

**From the EPDP Phase 2 Small Team Addendum:**

*“other topics that the small team does not consider gating factors but for which it would be interested to have further discussions with ICANN org during the implementation phase to consider if/how some of these aspects could be considered to be added in the current implementation of WDS or a future version”*

Topic leads identified during the EPDP Phase 2 small team meeting of 17 April are requested to complete the missing information in the table below. Others are also encourage to contribute and/or identify clarifying questions for further consideration by the small team.

<b>Topic</b>
1. Application Programming Interface (API)
<b>Background &amp; what is this feature aiming to achieve?</b>
<b>How is this feature expected to contribute to the success of RDRS?</b>
<b>Please describe the urgency of adding this feature</b>

<b>Topic</b>
2. Confidentiality options for Law Enforcement requests
<b>Background &amp; what is this feature aiming to achieve?</b>
(From Zoom chat during 17/4 call) Re: confidentiality, typically there is a concern about notifying the subject of a LEA investigation that Law Enforcement is seeking information related to them. Any other type of public disclosure of the fact of the request and/or its contents would also be a concern. Of course, the registrar would need to know about the requestor its contents etc. in order to be able to respond.
<b>How is this feature expected to contribute to the success of RDRS?</b>
<b>Please describe the urgency of adding this feature</b>

<b>Topic</b>
3. Billing mechanism
<b>Background &amp; what is this feature aiming to achieve?</b>
<b>How is this feature expected to contribute to the success of RDRS?</b>
<b>Please describe the urgency of adding this feature</b>

<b>Topic</b>
4. Review of RDRS terms and conditions for requestors as well as participating registrars
<b>Background &amp; what is this feature aiming to achieve?</b>

**How is this feature expected to contribute to the success of RDRS?**

**Please describe the urgency of adding this feature**

**Topic**

5. Requests submitted fall under “reasonable access” & phase 1 requirements

**Background & what is this feature aiming to achieve?**

(From the addendum) Confirmation that requests submitted to a registrar via RDRS fall under the Temporary Specification requirement for a registrar to provide “reasonable access” and/or confirmation of the interplay with the gTLD Registration Data Consensus Policy (depending on which of the two will be in force at the time the Whois Disclosure System will become operational)

**How is this feature expected to contribute to the success of RDRS?**

**Please describe the urgency of adding this feature**

**Topic**

6. Ability for requestor to indicate if they do not agree with information logged by registrar

**Background & what is this feature aiming to achieve?**

(from the addendum)  
Ability for a requestor to indicate if they do not agree with the information logged by the registrar in relation to whether a response was provided and/or the timeframe in which it was provided (note, there is no expectation that there would be any kind of arbitration, but this is about providing the ability for the requestor to indicate if they do not agree with the information logged by the registrar so it can be included in the general reporting on WDS)

**How is this feature expected to contribute to the success of RDRS?**

**Please describe the urgency of adding this feature**