

---

DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, 12 August 2024.

We do have apologies from Gabriel Andrews and Farzaneh. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand or speak up now. Yeah, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I have one to share and I don't know if it's relevant at all, but on the last GNSO Council call, I was nominated to be the liaison between the GNSO Council and the GAC, a role that I will assume at the AGM. I don't know if it has an influence on this group. I'll let you guys or the group be the judge of it. Even though the duty has not started officially before the AGM, I will start a bit before to have some time with Jeff to replace him. But I just wanted to put it there. I haven't updated my SOI yet, but I will do align with that.

DEVAN REED: Thank you and congratulations. Alan? If you're speaking, we're not able to hear you. Otherwise, I'll finish the introduction.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I didn't hear you call me. I just wanted to congratulate Sebastien and say the last GAC liaison from the GSO has played all sorts of roles, and I don't think there was ever any implication of any conflict. So congratulations, and I don't see a problem.

---

*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.*

DEVAN REED:

Thank you. If you need any assistance updating your Statements of Interest, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelist. Observers will remain as an attendee and will have access to view chat only and listen to audio. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. And back over to Sebastien. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Devan. Good evening, good afternoon, and good morning to everybody from very warm Stuttgart. I'm not sure what welcome to give, actually. But welcome, everybody, and thank you for showing up mid August. Indeed, at least on the European side, there's a lot of dead time, dead air. Right into point number two of the agenda. Or maybe I should pause just for one second, making sure that everybody is okay with the agenda and there's nothing else to add. Give me a second. I see no hands so I assume that the agenda is perfect.

So item one of the agenda is something that I have raised and I have raised with staff last week and is the following. You would have noted, particularly if you're North America, that there was an RDRS engagement event organized last week. For those of you that were able to join, great. I spoke with Marc Anderson earlier, who was trying to

---

find the recording for this and that wasn't readily available. I don't know if you found them in the between, Marc. But if that's still not the case, then maybe staff can help find the said recordings. I raised the concern with Lisa, not Lisa directly, but Lisa as one of our liaisons with staff, about this webinar. This is not exactly the first time that these things are organized completely outside of this group. So I wanted to have the discussion with the group. I am personally of the view that everything RDRS is of interest to us. I don't know that we need to have a hand on everything and organize everything, but at the very least, to be informed early, at the very least, to be able to participate if we can, and I understand that in the present case, ICANN reaches out to our registrar representative. They thought it would be good to have a registrar on the call. In the end, Ashley Heineman was able to join the call as the chair or the Registrar Stakeholder Group. But I was surprised and not fully positively surprised at the fact that we were having these calls and we were having these webinars, this engagement without the participation of the group. I thought that it was a missed opportunity. Missed opportunity in the sense that this group has connections outside of the ICANN community and outside of ICANN's reach, and I believe that it would be valuable for at least the people in the group to be one early enough to be able to promote these things, but a lost opportunity also because I would like for the members of this group to be on the mic for these sorts of things, to make sure that everybody within and outside of the community understand that the experts on the matter are around this table and to promote all of you and your faces and your voices. I think it's important as an exercise.

---

I understand the constant need for promoting this with registrars. It was the big unknown in the beginning and the big risk factor that all registrars should participate, and we wanted to do a maximum to have registrars to participate. But I believe that also it's well time to make sure that we offered things for the requester community. I followed the webinar. I didn't anticipate that I was in the audience, in attendance, and I thought Ashley did a good job, but the reality was also that most of the questions came from requesters. And when I'm saying most—I have my notes in front of me—but I can remember any questions coming from the registrar community is mainly from requesters, which means that there is an interest that we should be able to fulfill, but I think that we should do it better and do it with this group.

Now, again, we have had these discussions with Lisa and Caitlin. What was it? Ten days ago? The one I misqualified. But I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't barking at the wrong tree, that this group also was it the same view that they want to participate in these things, I want to be more involved. Good. I see no hands. Everybody must be in loud agreement with me. Oh no, I see a hand now from Marc Anderson.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hi, Sebastien. As you mentioned, I reached out to you. I was on PTO last week and not able to attend, and was looking for the recording or any additional recording our transcript on the call. So I guess I have a first question for staff, and I'm not sure who the right person to direct that is. I guess my first question is, is there a recording or transcript available for that call? And if so, could they help point, point this group to it. That would be helpful.

---

Second thing, I'll just say I agree with you. It seems like a missed opportunity to not involve this group in that outreach. That seems like something that would make sense to me. I would like to hear from staff on that. I guess not having attended the call, I don't know what was discussed, or what the purpose of it, or who all attended it, but it does seem like something that would make sense to coordinate or at least involve this group with in the future. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Marc. Just to make sure that everybody else understands and I forgot to say it, again, not putting Lisa specifically on the spot. She's our link to staff here, but this was not organized by Lisa. It was organized by another group at ICANN. People are responsible for outreach and those sorts of exercise. Steve Crocker, I see you hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I agree with your concern. Apropos of your comment just now that this, of course, was not organized by Lisa, who was it organized by, or perhaps more pointedly, who's running the program, and what kind of interaction can we have with them to understand how they view what they're doing? It's possible to draw all kinds of inferences which may or may not be wrong by observing that they've scheduled that without coordinating with anything. It'd be interesting to know what their sense of direction is, where they're trying to go, and how they choose what to do. Maybe a little informal heart to heart would be helpful. Could be that our whole activity is irrelevant from their point of view? That would be one extreme. It could be that they

---

just think that it's important to go reach out, irrespective of anything else, in order to make sure they've touched all the bases, all kinds of possible conclusions. But probably the best thing would be a kind of an informal chat just directly, instead of this formalized meetings with attendance and recordings and everything, but never getting to the part of the matter. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you for that, the suggestion. Yeah, absolutely. Lisa, I see your hand up.

LISA CARTER:

Hi. Thanks, Sebastien. I'll first go back to Marc's question. I actually have an e-mail into the team, the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, to ask about the availability of the link to that webinar, and then just by way of kind of explaining how everything's been sort of happening. So ICANN staff in general, since the launch of RDRS, has sort of been tasked with helping to increase awareness. There are lots of engagements that the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team go to that are not related to RDRS. If the audience is right, they might mention RDRS to people who are in attendance there to get awareness of RDRS out. They might report back to us on that. That's not necessarily events that we know about far in advance. They're just doing what they normally do, and then RDRS is one of the topics that they cover amongst covering all the other things important to ICANN, right? So there's that.

The other aspect is that I think as part of the Prep Week session, I kind of went over a little bit of what the engagement was. Again, that's sort

---

of the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team having the job of creating awareness around RDRS to the community. So what will happen is they will come to me and say, “Hey, we want to set up the webinar. Is there someone available to speak?” In the case of the one that happened last week, that’s what happened. When those webinars that are specific to RDRS are presented, they’re literally presented from a generic deck that was created in-house by ICANN’s Comms Team. So it’s literally very broad. What is RDRS? How does it work? Why was it started, etc.? And then sort of breaking down the benefits for requesters and registrars, providing links to the FAQs, the user guide, the login page, etc., very broad and generic. For this one that happened last week, it had not been the case in the past where those types of webinars had included any sort of detail from the registrars that Ashley presented on what is a good RDRS request. I thought that might be good to have happen since we had just had the ICANN80 webinar, which went well about discussing what a good RDRS request looked like, and that’s when I originally reached out to some of the Standing Committee members to do that presentation. They were not available, that’s why Ashley stepped in.

Going forward, I kind of talked a little bit to Sebastien about including this team in what was going to happen. So if there are events we’re aware of, we can send that to the mailing list so that you guys know in advance of when it’s happening and can participate with registration links, etc. Also potentially going forward, maybe giving you guys access to a generic deck for presentation and flyers, and making that available to Standing Committee members. So you guys can actually take that same presentation and go help spread the word as well.

---

So those are a couple things that I spoke to Sebastien about in terms of involving the Standing Committee going forward in awareness for RDRS. I hope I answered everyone's question. If not, please restate and I'll answer. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just find it mildly curious. GSE is not responsible for just contracted party communication. So you'd think that they would have reached out to the user community as well if this is a general informative thing, trying to get the community involved. So even if, for some reason, this group wasn't involved, you'd think that there would have been reach out at that level, which is mildly curious. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: I'm not sure exactly. I don't know what they do when they do their outreach. They kind of say they're going to set up the presentation and they just need a speaker, and then they sort of go do what they do to bring in the audience, some of which is obviously online social media posts from ICANN's Comms Team, etc. But I don't have the specifics on what other outreach they do, to be quite honest with you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: To Steve's question earlier—and I'll give you the hand, Steve—Steve was suggesting maybe that we—maybe not on this call, but I'm happy



---

to take some time for that—reach out to the person that is responsible on that end and have the discussion with them.

LISA CARTER:

This was just for North America. I think what you're talking about be a broader discussion with all of GSE, like the key people in all of GSE or the key point people who are representing RDRS for GSE maybe. I can touch base with them internally and see what's possible.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Steve, I saw your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Where I was headed before and even more so now, GSE has a job to do and much appreciated, and you guys are very earnest and put a lot of energy into it. Where I was focused is who's in charge of the overall RDRS program and where are they spending their energy? What are they trying to do? Engagement with the community is one piece of their job, obviously, and the help that they get from GSE is more than welcome. But what about the other aspects? What's the goal structure, what's their sense of how they're doing? What issues are they concerned about? And that, I think, would give us a better picture of where we, as a Standing Committee, fit in. We're tripping through these calls, responding more or less tactically to each of the things coming in, but it'd be good to have a more strategic sense, I think, of what the overall program is. So far as I know, the program consists of run this

---

thing for two years and we're done. I'm sure there's more to say about what the plan is. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Hi, Steve. Yes. I'm actually the program manager for RDRS, and that reports on my job, reports in to Elisa, who is overall part of the strategic initiative teams of icann.org. So ultimately, obviously, what we're doing is daily operations for RDRS, trying to work with you guys to get enhancements in the system, all of those things with the goal of in sort of informing the Board to help them with their decision on SSAD and what happens with that at the end of the two-year period, or even before they decide so.

I don't know if you might get to this a little bit later but, for example, the Board is interested in speaking with the Registrar Stakeholder Group Executive Team about feedback on RDRS, what's working, what's not, because they're also trying to assess what needs to happen in terms of reference to the SSAD, informing those decisions. So working with you, iterative enhancements, daily operations, the monthly metrics reports that we do manually, the quarterly surveys reports that we do manually, and sort of the day-to-day operations is kind of what's happening with RDRS right now, the focus being working with you guys on what needs to happen and where it can go, if that helps explain.

---

STEVE CROCKER:

It helps and it opens up another point. First of all, let me apologize profusely for not having retained or paid attention to the fact that you are the program manager for RDRS. Congratulations and condolences all wrapped up together. Whenever I hear the phrase, "Provide information for the Board to decide or the Board will decide," I have a very specific and strong reaction, having served on the Board for many years and served as the chair for several years. As a matter of form, I understand that kind of phrasing. The practicality is that's not actually what happens in any common sense. What happens is the staff, the Org, makes a very specific recommendation to the Board, and the Board either accepts it or gets other inputs or whatever. But the Board is not constituted, it doesn't have the expertise, it doesn't have the bandwidth, it doesn't have enough of the facts to act as a kind of independent program management body that's really what you're doing, if I understand you and your colleagues. So getting back to my other point, where are you headed with respect to the kinds of conclusions that you're planning to draw from this and the kind of recommendations you're going to make to the Board about what happens next? Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, Steve. Just like we present in general, like the statistics and metrics for RDRS to the public, we've also been doing that for the Board. Currently, we have not made any recommendations to them. We are, though, asking them specific questions about their thoughts on where it should be headed based on the metrics they see, based on their thoughts on the SSAD in general. There's not been presented any slides saying, "Here's our recommendation." What we've been

---

presenting thus far is sort of questions for discussion to get them to sort of talk through their thoughts on RDRS, kind of where they see it fitting in, what that means in terms of the SSAD, etc., and that's kind of where we are now. We'll be having another discussion with them in the next couple of weeks, again, with more pointed questions about what we know so far, the stats we've presented, etc., and asking them what direction they see it going. So, to date, we have not made a specific recommendation to them about it, and we're just sort of getting them to discuss the key points and metrics that we've shared so far.

STEVE CROCKER:

If you're expecting the Board to give specific guidance, then you're asking the Board to do work that—again, drawing on my experience sitting on the Board—is really misplaced. I mean, we have a staff of several hundred people and working full time, and you've got a Board that is spending some number of hours per year on this sort of thing. So it's quite unbalanced. What the Board's in a position to do is, yes, it can ask some questions. Yes, it can make sure due diligence is done and some degree of assuring that process has been followed. But the real bulk of the work is what you're doing and what your colleagues are doing, and so to say that there's going to be some discussions with the Board and you get some guidance from them, it doesn't match what I think the actual real dynamics are. At some point, as it has in the past, Org is going to come up with a very specific proposal. It's going to adhere to all of the formalities and etiquette of saying, "Well, this is what the community said, and this is would take direction and so forth." But the underlying facts are that a proposal will be put together by Org. And this Standing Committee, it would seem to me, should be privy to,

---

involved in, and heavily engaged in that process. Else, what are we doing here?

LISA CARTER:

Thanks, Steve. Yeah, fair point. And based on your experience, this is actually my first time at the rodeo, so it's good to have your input on that, and I'm sure we'll be discussing internally those types of things going forward. We just have not gotten there to this point yet.

STEVE CROCKER:

First time with the rodeo. Strap yourself in.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

If I may here, and I think that this particular rodeo is also a first time, so let's all be aware of this. But if I remember well—I'm not home, I don't have all my notes in front of me so I'm not going to jump on it—but the very reason this group exists—before it was the Standing Committee, it was it was the small team—was because the Board had asked the GNSO to look into something that was less costly than the recommendations voted in by the GNSO, and the GNSO asked us. I think that yes, indeed we are expected to bring those recommendations. I'm surely hand in hand with staff, but I don't expect those recommendations to come simply from staff. It will be something that I believe we should be working together before relaying to anybody, the GNSO, the Board, or anybody else.

I saw Simon raising his hand for a second, but he left very quickly. So I'm not sure you wanted to add something there. Simon?

SIMON RAVEH: No, I completely agree with you. I think that's the direction. Again, like Lisa, first on this rodeo with the Board and everything. Yeah, I'll follow directions.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. We spent a half hour on this. I think that's enough. We all understand what we want this group to do. Lisa, I see your hand up. Go ahead before I conclude.

LISA CARTER: I'll let you finish. I just wanted to indicate that if everybody wants it, because I don't know if anybody commented, ICANN sent a PDF of the generic deck and the flyer and all the things that you guys might want in terms of doing your own presentations externally on RDRS to spread the word. I can send that through to the mailing list.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do, in any case, and not just to the mailing list. It can also be posted on to the wiki, it would be great. Some of us, like myself, find it easier to find stuff in there.

Okay. So that brings us to—I'm quickly looking, I see no hands up, so I guess that we're good. That brings us to point three of the RDRS improvement work, and specifically starting with point three A on the surveys. Now, this was another point that we raised several weeks ago, a few weeks ago, maybe not several, a few weeks ago. And that is that

---

we are issuing surveys. Personally, I don't know. I know that it wasn't discussed in this group, but I don't know exactly how those surveys were formulated. I must admit, I'm absolutely not an expert in these things. I shouldn't put my nose into what has what hasn't been done, but I cordially invite to those amongst us that have a bit more expansive in their expertise and experience to check that. The truth of the matter is, I think that there's very, very low levels of response on the surveys. I think that the service should be a tool that we will use. But I don't know that they are in the shape of form that they need to be, and certainly not in shape or form to get the response that we need. And so I would like for us to also spend a bit of time working on this. Again, I'm not raising my hand for it because I'm a complete noob on this. But if anybody has experience on this, I would very, very well make that work.

I know that Farzaneh is not on the call today. She sent her apologies earlier. I've heard her mentioning the fact that she wanted to be able to have a look at it. But I don't know if anybody else is ready to raise their hand. Lisa, make it very long and then you get exhausted. But I saw your hand up, so if you wanted to add, please.

LISA CARTER:

Thanks. Sebastien. Just really quickly. In terms of the survey itself, two things. Last, last week we updated—there's an e-mail that goes out after the request has closed that says the registrar concluded the request, that e-mail originally was the e-mail that requesters would receive that indicated for them to please take the survey. However, my personal perception was that the survey response was partly low because there's nothing in the subject line that indicates that there's a

---

need for them to take a survey, and that the actual action to take the survey itself was listed at the bottom of that e-mail. So we just made an update to the language for both the subject line and the e-mail itself, where it actually asked for feedback in the subject line, and it actually puts the request to do the survey at the top instead of at the bottom. So that launched last week. I have seen a few more survey responses come in based on that, which is great.

The other thing is we already have an in-house research expert working on the new questions. The old questions, however, were shared with the Standing Committee. So I think when you go with the liaison, she worked on those that was shared with the Standing Committee. I think it's documented in the notes sometime prior to launch. The questions were shared with you guys. But we are looking at revamping those questions, and I do will have something to share with the one or two people whoever would like to participate in working on those questions and talking through it, but we do have something that we'll be able to show for both requester and registrar updates, in addition to the thought that it might be more helpful to have a few questions on usability in the actual interface after the Submit button, instead of having to wait 7 days, 10 days, however long it takes to ask somebody to refer back to their experience using the actual tool. So just to put that out there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Lisa, for keeping me honest. If we discuss that with you guys, it's very possible, indeed it was months, if not a year ago, and I appreciate that I revisit. I'll give you a hand just a second, Sarah, but to



---

answer your question, it's everything that Lisa described and the questions of the survey, given the very low return, I would like for somebody to look into it again. It looks like Lisa and staff, but I'd like for somebody from this team to look into it and make sure that we get the results that we need in the numbers and the quality of the questions. But now I'll give you a hand. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD:

Thanks. This is Sarah, having forgotten what I raised my hand for. I think it's a great idea, Lisa, that you're putting some usability questions right there after the person uses it. We know they're already looking at it. We know they have fresh in their minds what the experience was. And also really glad to hear that the response rate has improved now that the e-mail makes it a bit more obvious that there is a survey in there. Because I do recall that the response rate was a bit low. That's just really heartening because I do think that the survey information is useful. In terms of reviewing further updates, I'm happy to assist with that. It just depends on timing because I'm on vacation again next week. Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

That would be great, Sarah. Thanks for volunteering for that. The update just went out last week so we'll see over time how the change in language helps. But thanks for volunteering to review those questions. And we can do that after you come back for vacation. No problem.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Marc, I can see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Hey. I am not volunteering. That's not really an area of expertise for me so I'll leave that to other people. Thank you to Sarah for volunteering. I do have a request. Sebastien asked for some information be posted to the wiki page. I would like to also ask for the survey questions to be posted to the wiki page. I think it would be good to have a record of that. I do recall that being sent around by Yuko earlier but I'm not able to find it quickly. So it would probably be useful to have that posted to the wiki page.

LISA CARTER: Sure. I'll work with Caitlin and team to get those from what Yuko posted previously. And then when the new ones happen, we can post those too.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Thank you. Which brings us to point B, RDRS form. I can't remember what this was about. Can you help me, Lisa?

LISA CARTER: Yes, I can, Sebastien. This one was more about taking a look at actually the form questions in RDRS and potentially providing some help text on some of the key questions on that form that could help improve quality. I took a look at the document. I think it was from the RrSG, the minimum requirements document for that, to just compare what was in the form to what the minimum requirements document said. There's definitely some room to maybe do a little more explaining on some of

---

---

those questions to help the requester provide maybe more of what the registrar needs. Again, it would be helpful to have somebody look at those, potentially a registrar and a requester, to get the feedback from both sides on does this make sense in terms of explaining what this question is in the form to the requester to help the registrar. If there's volunteers to review that as well, happy to do that. I'm still working on those, but when they're done, it would be helpful to have somebody review those too.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. I was reading your point at the same time. Steve, yes, absolutely. Surveys are not the end-all be-all. Interviews work too. I would hope that the exercises that we do at ICANN, both on the requester side and on the registrar side, are part of that too. I think that the impressions that we get there also need to help us form our impressions. After that, going and chasing, interviewing people completely outside is always possible, but that gets a bit complicated in terms of advising that with these people. But if you have people in mind that don't come to ICANN, don't get to share in those sessions at ICANN that we should talk to, I'm very happy to listen and offer my time.

Item four of the call is to review the Impressions document. Now, we have tried to do that over the last few calls. I can't say that I have seen a huge amount of progress on the sheet itself, but I could be wrong. I didn't look today. In any case, the items, particularly on the requester side, belong to two people that are not here on this call. Unless somebody put their name on an item and like to discuss it now, I'm not going to discuss things either for Farzaneh nor for Gabriel until they're

---

here. Lisa, I see your hand up. You might have a specific question in the answer.

LISA CARTER:

Yeah. I wanted to raise my hand just based on the fact that there actually is a registrar ask that is ready to go. It's the ask that Sarah indicated is their priority too after the required address, and that is the ability for registrars to change request category. I wanted to talk through that and what that might look like, because it's something that we could probably get the ICANN engineers to begin work on since that seems to be ready. The impact of that would be that ask is quite similar to the registrar's ability to change an expedited request to standard. The metrics for that would be reported similarly so that if that registrar changed the request category from law enforcement to something else, obviously, the metrics reported monthly would deduct that mark from law enforcement and add it to the other category. You would see those things shift month to month, depending on what registrar changes were made in terms of request category. But I wanted to put that one out there as one that we could begin work on since the other ones aren't quite ready yet.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sarah, did you want to add to that?

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. I don't know what else I could possibly say. If there's questions, I'm happy to get into them.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, no. I'm happy to hear this. Actually, after the Registrar session in Kigali, I was surprised to see the prevalence of requests that were wrongly tagged and that registrars seemed to interpret the request anyway. They weren't completely focused. If it was wrongly tagged, it wasn't an immediate out. But indeed, it was affecting statistics. Now, when I said exactly what we're agreeing now, I heard yes, but if we don't fully trust the requesters, do we fully trust the registrars to know exactly where those are? And at some point, I hope that we can form an agreement. But I still think that indeed the stats—at least there's two pairs of eyes on it—that would be a bit more accurate. And I welcome this. But again, I thought that we had discussed this in Kigali and that it was really welcomed. I'm very happy to see it going forward. Anything else, Lisa? Were there any other questions?

LISA CARTER:

Just one other thing that relates to what Gabriel posted. I think it was a conversation between you, Steve Crocker, and Gabriel regarding I think it's item seven in the list related to putting together some front-end tool that could interface with RDRS that would require less heavy lift from ICANN staff. Just so everyone's aware, we had a call with Gabe last week and a couple of the engineers that he's working with. We're still in discussions on it and they're going to put together some requirements and send it through to ICANN. So we are talking about that one. I just wanted everybody to be aware that there's some movement on that item as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. Any questions again? Either requester or registrar, is there any item anybody wants to have discussed or anybody wants to raise their hand to take an item on board? No? Okay. We'll obviously revisit that again, particularly when the owners of the depending item on the request side are back online, which hopefully will be by this time in two weeks.

I don't think that we need to belabor this any longer. If we go back to the schedule, I think that the last item was an AOB that you wanted to present, Lisa, about metric 10.

LISA CARTER: Yes. Actually, I think on the last call we had, when I was trying to explain what all the not founds and not supporteds meant, everyone pretty much asked for the expert in that regard. And so that would be Simon. Simon's actually going to speak to the explanation for how the data is parsed that lends itself to the statuses you see for metric 10 in our monthly reporting. Go ahead, Simon.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Simon, for the record, you are recording. You will be, because I know that Gabriel was very interested by that question and he'll listen to the recording about it. But go ahead.

---

SIMON RAVEH:

Sure. Sorry. I lost the screen. Thank you. We start if the user just put a TLD or just a garbage, right? It's not something that can be translated into domain name, you'll get domain not supported. After that, if it's a valid domain name based on the RFCs, we do a WHOIS query to the registries and registrar, and try to find this domain name. So if the domain name is not found, then you'll get a domain not found and that's a return that we get. If we found the domain, we look for the IANA ID in the response from the registry. And if the IANA ID is not part of the participated registrar, then you'll get the registrar not supported. We added also now, I know it's not reported, but it's something that the team here is interested. Now, even before we start the whole process, if it's a country code, we go over the list of country code. And if it's a country code, we're not even doing WHOIS query, we just return country code not supported. And the last one is a success, which means we did a WHOIS query, it came back with a valid response, it came back with a registrar that participates in the pilot, then you'll get a success and you can continue.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I raised my hand so I recognize myself. First of all, in the logic here between item three and item four, the ccTLD WHOIS indeed doesn't contain IANA ID. I think that you should look for ccTLD before you look for IANA ID.

---

SIMON RAVEH: That's what I said. It's not in order here. But the first thing I will look if it's a country code, it's immediately disqualified. I'm not doing WHOIS. I immediately return it to country code not supported.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. The second one, when you say WHOIS, you mean RDAP or you're still actually very much using WHOIS? This is a question more for the future. The next year and a half, it doesn't matter, it still will be there, but for the longer future.

SIMON RAVEH: Right now we're still using WHOIS. We do have enhancements to do in RDRS and other system to switch to RDAP. So it's on the roadmap and we plan to do that soon.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. I wouldn't abandon WHOIS altogether particularly if one day we decide indeed to deal with willing country codes because they're still very much there. Anyway, Marc Anderson, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. Thank you, Simon, for the explanation. One use case I don't see here that I'm curious about is what happens if the lookup is for a non-regulated TLD like a .gov, for example? If the lookup is for whitehouse.gov, for example, what response would that get or where would that fall in this process?



SIMON RAVEH: It's not listed here, but it will fall under TLD not supported. We do check for all the active and approved or regulated or contracted gTLDs before we actually do WHOIS as well, just to make sure, and to minimize the API queries that we do. You'll get TLD not supported as a user.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Can we add that to this chart? I don't know exactly. It looks like something screenshot it to something else, but that would be great. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Let's dive in a little bit onto the first line, the domain not supported. Most of the examples, except for the last one, are not properly formed domain names. I would have thought that simply at the syntax level before you can hit Submit, the domain name would have had to be properly formed. Is that not the case?

SIMON RAVEH: I don't remember the UI right now, what type of validation we do in the UI, if you actually check that. But it will be also, if you just put .com, you'll get domain not supported as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I accept that part even though a blank second level domain doesn't quite seem valid. But my recollection is in the statistics, the number of

---

domain not supported is very large. And it boggles my mind to say either you're not checking the syntax at the user interface level or that many people are putting in domains that are completely irrelevant. It just doesn't sound right.

SIMON RAVEH:

Unfortunately, it's not that the real people are using the system. We do know that and I see it on other ICANN properties, we are constantly getting a lot of garbage, a lot of bots passing Captcha and ICANN accounts, which is completely open to the public, and you can create account. People are doing that all the time. We keep cleaning that. So a lot of the traffic that we actually see on RDRS, there is a lot of garbage coming in. A lot of the domain not supported, it's not from real usage, but actually from bots and all these people that are trying to break the system.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Given that we are paying attention to the total number of requests, if a significant number, half or a third, are bots putting in random trash, I guess we need to try to take that into account when we look at the other statistics in that case. Because that's not an issue that I had ever considered in our discussions here. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I think this is exactly a good point. Anecdotally, actually, if somebody, they work on NXDOMAIN or all those badly typed domains that are running to TLDs, they are vastly outnumbered, the actual use of maybe

---

not .com, but of the new gTLDs, it's incredible. A lot of bots out there.  
Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. I think I have three things to say. The first one, I think I agree with Alan. I had expected or maybe I thought, based on my one time testing it, that if I go into RDRS and I start typing in a domain name to lookup, it won't let me click the proceed or whatever the next button to move to the next step without it being a proper domain. So if I type in sarah.abc and .abc doesn't exist, I didn't think I could even submit a request to get to the point of having a return status. I guess that's surprising, and I should return to the user guide.

Number two, I just heard talk about the rate of requests submitted by bots. That is very surprising to me. I was somehow under the impression that RDRS users are all human. Wow. So is it possible to request more information to be provided about the rate of known bots using RDRS?

Then number three, the explanations that we are seeing in the middle column of this wonderful chart on screen. What I understand from Lisa in the chat is that an RDRS user will see the status on the left but not the explanation. And I think that these explanations could be very helpful. Maybe this is your suggestion already and I'm just catching up, but maybe we can do more to put that information in front of the user.  
Thank you.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Simon, I hope that you can indeed explain where those are derived. I assume that the interface between what is done after the actual submission, it might be done transparently through the user through AJAX or something like that in terms of pre-verification.

SIMON RAVEH: Exactly. I think we confused the actual request when you move screens, which it's an actual—you need to already have a valid domain name to what happened before, which is as the user type in after I think three characters, we try to do a lookup and make it more responsive. We do an automated lookup, a call to the API to try and translate it to a valid domain name.

In regards to bots, I don't know that we can separate it, but I can tell you that I see a lot of—again, I don't know if it's an automated bot or just users trying to hack the system, but I do see a lot of lookups that are different type of SQL queries, many different things that they try to do to break the system.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: This is getting into the weeds of it, but it might pay off for the statistics. If I were to type sebastien.com, that happens not to—well, at least not the domain I know, but I don't have the existing domain, but let's assume that it's not. As I'm typing S-E-B, there's no reaction. As soon as I start typing the fourth letter and so on, there is an automatic lookup. Is that accounted for in the vast number of domains not supported until a full domain is formed? Or are you waiting indeed until individuals stop

---

typing or type something that is plausible to start looking? You seem to have said the contrary, but I don't know how you calculate the stats.

SIMON RAVEH: I need to look at the UI code for that. I don't remember that. If we actually did the lookup call, then it will be counted as part of the domain not found.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It is possible. Just by the way we count being, that it is possible that even completely legitimate requests have started by several lookups that are counted as domain not supported until the string is fully formed. Okay.

SIMON RAVEH: Yes. It's a possibility. Now, if we want to address that or to however different behavior, it's doable, but we'll introduce another click for the user.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. Or the way the law used to derive the stats need to be interpreted in different ways. The same request, the same IP address, the same whatever it is, not valid until final. But anyway, I don't know exactly how that would be done, but I'm sure there is a way. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I just went into the system and tried it. Indeed, when you're typing in the name, it's validating it. It either ends up with yes, this is a valid domain and we know who the registrar is, or it isn't. But if you're somehow counting in the counts, all of the cases where someone types in test or com or my company LLC, I thought in the statistics, we were only counting requests that were completed, and then passed on, hitting Next at the bottom of the screen. Whereas I can get a bad request just by typing in the domain name not going any further on the screen with my address information, organization. I guess I'm a little confused. I thought we were counting completed requests that were submitted.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I think, as Simon said, that he will need to look at the code. Simon also said and told us that he's got a hard stop now and he will be needed. I'm happy to continue and take notes on the questions that we have. Simon is going to have to go and maybe answer back in two weeks or via the list. Thank you, Simon, for staying. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Similar to Alan, I just went into my own ICANN account in the domain lookup box. I typed in icann.org, and when I hit Tab to go to the next box, it checked and made agreed. Check mark. Yes, it's a good domain. Then I typed in just the word test and I got "Domain lookup fail. Non-existing domain name. The domain you entered does not exist." And that does not match anything I see on the chart. It did sound like Simon was saying there's two different steps maybe, but there is some

---

confusion. I will just say I would appreciate if this can be further investigated because I do think it matters. I think it matters because it affects our stats, our metrics, of how many lookups are happening. And if we're counting a lookup for test and then a lookup for test.org as two different things, even when it's really the user just typing slowly or doing something wrong, that's not giving us good data to work on. I do appreciate further information. I'm going to make a screenshot of this because it sounds like Lisa said that that shouldn't be happening. Sorry, I think my chat was confusing. The two things were separate. The icann.org was a correct response. The lookup fail was on the word test. I confused you unintentionally. I'm so sorry.

LISA CARTER: You made me nervous, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: The word test was the error. But it's an error message that is not on the chart. It is still an area of confusion to myself because I thought that all of the errors would be on the chart that we are looking at. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. All noted. I want to wrap this up because we're already two minutes over the hour. I'll give you the last word, Alan. Just one thing we need to be—I'll give you the last word after I give my last word. The very last word you'll get. We just need to be a bit aware here. There are facilities that are provided by these interactive interfaces that will require maybe different ways of looking at the stats or different ways of

---

collecting the stats. The surest way to have the perfect stats is indeed removing all that pretesting and waiting until the person has pressed Enter to finish typing in order to do the analysis. I think it might be then there's a loss of functionality in terms of users that would be detrimental. I'd like to make sure that in the effort of correcting, of having the perfect stats, we don't diminish the usability. Alan, I saw your hand. I'll give you the last word and then we can call it a day.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I just wanted to point out that even if you have a bad domain name at the first level, it lets you go ahead and fill in the rest of the screen. So it's possible it will let you even get submitted at that point. Just something to check. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. Thank you all. Have a good rest of your day. We'll talk in two weeks. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**