
**ICANN Transcription
RDRS SC**

Monday, 01 July 2024 at 17:30 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:
<https://community.icann.org/x/DoC0F>

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call, taking place on Monday, the 1st of July 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Sarah Wyld (RrSG). Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. All right. Seeing none, if assistance is needed updating your SOI, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat only and have listen-only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. 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. Over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Good evening, afternoon, and morning to everybody. Sorry, I'm slightly disorganized because I thought I'd be home by now, but having to do it outside of the Internet is good, and you can hear me well. But apparently, it's working.

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.

We sent you the proposed agenda for today. I just wanted to make a quick comment about the letter that I proposed last week. There was much discussion on the mailing list about it. Thank you. Just to be clear, and I think that was clear to everybody, what I mostly interested about is to remove the more—well, I don't want to call it political aspects, but the aspects that are not purely managing this pilot, managing the RDRS product as is. Trying to figure out what we can recommend to Council in 18 months' time, rather than going back to the discussions that we keep on falling back on what our legitimate request and how to use this product to obtain data or whatever the functionality of it. I think that is something that we need to keep an eye on in the sense that if there are new ways to look at it from the community, we need to make sure that the RDRS product matches that. But I don't want to have that political conversation here, and I thought last week or two weeks ago in our discussion, that was where we had landed at.

So I would like to invite again the Council or the rest of the GNSO community. I don't think that this is PDP-ready. My experience on Council tells me that this is not PDP-ready. But I think that there is room for discussions. Again, I was very positively impressed by the level of discussions that I saw in Kigali. The message I wanted to pass is please let's not have this conversation here, but make sure that we are positive about the conversation and invite for it to happen elsewhere outside of this group. I suppose that a lot of you will want to be part of that conversation anyway. But again, I don't want it to take all our bandwidth or substantial amount of that bandwidth, just for reference. In Kigali, I seriously intended on having our own Standing Committee discussion to be focused on the elements we would ask ICANN to develop for the next six months. We barely have time for that because we had some time to spend updating the community on where we're at, and that's legitimate. But then we spend a huge amount of time on discussing the outcome of the [inaudible] meeting that had happened just before instead of focusing on the product. I'd like to avoid that in the future.

I've read everybody's comments. I don't know that it's ready to be sent. I appreciate the fact that I probably shouldn't have used the word policy. Because even if it's a word in the dictionary, as John mentioned, it's a word that carries a lot of meaning in our community. So I believe it should be removed. I will circulate a version where I'm trying to compile what I've heard from you after this call, and maybe we just have one last read and then I'll send it off to Greg and Council.

Did anybody have any other comment on this as it's not on the agenda? I don't want to spend an hour on it, but I'm ready to hear it or have anybody add to this if they want. I see no hand. I see your mic open, Steve Crocker. I have a hand from Marc Anderson. Go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

I hesitated to raise my hand because I know you don't want to spend a lot of time here. I guess I understand your intent and your reasons, and I think I agree with that. What I'm not sure about maybe is what you think what would be the best case scenario for you for the action for the GNSO Council to take. I understand your reasoning and why you want to send a letter and that all makes sense to me. But maybe it would help me if I could understand what you're envisioning the GNSO Council to do upon receiving the letter.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That's a very good question. I don't think that there is much that the Council needs to do. I wouldn't immediately jump to suggesting a PDP or anything like that, because, again, I'm utterly convinced that it's not PDP-ready. I would assume that, at the very least, they would go back to the different interested parties within the GNSO and probably beyond and continue inviting the conversations that we've seen in the last two ICANNs, possibly with a high cadence. We have only another 18 months for this so I have no hope of seeing the issue of what constitute a

legitimate request or all these things resolved, and I don't even know that they can be resolved on a community level. But I would hope that we have more of the conversations that we had in Kigali, because again, I found them very constructive. It's maybe an invitation to ensure that that is organized and possibly at a cadence that is higher than once an ICANN, so three times a year. Otherwise, no other expectations. Steve, I see your hand up. Marc, I hope that answers your question.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve D?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, got it. Thanks, Sebastien. At the end of your draft—I'm driving, I don't have it in front of me—but I believe you talked about delivering our product or some phrase to that effect. My question is what do you believe our product is? Is it an RDRS system that meets the specifications we were given to build or is the product the recommendation to Council at the end of 18 months as to what to do with the original SSAD recommendations? What is the product you have in mind when you use that phrase? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Definitely the latter. It's a set of recommendations. Now maybe amongst those recommendations, one of them could be, "Hey, we built a system which I believe ticks 80% of the boxes, and we believe that that should be the basis for something in the future." But I don't know about that. It's definitely a set of recommendations. What we set ourselves to do in the beginning is to even try to see if this was a product that would serve the

purpose in itself. There were long discussions about proving that by traffic, by footfall, and we decided that that in itself couldn't be the sole measure. If it could be measured by the success rate in the sense of getting data at the end, which seems to be what the requestors want, and we decided that was a metric itself. I don't quite know what, in the end, the response in terms of the product will be, other than recommendations and the experience that we gain from this exercise.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

But to continue, the exercise was the product of the RDRS, the RDRS actually functioning. And the exercise would lead to a recommendation that partly relies upon an assessment of demand. I would still say that within the Standing Committee, it is our job to ensure that the RDRS works to the extent that you can actually rely upon it as a measure of demand. I brought this up in Kigali that, in fact, requests are handled in dramatically different ways for almost the identical provision of evidence, it's not our goal to make it consistent. But we have to acknowledge that if the product we've delivered, the RDRS, is not functioning as it was specified and even 80% is not good enough, then the conclusions you wish to reach about recommendations are immediately undermined. So we need both, Sebastien. We need to deliver a product that works and continue to fine tune it. I made the point in Kigali that as we improve the product, even if only by [help] screens, then we do another iteration of three or six months and that iteration allows us to have more reliable data of demand. But in order for us to do a recommendation, we have to deliver a product that actually works. And that's why I believe it's both, not just the latter.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

But Steve, everything could be better, but the product worked in the sense that we pick up requests, send them over, ensure that they are filled to the best of our knowledge of what a well presenter request is,

and then pass that on to the sponsoring registrar. That in itself is a product that works. And we can make it better—

STEVE DELBIANCO:

If your ambition for the product is a simple passive conduit as a ticketing system, and that is in your opinion, been delivered, then you should not be surprised that it will be a terrible mechanism to measure demand. Because demand will decline very quickly in part of the requester community. We are designing an experiment that since it adds so little value to the requester community, it will end up proving that tautology. There is no demand for a product that merely passively conveys some small fraction of requests to the participating registrars without any significant help of getting a response. I don't know. I feel like you're selling ourselves short if all we have to do is a conduit.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

This is part of my concern. I don't think that it's a part of our mandate to have that more political discussion. I don't have any better way right now to describe it. But let's say call it the political side of the discussion. It's not part of our mandate. We don't have the time in the next 18 months to resolve that. And it was never part of the mandate to start up with. But it is, I agree with you, a problem that should be looked at. It's an issue that should be evaluated, and it's an issue that should be, I believe, worked best in concert between the different parties and the capacity to come with best practices, to come with a better understanding of what each other expects in order to cross that bridge. Again, 18 months is not going to be enough to develop policy. We spent years in the EPDP Phase 2 working on it without being able to develop. And that's already been a process that we need to acknowledge. We can't throw that away. But it didn't come up with conclusions there either.

So what I want to say is don't wait for us to come up with the recommendations in 18 months on something if at least that conversation is not promoted or is not had in the background, because we're not going to be able to resolve that problem. But we certainly want that conversation to be had, and we don't want to ignore it. I certainly don't want the Council to assume that in 18 months, because they've had us spinning around, they will have answers on everything, because we won't be able to solve that like that. It's out of our mandate, in my view, but it needs to be had. It's not going to be had in the PDP, again, because these times are too short. But I do want to have that conversation happening, because again, from what I've seen, and you were in the same rooms as I was in Kigali, I believe, and I saw it at least at the table I was sitting at, the possibility of finding some common ground. I'd like to promote that. I'd like to make it clear to Council that it should happen. But again, I don't believe they should happen in this room. Paul, you've been super patient.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks. I guess my only concern about this is that—again, I've not seen the letter in a couple days, I looked at it briefly at the beginning. Do we affirmably suggest that the Council should do something else here? Or is it just we're saying we don't want to do it? I think it's one thing to say we don't want to do it, the community can do it if they want to. I don't know then how we get the feedback back here for that. Maybe people don't think we need that feedback. I'm not sure. But if we do want to know what the community is saying, it seems like we should be asking Council that there's a missing team here. They know there should be a team that's running these kinds of sessions so that they're not free range. We had a free range one originally run by the IPC, which a lot of people had a very negative reaction to. We had a very pleasant one in a tent in Kigali that people seem to have a very positive reaction to. But there does seem to be a spot here for something in addition that could feed the

information back to this team and to the Council and all the other places. And maybe even engage in finding a way to promote the use of the system. I mean, I don't want to get too crazy. Are we suggesting that? I apologize if I missed that in a letter. If that's what we're suggesting, basically bifurcating the function rather than doing away with it, that's fine. Because we weren't doing it in an organized way here anyway, which is some folks on the team took it upon themselves to do it, which is great. But maybe it could be a little better organized and cause uniform happiness instead of ups and downs. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Absolutely great point, Paul. Maybe I was being too shy in telling the Council what they should do. But yes, that would be essentially what I—again, I don't know if it's a small team or if it's a working group between the requesters and the responders, whoever they may be. But yes, I believe that that should be. I don't have the text in front of me, but that's where I say and that we are interested by the result of that discussion. Because indeed, it's going to help us and we need to have that feedback. It is what I had in mind. Maybe I need to word it slightly more clearly or more forcefully. But it is exactly what I had in mind. Having another group in parallel. I assume that a lot of people in this group will be in the other one too, maybe not all, but in another group. Not only is it not really in our mandate and we have short timelines here, the other problem I have is a problem of optics too. I certainly don't want that level of discussion to happen in a group. I haven't counted how many people we are here around the table, but a group of 20 people. It needs to be a lot more open, it needs to be thought in a different way. This is not something that should be in a smaller community.

There's also stuff happening in the chat and I'm not very good at following two conversations at the same time. It's my own shortcoming. I did see something about—I think it was from you, Farzaneh, about the

fact that the product should follow the policy. Yes, in principle, you're absolutely right. Except that in this particular case, the problem was that the product that had been described by the policy was way too complicated and costly to develop. Literally the Council asked us to find product solutions that would allow it to piecemeal what the enormous [inaudible] that the policy I've described. But you raised your hand, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Hi. I just wanted to mention that. First of all, it makes me really uncomfortable calling this system or service product. We are not a bazaar. We are not selling anything. We have a mandate to provide this system in a pilot manner and see what sort of policy issues we need to tackle, what sort of technical issues we need to tackle, and then we can decide what is in the mandate of this group and what is outside of it, and then we can feed this into a small team. I don't know why—I mean, I thought that we knew what the mandate was all along. I think that we can just compile the feedback, and then decide with the Council what should be done about the things that we don't think is in our mandate. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Trying to find that mute button. The idea of a product development—sorry, the way of using it... The product of our work is the way I wanted to use it, not specifically RDRS bailiwick. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. If I heard you correctly, you made a reference to what our job is, to identify that if this is not a sufficient solution, then to go

look for others. Or at least that's what the Council asked for. Is that wrong?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sorry. I don't have the chart. I should live with the chart in front of me, but I don't have it in front of me. No. What the Council and the Board were trying to ask us initially when we started this was to say the SSAD recommendation that came out of the ODA said that it was way too expensive. In the broadest sense of the term, can you look at a solution that would allow us to pass that lease of viability of a simpler system and by that assess the audience? The problem that I have, and Steve DelBianco said it very well, is that this simple system was fairly easy to design just as a ticketing system, as a transporter of information from a requester to responders. But we're finding ourselves now not being able to assess the efficiency of it closely enough beyond the fact that it just passes the question from one to the next well enough without having sustained usage of it. That there is a bit of a chicken and the egg here, you can't get requesters to keep on trying if they don't get more answers, I don't know if it's in itself an metric. But if they are not able to better refine the way they answer questions to get the answer they want to obtain. I mean, this opens a whole lot of can of worms. Again, I don't think is part of this particular group, but it's an interesting conversation that should be had as to what is one to expect when they request data, when is one to expect when they request data in an open manner, should they know how to better request data. Should it be more precise about the way they do it, should it be more precise about the exact data that they need, what they need it for, etc. All conversations that we're being had in Kigali, by the way, all interesting and all very helpful here.

Sorry, I'm going in circle. I'm not sure I'm making sense here. But to me, at least there's two different discussions to be had. One is indeed building this pilot and making sure that we have a tool that enables us to

assess the audience and the traffic for this type of product, which is what we were asked to do. And to a larger thing, we've done it, except that after six months, we realized very quickly that we're not going to get any traffic if we don't promote at least that other part of the discussion because people are going to walk away. I hope that answers your question.

STEVE CROCKER:

Not quite. Let's back up to—Council said SSAD is too expensive, we need to look for something simpler. And the next step, it seems to me, was okay. Then RDRS is what you have to do. Namely a centralized system run by Org and throwing together on reusing prior stuff and ignoring or not taking on all of the other parts of the problem. Let's go do and that, and let's put a lot of energy into that and try to get everybody to use it. But meanwhile, the original question is what do people really need and how are you going to build a system that works for everybody is ruled out of scope. I don't know where you go with that. Well, I do know where you go with that, but it's maybe elsewhere.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

You're taking one or two shortcuts here. The first one, it wasn't Council, it was the Board that asked us, or that asked Council and the Council delegated the question to us. The idea was not to say we're discarding what people want, because what people want has been described in the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, it's the SSAD. That's technically, as far as we're concerned, what the people want. This is the set of recommendations that the community came up with to find a solution to the problem of data requests. Again, the Board said this seems absolutely enormous, an enormous endeavor for us to get into without any clear view of what sort of audience we have for this product. Can you try to design something simpler that is not as costly to run and assess the audience? I don't know that it's the end all, be all. I don't

know that it finds all the solutions. I know that it doesn't tick all the boxes of the SSAD. Because by design, we're doing something that is simplified because nobody had the budget to go and develop the hundred million worth of a tool to answer that question.

As to why do we ask Org or why did we not delegate it outside, it was also a decision of the Board to keep that so far at this stage, a pilot that is run internally in order to assess the audience, the traffic in some way or form, knowing that it's not—the number of requests, we don't estimate the traffic or the interest for this product, this tool by what we see on it, but what we can extrapolate from what we see on it in the real world. That's all part of the recommendation. So no, I don't think that this product is going to be the end all and be all. It is the tool that we're being given, it's the latitude that we're being given to try to assess the market appetite for something that ticks those boxes, that answers those questions, that allows for data to be requested and eventually released, if at all.

STEVE CROCKER:

There are so many points of disconnect here in the whole sequence that it's hard to turn this into a useful discussion. But trying to transform the data that's being collected into a meaningful recommendation is to how to go forward seems like a serious stretch. Just trying to get people to use the system more, I guess we're obliged to do that. But I have to go back to some very old analogies. This is like trying to get to the moon and saying, "Well, but if we climb two more steps up this mountain, we'll be closer to the moon." You can climb all the way to the top of the mountain, you won't be any closer to the moon. You can get to the moon if you think about it differently.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Again, I'm not sure that the mandate of this pilot was to get to the moon immediately. It was to assess the appetite for the moon in the first place before investing into a pilot program.

STEVE CROCKER: I understand there's some differences of opinion as to what the incipient demand is or what people want. Some argue that there really isn't much need—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, just to make it clear, we were in a situation when we started this with a WHOIS that was receiving millions of queries per month. Once it had gone dark, what registrars were reporting are hundreds of requests per year. That's the disconnect that we were trying to figure out. The difference between an open system where a large amount of it was automation. WHOIS was responding to other machines and to a system gone dark where that had been turned off. And the humans behind it that continually request it were in the hundreds. The reality lies between the two, for sure. But it was trying to assess how close we were to the hundreds or to the millions.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm in complete agreement with you. Let me just expand on that. The statistics that you have, which I'd like to find a reference to, was something like four billion queries per month, if I remember, maybe per quarter, which is a big enough number. That's nine zeros. As you said, now down to hundreds of queries for nonpublic data. It's an important thing to realize that you cannot change any system by those kinds of numbers without having it be completely different. You don't scale things up or scale things down by those kinds of numbers and stay anywhere in the same ballpark. A 10% change, sure. 20%, 30%, now you begin to get

some stress. When you're talking about thousands of percent, millions of percent actually, you're in a totally different ballpark.

The experiment that's underway I think is incapable of providing the data necessary to find where in that broad range the demand really is. Is it in the thousands per month or is it in the millions per month or anywhere in between? I don't think we're getting enough data that would really be helpful. Unless the point is, "Well, we built a system and people are using it and so we've done our job. Never mind any of these larger issues. It is what it is." That's the appearance that many people have about what's being done. It is not only a real problem in terms of what's actually being provided but it's a reputational problem on top of that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I'm not sure I fully agree with you, Steven. This is anecdotal. I don't have the data in front of me. But when I asked the people that deal with these things internally at GoDaddy, their general vision is that we're still very much within the same traffic that we were receiving in terms of requests post GDPR. The only difference here is that we used to have all those requests coming to us directly and now we have those requests coming partly directly still and partly through RDRS. But it's not like we've multiplied by 10 or divided by 10 or divided by 2 the traffic that we have. It's still very much the same level of requests that we were receiving six months ago before RDRS.

STEVE CROCKER:

Excuse me. If I understand what you're saying, you're comparing before RDRS and after RDRS, both of which are after GDPR. What we're not finding out is what the requests would be if there was a system that was more responsive. This system does not provide any significant greater access than existed before RDRS. I mean, that may be the result that's coming up. So that in some sense, the creation of RDRS puts us more or

less where we were without RDRS but after GDPR. The question that I think is much more relevant is what would the demand be if there were a system that was much more efficient in all respects for processing legitimate requests still preserving privacy, etc. And we're not tackling that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Gabriel has been patient. Let's see if that's part of the answer but otherwise, I come back to you with an answer. Because I don't think it's a product or a tool problem. I think it's a problem of interpretation of GDPR. Let's go to Gabriel.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Hi. I just want to let folks know that I am also trying to get some data that might be informative from the User Constituency. That is my organization, a single law enforcement agency in a single country in the world. It is difficult to do. But one of the things I've done is I chose—and I'm speaking very anecdotally here—but one of the most commonly used WHOIS query tools that I've seen agents and analysts and computer scientists use, it's a particular one called CentralOps.net, I think, is the URL for it. This is just a single one of the many thousands of potential ways you can query WHOIS data, but I asked our folks that run IT across the nation if they could tell me how many times that one site was queried and give me a period of time over which they can provide that data for. And what I just got back within the last couple of weeks was that just my employer, the FBI in the United States, and just this one query tool, we've reached out to that almost 15,000 times in the last 90 days, and this is using from users that are just shy of a thousand. So I guess that's about 15 queries over 90 days per user. That seems to me to be about right for a single tool. And this is a tool that has no better data now than RDRS does. In fact, it has probably worse data. But again, it speaks to I think that that volume being significantly higher than what we're seeing

with the RDRS at present and speaks to why I still suspect that there's an end user awareness gap that may exist. I hope to go back and get additional data for additional tools. This was just the very first query I was able to finally get approval to do and to share. But I'm hopeful it won't be the last I'm able to report on this. But it is very, very challenging, I think, to get a true perspective of how much demand exists, that I just hope this additional data point, though, can illustrate that it definitely does lie somewhere higher than RDRS and perhaps lower than the millions of automated responses. But end users still very much seeking this data out even despite the data not being public.

STEVE CROCKER: If I might just ask for one point of clarification. First of all, thank you. That's very helpful. Second of all, when queries are made through that tool, you're getting nonpublic data, not just public data, right?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: It's only public data. This is a public available tool. I will put in the URL. I just want to make sure. Yeah, it's a .net. I just wanted to make sure I wasn't misremembering the actual TLD. But it is only public information and it's muscle memory. For literally decades, investigators have been using open-source WHOIS and they haven't stopped using it despite GDPR. So we need to change muscle memory, and that's not easy ask.

STEVE CROCKER: But didn't GDPR shut down what you get? Are you getting only the post GDPR level?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Only the post GDPR and where on rare occasion you still have some public info like .us or what have you. But yeah, the information quality

definitely has declined since GDPR. And people are still using to this extent even years after. So that's the point I'm trying to make.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Yeah, really helpful, Gabe. Steve, to go back to your question again, I don't think that we're ever going to go back to a world where there is the automation to the level you witnessed before and the easy access to the quality of data that you have before. I do think that—and this is what I was finding, hopefully, in the conversation particularly organized by the registrars—resetting expectations on both ends as to what a legitimate request is and a legitimate exchange of information of two parties working for each other, saying, “Hey, I need data. This is the reason why I need the data. This is what I'm going to do with this. This is how you can trust me with the data that you will give to me.” And on the other end, the other party being able to recognize that there are some legitimate were used that don't require court orders, etc. There's a world between the two. And I think that in the examples that were shown in that session, there are things that are part of the conversation that are going to make that exchange of data easier. I think that by showing all the requesters and what looks like—again, I don't want to say that there is a canvas for a request that will go 100%, because jurisdiction and the appetite of the registrars who take risk, etc., let's remember that the registrars are on their own without risk right now, that ICANN is nowhere near to take responsibilities on it. They don't want to do it and they haven't wanted to do it for years, so it's not going to change anytime soon. All these things are still going to be elements that are going to change from registrar to registrar. If we can show different registrars whether those do and show where conflict can lie and sort of reopen that discussion internally for those that need those examples from the

community. And the same way around on the requester side, we might be able to better that. But again, we're not going back to those automation. There won't be any one request that will get positive response for everybody. Even law enforcement depends on jurisdiction and depends on who they represent where. They won't be back.

STEVE CROCKER:

Points well taken, Sebastien. But arguments are the form. We can't achieve something that is perfect for everybody or one uniform solution is going to work. I think that's both true and not necessarily the last thing or even the only thing, even the main thing that needs to be said. A solution that would be good for a large number of people even if it doesn't cover every hard case would move us a great distance forward and leave room for improvements later.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

So in terms of what was asked of us, which is to develop a ticketing system that does it, I believe that this is it. I believe that that is able, because I've seen in the examples that we discussed in the Registrar group that were all based on RDRS request, that some of the requests were able to pass muster because we're in deep collecting all the right information to do that. Some of those were missing it, either interpretation of the registrar or because all the elements were entered, or because the request wasn't legitimate, which happens too. Not all requests are created equal. But the tool that we have here at least puts all the elements of what is needed to take a decision, collects them. We're fine tuning it by making mandatory stuff that wasn't and that should have been, etc. But that's a tool. But then once we have that perfect tool or as good as it gets or as good as we know it should get, then we're back to the problem. I see the rank was discovered. It was relating before. We need to get enough traffic and enough incentive to

keep that traffic to make sure that it's not abandoned, because otherwise, it's a perfect tool that is useless because it's not used.

STEVE CROCKER:

You said it's collecting all the data that's needed to make decisions. I'm not sure that that's actually the case. It's the way it's presented. And the registrars in a really remarkable session in Kigali had a session that I thought that we were going to hear from their point of view the kinds of things that requesters needed to do to improve their success rate. As best I could tell, the main message was, "Please give us more information, please give us more information, please give us more information, and so that we can make the decisions." That no guidance of any substantive or specific as to what kind of requests would succeed and what kind of requests would not succeed or how to achieve any kind of uniformity or so forth. More generally, none of the discussions that we're talking about here get at the real substance of the issues. How do you construct a system, whether it's automated or not automated, where the people who are using the system, starting with the requesters, have a good sense of what they need to do and in order to get a successful request. And the flipside of that is what not to do, what kinds of things are not likely to work so don't bother about it. The rather graphic Sankey charts that Gabe has provided, to me that scream that there's some really imbalances there. We should have had very quick convergence toward high percentage of successful requests if the people are in the learning curve and have feedback that said, "Here's what to do and here's what not to do." I don't think that that's coming back. And I don't think that we have an organized scheme for analyzing that data. And I suspect the answer is, "Oh, you can't look at that data. That's sensitive data, we can't analyze that." That's a very awkward position to be in.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I just want to call out. I have an AOB thing that I would like three minutes for. I know we only have 13 minutes left. But I require committee concurrence for ICANN staff to take an action. So I hope that at the very end of this, I can have three minutes for that topic. Just calling it out now. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Can I ask who was driving the screen to go back to the agenda? I think, if anything, this discussion, and we spent over 45 minutes on it, if anything, this discussion proves that these are topics that need to be discussed. Again, looking back at the mandate of what this group should be, I don't believe it's part of it. Maybe I'm wrong. But I don't think that I've heard that this discussion should be part of the mandated work of what we were given. This is why I wanted to write this letter. This is why I wanted to raise that alarm with Council, because I believe that the discussion should be had. But I don't believe they should be had here. Council may come back to me and say, "No, no, no. Have the discussion. We'll change the mandate, don't worry. It's a good discussion to be had, have it." But at this point, it's not the mandate that we were given. This is the reason. I do believe that it should exist. And the fact that we spent 45 minutes again on it shows me that I'm not entirely wrong.

With this said and given the fact that Gabe just asked for five minutes at the end, can I very quickly try to go to point two? Lisa, I'm catching you by surprise here. But can you, in five minutes, give us gist of what you wanted to discuss? Then we'll have to take it to the list for the next two weeks?

LISA CARTER:

Yes, Seb. Sure. Really quickly, I just wanted to obviously drop the link for the metrics that got posted the same day we had our last meeting, because we didn't have time to review those then. I think the next meeting we have will be around the time of the next report. So just a high level, just kind of I wanted to note some things, how they're trending. As you guys kind of previous discussed sort of the number of requester accounts added is kind of on the downward trend. Same for metric 5, number of requests is down, 255 in March, down 156 In May. Use of data requests forms metric 6.1, 6.2. That seems to be a little bit on the increase for nonparticipating slightly but decreasing for participating. And then law enforcement and IP holders continue to be the top request categories, with other coming in third, metric 10, domain not supported is the highest metric. And for this coming report that we have, we'll include Gabe's request for metric 10 even though it's not in the Impressions document. That's something else I wanted to kind of put forward is that if everyone can please just put every request in the Metrics document so that it can be tracked. Same for I think metric 8 that Steve asked for. Metric 8 won't be included in the next report, but it will come probably the report after. So that's kind of what I wanted to cover.

The one other thing that I wanted to squeeze in is we had a conversation about how many ccTLD searches there are. There was a little glitch in the system last time we spoke, so the number I gave wasn't actually accurate. I wanted to give a correction. So ccTLDs account for about 8% of overall lookups. Right now we have about 1087 ccTLD queries total, 87 queries were like of non-existent two letter dot characters. And that was 1087 out of 12,985 lookups as of the 25th of June. So that's all I had on the metrics. And then obviously, you guys need to discuss what additional metrics you want besides the metric 8 and metric 10 that were mentioned last time. That was really fast. But that's what I got for that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, that's perfect, because it's exactly what we needed. I'm not sure that we have time to open the debate of metrics. And maybe, Gabe, you can help me here. I think that we were in the same mind, but I can't remember exactly where we were at. We were trying to see if most of the domain not supported were ccTLDs, and your answer is no, most of them are not. So what are most of those requests for the domains that are not supported? Is it TLDs that don't exist at all with typos? Is it .gov, and .mil and the ones that are excluded that are gTLDs? What are we talking about exactly?

LISA CARTER: I'd have to go back and look, but just on recollection, people are just typing in things that aren't actually in the domain space, made up names, some gibberish names, etc. But we'd have to go back and look. But yeah, ccTLDs is only 8% of that total.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I'll chime in, Sebastien. I believe what we were seeking is that explanation. Exactly what you're saying, to be able to answer that question every time the month comes out. Like, if they aren't the supported ccTLDs, then what are they? Whether it's the .mils which are your non-supported, whether it's a ccTLD or if it's gibberish, I think that being able to answer every time is exactly what we were hoping for.

LISA CARTER: Just an FYI, that the ccTLD ask won't be in the Metric 10 Ask report coming out for July, because that was asked for later after we kind of had to do all the work. So the ccTLD addition would be after this next report.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Copy. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Sorry, before you do the work and then we ask for the work again, if gibberish is such a big category, can we have a category that says gibberish? And then maybe the .mil and .gov are one box, and then the ccTLD on another box? So we can get rid of that gibberish altogether and agree that it's something that we can discard. But it's not something that we need to handle in a future system?

LISA CARTER: Can you guys add that to the Impressions document that asks?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. That's a very fair ask. Yes, absolutely. I will. With this said, I have 25 on the clock. Gabe, did you want to present your AOB?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah. Thank you very much. So I sent an e-mail on Friday, and the topic of the e-mail was revising the API feedback. As you recall, one of the line items in the Impression document was to ask ICANN staff how much work it would be to create an API for the RDRS. It was assigned either very high or high, I forget which, but significant. So, in the meantime, I was following a suggestion that came from Steve Crocker to explore whether or not the requester constituencies can shoulder a lot of that burden around without asking ICANN to create a brand new API. And the short of it is, it seems promising after conversations with a bunch of engineers on my end, but I'm reducing the ask on it. But I still have to get permission from the committee to ask the staff to do two things. And those two things are that we would want to test domain that we can query to make sure that our connection is actually connecting successfully without tainting the data. And so any test domain at all that just won't show up in the data collection, because I don't want to be

accused of that would be fantastic. And then secondly, we would just like ICANN staff, if they could, to provide us with an e-mail address that we can use to send the occasional technical question. So a technical point of contact that the engineers in our end can use for ad hoc challenges and requests. And then the benefit to this would be—and I see Farzaneh's question—why API? The benefit to this is we're really trying to get data on how much of the lift of authenticating our employees' identity can be done at our end, and then thus take away the cost that that would otherwise incur to ICANN in an SSAD. I believe that was one of the main cost drivers in the original conceptual view of the SSAD. So we're trying our best to see if we can shoulder that. But we need to be able to explore this on our end first.

Again, it's in my e-mail on Friday, but I'm just asking for two things. If they can get us a test domain and if we can have permission for them to create an e-mail address. And, I guess, permission for their technical staff to respond via that e-mail. That's all I'm asking. And I don't think that there's anyone that would object to this on this call. But I really want to not delay that work because I'm now asking our engineers to do some of this and quickly. So, apologies, but I just didn't want to even miss the opportunity to ask the team for permission to do that now.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I see no objection. Marc, you have your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien, and thanks, Gabriel, for taking that on. I guess two parts of your question, the one on technical support contact, that really feels to me like it's outside of the purview of the Standing Committee. That's a question for staff, pure and simple. I don't really think we should have any part of that. If they're willing to support that, great. If not, I'm not sure it's entity. It's up to us.

The first part of your question, though, about a test domain, that seems like a very reasonable ask to me, but I think like all other asks, I'd want to understand sort of what the level of effort and timeframe would be. Maybe that's something that already exists, and they can just sort of tell you what it is. Or maybe it's much more complicated than that. So I think like all other asks, I would want to understand what the LOE and timeframe would be.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Given that we have two minutes, I don't expect, Lisa, that you have answers to any of that. But if we can have at least a verbal confirmation that you received the e-mail that Gabe prefers to on Friday and if indeed you can commit to answering at least to the e-mail.

LISA CARTER: Yes. And if that also is already in the Impressions document, that ask?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yes, it falls under the API, but I need to basically revise the API ask, so I'll do so too. So I have two items to revise in the Impressions document. Sebastien, you didn't see my notes on the side chat, but I was raising a hand to do the same for the other topic as well. So I will try to update it imminently for both those two.

LISA CARTER: Okay. Then once it's there, then I can send it to our team for a revised LOE on it.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Much obliged.

LISA CARTER: Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: With this, and less than a minute to go, we didn't tackle most of the points that we had on our agenda but we had a good conversation, I will go back to my letter and try to rejigger it in a way that I heard today, that I read in the last few days. And we'll send it back to this list before I send it to Greg in Council. Thank you all. Have a good rest of your day and talk to you all soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]