why disclosure isn't coming. In other words, it's the same reason the IPC and BC voted no for the SSAD, is that it doesn't do anything to increase the likelihood of actually getting a response.

So my question, Ash, is when it comes to reporting the identity of the requester or enough a description is really important to understand how the system is being used. We wanted to be able to assess where requests were coming from—and I don't mean where geographically as much as what kind of an entity was making the request—and we'd like to know what legitimate basis was being asserted by the party that made the request. And that helps us then to evaluate against whether or not a disclosure followed up and if so, when?

So the question is, how does that reporting requirement square with what you suggested earlier about your intent to delete the requester information? Would you be able to retain enough about the requester to satisfy the reporting requirements that I was describing? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: If I may just interject very quickly. And Steve, I fully acknowledge what you described as minority. But I don't think it was a minority in the group about the fact that during this phase—and I've said that earlier in this discussion, the volume of transaction is not supposed to be significant or definitely not the metric that we will solely base ourselves on. So that's acknowledged. That's been said and written. So I'm happy to [inaudible] now, Ash, if you want to answer the question.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you very much. I think it's a bit of a nuanced answer that I'm going to give you, because what we can keep and cannot keep is obviously the kind of reason why we're even contemplating the system. I mean, it's in the face of GDPR that we're thinking of the system. So what should we and what can we keep is integrally interwoven with the very need for this system.

So I would ask that that clarification is effected in light of what is required as reporting back. If that is clear enough, maintaining data that is required for reporting is something that we can do providing we know that that data can be retained without tripping GDPR wires in the process.

So the level to which we can retain the data, the period of time for which we can retain the data, those are all considerations in

minimizing the amount of data that we retain and minimizing the amount of time for which we retain the data. And I think it's a balance, on the other hand, with what is it that we're seeking to do with the report on the other hand.

So I trust that that's answering your question. I also know that our CEO has very strong opinions about this topic. So if you permit me, let me cede the ground to Göran here. I know he has some comments to offer.

GÖRAN MARBY:

I never have strong opinions. The point—and we discussed this—we already said that in the ODA. The system cannot circumvent the law, it would not increase the probability for disclosure, because that is done by the balancing test. But I get your point about reporting.

But there's actually another thing I want to say which I should have said in the beginning. So, so far, we have not made any decisions, the Board has not made any decisions about either the SSAD or the SSAD Light or what we now call the WHOIS disclosure system. That's good to know. We continue to have a conversation.

And I hear some of the questions we get is really policymaking questions. As we we have the conversation, we went back and started looking at the sort of technical system that will take not

too long time to build, to minimize the cost. Everything is always possible if you throw enough money on it and enough time on it.

But the idea, what we need to do, what we need those six weeks for, for instance, is the fact that we have to go through the system to see what part of recommendation exists and we can build into it. And then continue the discussion with you guys. Because it's not we who makes the decision, but [inaudible] policy.

I mean, the billing discussion, the reporting, discussion, whatever is part of the consensus policy. So at the end of this, what we might have is two different alternatives. One of them is the alternative that will be called the WHOIS disclosure system, and the other one is probably called an SSAD still. And then at least there could be a conversation about which one is the most important one.

So I really want to point out we're not trying to lead you in a certain direction when it comes to policies. That's why we sort of twisted everything around. You asked this question, could you make it easier, cheaper, quicker, and this will be done. But now comes really the hard part. This will not fulfill all the recommendations in the existing SSAD. We know that. The question is, how do we deal with it? But that comes from the bottom-up process, not from me.

So I just want to say there's no decisions made, the Board has not made any decision. This is an ongoing conversation. And by the

way, as a representative of my team, I have to say that this is A very positive discussion. And I have to say that we are really happy about the way we do this conversation together. It's a little bit of a new way for all of us. But I enjoy it, my team [inaudible]. Thank you for the trust. Thank you very much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So I see a queue with Becky, John and Thomas. And I had kindly asked if we could make this part shorter. So I just want to put it out there. I have promised Steve Crocker 10 minutes of this time to do a presentation. If he would like to tell me that I have more time, that would be great. And I do want to have a discussion about priority because I do want that to be discussed . F we ask staff to work on this, they will have to tool down on other projects. So Becky, I see your hand up.

BECKY BURR:

So this is actually a transition to that. I think to Göran's point, the Board is anxious to know what the Council thinks about the information, about [delays] that have been put out there. I personally—and I've said this before, I think it's extremely positive that we're getting very concrete disclosures about the impact of this from Org. But the Board is anxious to know about—and then really to Steve DelBianco's point and others, the Board also is anxious to know that there's some clear understanding about what Göran is calling the WHOIS disclosure system, what

the purpose of it is. Is it to collect information? Is it to simplify intake? What is it going to do? If we're going to do this, let's be sure we're all on the same page about it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Becky. So I can't speak for the GNSO Council and we will have that discussion this week. What I can say for the record—I think I saw Eleeza back in the room maybe to describe that better. But we have in discussion with staff agreed that out of the three other projects that this is in competition with, two which are the updates to CZDS and the improvements to the EBERO program can be put on pause without major damage. And then the teams working on it currently to the SSAD Light or the WHOIS disclosure, the scoping, at least, and that I understand also that there will be some delay and disruption to the SubPro ODP. But at this stage, none of these delays envision missing milestones and particularly missing milestones ahead of ICANN 75. The planned work for them will be done. Now, this is hearsay, and I would love to hear—and I'm sorry for John, Thomas and Desiree, but I would love to hear something from staff on that just to answer Becky's question. And I see Eleeza's hand up.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you. I apologize, I had to leave the room for a few minutes to attend another session. So I'm back now. In terms of timing, you are correct. On the two projects that would have to be

paused, I can't really say that they wouldn't have major impacts. I think it would for those who are impacted by the projects, but they would indeed have to be put on hold as we wouldn't have the resources to cover that while working on this design paper at the same time.

With regard to the SubPro, some of those same resources would have to be pulled back from that work and thus it would result in an overall delay to the sub pro ODP. But they would continue to be making progress. The SubPro ODP would not stop as a whole. And they would still have plenty to discuss with the community and in time for ICANN 75 which depending on when we begin with this design paper is about when we would anticipate—if we started soon, let's say after this meeting, we hope to be able to deliver in time for a discussion at the next ICANN meeting. So I hope that's helpful to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you very much. We will have these discussions also within the Council so I'm not closing the discussion. I think it's helpful. Thank you very much. I see Thomas's hand, and then we will have to wrap up anyway, because I did also promise that time for a last presentation. So Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Sebastien. And to Steve's point and also Steve Crocker's point that folks might not use the system, the GDPR—and I'm sure other privacy laws as well—have different [routes] for requests. So there are areas in which the contracted party would be legally required to disclose data. And if data is disclosed in fulfillment of a legal obligation—for GDPR, that would be 6.1(c) then certainly you have little flexibility as a contracted party. You need to respond to those requests.

But we're primarily talking about 6.1(f) cases. And this is where we're talking about the balancing tests. And the background for this is that the contracted party is entitled to disclose the data. They don't have to. And therefore, if we really want this to be a meaningful test for the system and its usage, the contracting parties could say that all 6.1(f) requests should be triggered through this test drive so that they would not respond to direct requests but gently nudge the requestors towards the central system. And by doing so, if there were agreement on that, I think we could really find out what the demand in the market is.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much for that comment, Thomas. This has been a very good discussion. I know for having had discussions with staff that they're very [available] to continue that discussion offline, as we will need to, as there's a number of topics that we have open here that we will need to discuss. And I will be also seeking help

and assistance from Becky in ensuring that by the end of this week, the Board has all the elements that it will need in order to make sure that it can take a quick decision to hopefully start with this. I did promise Steve Crocker some time to present what he asked for on our last call. And I would like to pass on the mic to him. And without further ado.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. And in the interest of time, I'll proceed as rapidly as I can. Let's see. Back up one slide, I guess, please. So just a title slide. This is what I want to share, is a joint project that Donuts and our recently formed nonprofit, Edgemoor Research Institute are trying to undertake together. Next slide.

It's intended—there will be quite a bit of similarity and some differences with what you've talked about with SSAD, SSAD Lite. I'm not going to try to do like a complete comparison, but just present sort of what we're doing. And then at some other time and setting, we can have some discussions about what the relationships might be, except to say that this is tended to be complimentary and supportive, not competitive.

So our focus here is how can you get a minimal simple registration directory service underway as quickly as possible, one that can be adapted and expanded as necessary, and developed in a way that

is completely open source and available to all the different parties who might want to use it. Next slide, please.

And why do this? Well, we think this will be a benefit to the domain name community, provide functionality, provide a platform to gain experience, and to stimulate more concrete discussions. A lot of the discussions that have taken place over the past several years are in the abstract, and in my experience and a lot of other people's experiences, if you build the system and get some experience with it, things evolve very rapidly and come into a much sharper review. Next slide.

So the basic structure is just to simplify as much as possible the submission, management, response and use existing standards as much as possible. Next slide.

So here's a simplified picture. Requestors on the left, data holders, which is a covering term that includes registrars and registries, not necessarily specific to contracted parties, it could be CC or others. And in the next few slides, I'll tease apart each of these pieces.

So the basic cycle here is a request makes a request and it arrives at the data holder who then makes a decision about what to do and then provide some sort of response, including a negative response saying I'm not going to respond to you or not going to answer the request. Next slide, please.

So just focusing on what the request looks like, its basic elements have to include some information about who the requester is, that could be a range from anonymous to heavy duty authorization and authentication of that, depending upon the circumstance, identification of what their designation, what the purpose is, and then what the requested data or what the action is because the same sort of request and response cycle can be used not only for the traditional WHOIS, but also for the allied activities of passing messages on to the registrant, for example, or requesting a suspension or takedown. All of these fit into a same basic framework. Next slide, please.

So the critical thing there is, okay, the request has arrived at the data holder. And now there's a process that takes place that has to include a bunch of questions. And if those questions are answered in the affirmative, then formulate a response, keep a record of that and respond. These small blue cylinders are intended to represent localized data repositories that the requestor on the left and the responders on the right have as internal systems. And one can imagine shared systems and more centralized systems as an extension of those, but there necessarily will be internal systems that keep track of these things. Next slide, please.

So then the response is, can either be exactly what was requested or can there be a partial response? Or it could be a negative

response. And then there's metadata, how long did it take, and other statistics about all of that. Next slide, please?

Critical thing is to think of this as a system that can be built upon as a minimal framework. So start with an API-based interface with web frontends built on top of that instead of the other way around. And using RDAP, appropriately, looks like almost everything that needs to be there can fit within the RDAP framework which is already operational. Next slide, please.

So here's our guess at a timeline, and this is all subject to change, but launch by third quarter next year, have requirements and basic system design done over the next quarter and then rapid development and then testing and revision and so forth. And next slide please.

Sharing this with you has two purposes. One is to share with you what we're doing and the other is to encourage participation and support. And participation and support comes in multiple forms. Understanding what people need, asking for different parties, contract parties, noncontracted parties, requesters, etc. to actually participate.

It's an entirely voluntary system. There's no force involved at all. And all of the results, not including proprietary information and PII kind of things, but what the statistics are, how well it works, what the experience is, intended to be shared widely and easily.

And that is the super short presentation. There's a bunch of other details that we could get into about how this could be expanded and additional services that can be layered on top of it and so forth. Questions, comments.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Steve. In the interest of time, because we have less than two minutes, just quickly from the questions that I saw in the chat, can you develop a bit on how does this complement what Ashwin presented? And to my view, immediately, there is indeed the fact that it's beyond contracted party for requests. And the second is, can you explain a bit who's behind that, knowing that that entity will hold data on requesters and potentially other PII?

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I can cover some of that, but perhaps not all of it. So this at present is an initiative from Donuts and from Edgemoor Research Institute. So it's a very small, lightweight thing. We would be delighted to have others participate.

One of the things in addition to the fact that it's not necessarily limited to contracted parties is that the focus here starts with, what do the requesters want and how does it fit into their processes and their systems? And on the other hand, the same questions with respect to the data holders.

So from an interface point of view and a system architecture point of view, the focus is really, in some sense, on the ends instead of the middle. It's certainly possible to develop the system in a way that has centralized ticketing, centralized record keeping, centralized statistics and so forth. It's also possible to develop in a hybrid fashion in which there are multiple pathways. The critical aspect is enabling the requesters and enabling the contracted parties or other data holders to tailor this into their systems with minimal cost and with maximum control. So that's the primary thing there.

I think I left out one of the things that you asked for.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Steve. I think they you answered. In any case, I'm afraid that we're short on time. So questions may need to be asked directly to Steve or taken in our next call. Thank you very much, everybody, for participating. It was a great discussion and I would like now to get off the mic and close the session.

JULIE BISLAND:

Thank you, Sebastien. This meeting has ended. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]