ICANN Transcription

RDRS Standing Committee

Monday, 03 June 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/TACNEg

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

JULIE BISLAND: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, the 3rd of June 2024. We did not receive any apologies for today's call. The Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? Please raise your hand if so. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It's not really an update, but I realized that my SOI hadn't been cleaned up after stepping in Council. And I was looking at it this weekend so I did update it and it's more accurate, let's say. There's no major, major change, but there was some Council response that are no longer relevant.

JULIE BISLAND: Perfect. Thank you so much for that. Anyone else? I have just promoted a few folks if you want to check your screen. All right. Observers are welcome and we'll be able to view chat-only and have a listen-only audio. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space, which I will post in just a second. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you. And over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Julie. Good late afternoon here in Paris, morning and afternoon and everything for everybody else. I don't have much to say in terms of welcome otherwise then this is our last meeting before a number of meetings next week. We will discuss that to make sure everybody is connected and aware. I have received invitations from the different groups, asking me to extend it to this Standing Committee. But I think that beyond that, we should make sure that as many people as possible join us, particularly for the sessions that we'll discuss in a minute, but the Registrar and the CSG session, to make sure that we share as much as we can.

Then I'd like to try to spend as much time as possible also to talk about system enhancement and coming up to final ideas to bring to a meeting in Kigali to discuss, knowing that we wanted to have then some kind of a path for staff to take for the next few months in larger development. I don't know that we have besides any of this. With this, I'm not quite sure who wanted to do the different

ICANN sessions. Was it you, Lisa? Otherwise, I'm happy to do it. It's probably just a reminder.

LISA CARTER: I just actually put that on there as a reminder. I know we briefed this, talking about it last session.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Again, there will be next week three sessions. There will be ours first, which is just the Standing Committee. I'd like to spend some time then discussing and agreeing on the enhancements that we will want longer term. I don't know if we have enough material or have enough agreed to do that. But let's review that today in part four of our discussion. There will then be on the same day a CSG session, which I assume is not going to be a repeat of the one in San Juan, but will also allow users/requesters to share what their findings are and improvements and etc. And we'll have a little discussion about the Impressions document later on and how to collect the information.

Then on the Tuesday, there will be a similar session but hosted by the Registrars. The Registrars intended to prepare a thought sharing session where actual request—anonymized, obviously. We're not there to name and share. The actual request will be presented and reviewed to try to understand what makes a request feasibly or positively responded and where the problems are. With this said, is there anybody from the CSG or from the Registrars that would like to better explain what I've just explained briefly, or did I cover it? I see no hands. I must have done a perfect job, which is not surprising.

I see your hand, Steve. I received invitations from the different groups asking me to extend the invitations to you. I think that you should also, within your own groups, try to bring more people. The more we are around these tables, the more we're able to share, the better we'll get an understanding of whether the Goldilocks' point is. With this said, I see your hand, Steve DelBianco.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Sebastien. In the CSG hosted session in San Juan, we prepared some slides that included data from requesters and it would have been much more beneficial not only for the requester community but for the registrars to have seen that in advance. So I've raised that with my colleagues. I'm not personally a requester, but there are BC and IPC members that are. Steve Crocker's well in tune with some other requesters from a broader community. So we will ask and do my best to gather any slides that might be presented and make sure that I circulate them to this list in case you're able to examine them ahead of time and have some follow-up questions or explanations that you want to use. I would invite registrars to do the same on this list if they have data they'd like to bring up such as what makes for a good request. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. I see your, Sarah. I found a hand there.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. They moved it. They moved the hand button. Your description of the Registrar-hosted session was perfect and that is exactly what it will be. I will just let you all know. If you need to be a couple minutes late, it's okay. Take an extra long coffee break. The first 20 minutes of the session are very Registrar group-specific. You're, of course, welcome to be there, but you might not find it relevant, and that's okay. But then, we will get into the RDRS review real example request. So I really, really hope to see you all there. But I know that it conflicts with other sessions. So if I don't see you there, I will still understand. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: One quick follow-up, if you don't mind, Sebastien and Sarah. I'm wondering whether the rooms that we have will be large enough to accommodate. I think the room we had in San Juan was cramped, right? We only probably fit about 15 people, maybe 17, at the table. The rest, you really can't participate if you're sitting in an audience. I do hope this is a bigger room. But it's hard to say right now. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I really agree with you, Steve, that it is difficult to participate in a lecture audience kind of situation. For that reason, we have a different room set up. We will have round tables that seat 8 to 10 people. Maybe it's 8 people per table, and there are 10 tables, something like that. I don't know if that will accommodate everybody who joins. But hopefully, those who are able to be at the tables will be able to have a really good, robust conversation within the table groups, and then report back to the full room at the end of the session. That's the plan.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I hope that answers your question. Again, come to the other group. Indeed, there are some conflicts. I received also an invitation from the NCSG, which I had to decline because of the conflicts with the Registrar session that I wanted to follow. These things happen. But as much as possible, please be there because I think that it will be good to hear from all angles. With this said, I think that we'll close this and we can move on to item three of our agenda which is the RDRS usage metric follow-up. Lisa, I do believe that is yours.

LISA CARTER: It is. Thanks, Sebastien. I just wanted to put this on the agenda as a follow-up to some of the questions that Marc Anderson and Steve had at the last meeting about metric 15 in the summary of data. I know the ask was from the end of that meeting that I can go back and take a look at the presentation of those metrics, specifically for the last one posted, which was the 15th of May. And we did go back and look at it and it turned out, I think, as Steve may have suggested, that the numbers had been transposed. So we corrected that. That is in the process of being reviewed for publication later on this week, probably by Wednesday, Thursday. Then in the process of doing that review, we went back to look at some of the previous ones just to make sure those were good. We actually did find, again, there was a transposition of those numbers in the report published for April as well. So we are publishing a correction of that, and that correction will be documented in both of those reports that are reposted to say that it was reposted and we corrected the information. Sorry. I see Steve's hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks a lot. I appreciate you guys looking into that. Kevin Murphy at DomainIncite had relied upon the wrong numbers for the DomainIncite post that he had. I might suggest to go to DomainIncite, you'll see it came out the same day as the report, he completely relied upon the data to make the bold statement that there was a dramatic increase in the response time. I do believe it would be helpful to reach out to Kevin. He'll make an amendment. He'll make a change to it. Then the second thing is when you get approval to post the new ones, do you just overwrite the old one or are we going to end up with multiple iterations of the same month's report on our website? Thanks.

LISA CARTER: There won't be multiple iterations. Basically, we'll take down the old one, post the new one, and as I indicated, we'll actually say in that document that this is a new posting with the correction. So that people who look at it will know that it's a different document and that there was data corrected for metric 15. Then as far as the comment for DomainIncite, we'll take that back to determine the best action to take there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, this is Sebastien. When you said that you're going to repost, you also will regenerate the CSV that goes with it?

LISA CARTER: Correct.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm sorry. I didn't check, I should have, but did you also generate a CSV for the reports since the beginning or only since you started with the CSVs themselves?

LISA CARTER: No. It goes all the way back to the beginning for all the CSVs. So the two CSVs that need to be corrected based on this discovery will actually be updated as well along with the actual report.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: You're welcome.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Any other questions on this? I see a comment from Gabriel, who's agreeing on making the data clearly updated. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to thank Lisa. ICANN in the past had a habit of revising documents and not making any notation at all, either in the document or on the webpage, that there's been a change. So thank you. Thank you for making sure this one is documented properly.

LISA CARTER: You're welcome.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Well, we're speeding through here. Thank you for being alert on this data. I didn't see it until you guys mentioned it. But it's also why we're there. So thank you for raising this. And indeed, thank you, ICANN, for making the corrections and ensuring that nobody gets lost there by noting that the correction exists.

With this, let's go and discuss the systems in the house. We still have 45 minutes. I'd really like to spend as much time as possible there to look at it. But maybe, Lisa, you go over the first two items and then we'll take it from there.

LISA CARTER: Sure. I'll try to go through mine quickly to leave you guys more time. If you guys can share, I think maybe Caitlin can share the screenshot of the RDRS requester interface. The other one. When she gets that up... Basically, I know there was some conversation about requesters indicating that their law enforcement when they're not—one of the reasons I know registrars are asking for the ability to change the request type is related to sort of this type of thing. So I just wanted to show that what we are doing is putting the language that's in the Requester User Guide. This is pulled straight from the user guide right above where the requester makes their selection to let them know that it's a violation of the Terms of Service. To provide misleading content, including representing themselves as law enforcement when they are not. So hopefully, this will deter people from selecting the wrong requester type and prevents registrars eventually from having to change the request type because it was submitted incorrectly. I just wanted to put that one out. I don't know if there's any questions here before I go to the other one. No hands? Okay.

Then the second one, if you can show that list of the screenshot. Maybe make that slightly bigger. For this one, in looking at the list of request types we offered in the dropdown, the first one says Computer Security Incident Response Team. The third one says Cybersecurity Incident Response Team. Those are both basically the same as far as what our in-house subject matter expert indicated that incident response all groups together. The proposal is that the third one be actually changed to indicate Cybersecurity Team and remove the Incident Response because that's covered by the first item. Then what we would do as far as metrics would be to continue to show the data from when it was listed as Cybersecurity Incident Response because we don't know the intent of the requester. We don't want to get rid of those stats. They're definitely relevant to the report. But we would remove the ability to select it in the future and replace that with Cybersecurity Team since that would not be represented and hasn't really been represented in this list. Only incident response. I just wanted to put that forward to the Standing Committee to let you know that that's what we're looking at doing specifically for the dropdown. And we don't have a timeline for when that's going to be released. We just started talking about it. But I did want to bring it up to you guys. I see a couple hands up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead. I don't need to manage the queue. Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: No objection, in general, to clarifying the request type as we learn more about the categories. Requesters are making use of this. So long as we have some sort of footnote of as to what it used to be called to make the retroactive analysis more feasible for folks. And to that same point, I wondered, having noted that there were a lot of others in the most recent April report, a sizeable amount, if we can't maybe start doing the same thing there, we know there's a lot of others that you already through whatever means have some visibility into what category they are, if you couldn't add them to this list with the little footnote that said "Previously part of other" or something to that effect. That's all.

LISA CARTER: That's a good point, Gabe. For the Cybersecurity Incident Response Team that we're taking out of the dropdown, it will be noted that that actually is no longer available with some sort of footnote in probably the metrics report itself. Then we will indicate that we have the new label that is Cybersecurity Team that will go forward. We will have to explain that, basically, in the metrics that we present. Just definitely a good point about other as well. Thanks. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I'll be interested to see how the other thing shakes out. Just because if they're selecting other, I don't think there's a free form text box to type in what type of request it is. So I'm not sure how that would be evaluated. But I understand it already do so. My question is—

LISA CARTER: Sorry. I would just say they actually can type in.

SARAH WYLD: They can? See, this is what happens when I can't actually see the system. Thanks, Lisa. That's great. That's great. Okay. My question's actually related to the previous screen. If you don't mind just to go back to that other screenshot, please. Just because I need to now explain this to registrars. Could you please remind us where does this text come from that it is a violation? Was that from the Terms of Service or the FAQ? Lisa, I think you said earlier where it came from and I just can't remember. But you're on mute now.

LISA CARTER: Sorry, I was muted. I didn't realize that. This is the exact language that appears in the Requester User Guide in relation to misrepresenting information in the system being a violation of the Terms of Service.

SARAH WYLD: Okay, the user guide. That's great. Thank you. So I will just say as a English speaker, it's weird. The end of the top line where it says, "That would be named in a manner that misleads others," that reads very strangely to me. But I do think it will be appropriately clear to those who are using the platform so I can live with that. Thank you very much.

LISA CARTER: Sure. I think Steve was next maybe.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Good. With respect to the categories of requesters, in addition to capturing the numbers in each category, has there been any attempt to identify groups of those and to reach out to them to find out what their attitude is and experiences with respect to using the system? The data that you're collecting there will be what comes in the door, if you will. But the question I'm asking is how many are not coming to the door or thinking about it or don't know about it or whatever. Then as an entirely separate thing about functionality, it's been reported that it takes more than 30 clicks to submit a request. Can you measure? Can you add some instrumentation that measures the number of clicks for each submission and accumulate those statistics internally so we can see what the user experience is?

LISA CARTER: Hi, Steve. Thanks for the feedback there. I think this is a similar question that maybe was asked in the past when the pick list was shown to the small team. And I think at that time, it was indicated that the list was created internally based on conversations with ICANN and our Legal team and based on what was in the WHOIS disclosure design paper. So no additional outreach has been done since that time, to my knowledge, to discuss with each of the groups on their feedback on the list itself. Then second, to your tracking clicks, I can take that back to the team. I don't think that's something that we had originally intended, but we can take that back to discuss internally.

STEVE CROCKER: Thanks very much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I recognize myself. On Steve's last point—and we can talk about this later today—I want to also to go back to the questionnaire and the user survey. I think that it caught us a bit by surprise. And the response on that is really, really low, so maybe we want to do some work on this and make sure that we're getting a feedback. Again, this is a pilot and it's all about feedback and getting information back.

The other thing that I wanted to note—and we don't need to keep on swapping back between the different screenshots. On the other screenshot, I've just seen that it's alphabetized. I love an alphabet as much as the next person. But here in this particular case, particularly because there are some request types that are actually quite similar from each other, it might be more intelligent to have it grouped or sorted by broad requester types, and then within that, finesse it between different [inaudible]. I see that the same alphabetical order, all but four other, was used also in the CSV. So I'm assuming it's the same thing in the interface. I'm sorry. I haven't been able to see the interface lately. But can we make sure that that is also done in a coherent way? It'll help people finding where they are and where they belong. And it'll help them qualifying the type of requester they are better if we help them that way. That's me. I see Sarah's hand.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I'm still thinking about the question about the number of clicks. I put it into the chat, "What do we learn or what would we do with that information?" We could achieve having fewer clicks in the process by putting all the information into one screen instead of having it broken up by step as it is now. But does that actually make it better? I personally would find that less usable just because I have a small little laptop screen.

Then I'm looking at Gabe's input in the chat, and Gabe would like to see if the number of clicks perhaps is in some way related to the number of requests that make it all the way through from the initial lookup of the domain to the actual submission of the request. I guess then my question is do we really think it's the number of clicks that are affecting that? How would we know that? How would we narrow down that it's the clicking on the screen that affects the ability or the desire to complete a request rather than the information that's being requested in order to be able to evaluate the request and the requester's desire to actually provide all that info? I don't know. I guess in the end, I imagine that if requesters found there were just too many steps in the process, that they would have said so in the survey. Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. I'll recognize myself just for one quick point here. There might be ways of having a workflow that reduces the amount of clicks. I hope that we all agree that the questionnaire, the different questions, the elements of this questionnaire, are important, are vital, and we're not touching that. We could reduce the number of clicks by just having one big box for people to throw everything in it. But that would completely defeat the purpose of what we're doing. Thanks. Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Interesting. I didn't have in mind trying to subvert the system by having reducing number of clicks by simply having one big, unwieldy page. But the observation about how many clicks also carries the implication that that seems to be an awful lot of work for submitting requests. I didn't want to suggest any kind of major redesign at the moment, but rather just gathering data that would be informative. But sometime down the road, imagine there'll be a desire for serious discussion about how much work should be necessary and how can you make it balanced in terms of the amount of work versus what's required to do this. Let's say go back to the top and rethink the interface and the whole process. And I had intended my suggestion of measuring the clicks as a lightweight information gathering that would lead into that, and lots more information would be required, and so forth. I don't know what kind of immediate changes could be made that would reduce the friction, and I don't know what the relationship would be between the number of clicks and whether things get completed.

Let me just add one other comment and then I'll quit. I know when I go into a system that I'm not familiar with and I'm asked to fill out a form, it's not uncommon to be told you must complete page one before you're allowed to see page two, etc. I find that to be really quite off putting because sometimes I don't know what the right answers are to put in page one until I've seen the whole form. That's a different issue in a sense that one should be able to go back and forth. With that, I will sit back in my seat and listen. Thank you.

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

LISA CARTER: Hi. I just wanted to comment on the template that's available in the system as far as reducing friction or making it easier for requesters to resubmit similar requests over and over and over. And the use of that could solve some of the issue, I think, maybe, that's trying to be addressed by tracking the clicks or reducing the friction or conversion rate or all those things. So I just wanted to put that out there.

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

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I just want to agree with Steve that it is useful to be able to see the whole entire form. I would suggest if that's not how the RDRS itself is set up, then the user guide, which currently has screenshots of some part of the request form, could be updated to include screenshots of the entire form. I think a requester, if they're only submitting a small number of requests, might be more likely to look at the user guide than at the template. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that. Any other comments or suggestions on this click? I see a comment from Farzaneh, mentioning talking to some U.S. designers. That seems like a good idea. I don't know if there are within staff people that are more specialized than that or that they have already enrolled for this. Again, I want to be a bit careful here also. I think that we're getting very, very close to the final dataset that we want to collect, the types of all these things that we want to get before changing the workload dramatically. I would want to make sure that that's done at least. Because then, that means that we're collecting data there. We can always fine tune the way it's done. But I've heard the same comment as you have, Steve, during the session in San Juan. There were some people talking about extraordinary number of clicks to file all the requests they wanted to file. Simon, I see you hand up.

SIMON RAVEH: Thank you. I just wanted to mention that when we build the UI, we also look at accessibility and those types of things. That's one why we split form and making it easier to navigate. I don't say that one is better than the other, but we do think about those other criteria in general.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. It's really something also to be seen, at least, with the requester that we have on hand. Having worked in IT for many, many, many years, I find that an engineer's idea of an easy-to-read screen is not always the same idea as a user off the street. Anyway, personal comment here. Marc Anderson, I see you hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sebastien. Can you hear me okay?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Absolutely.

MARC ANDERSON: All right. Great. I want to comment on something Gabriel said in the chat. He made a note about commentary, maybe something to note for successor system. I think he's hinting at something. I was mulling over in my head. We have 18 more months with the pilot, and then we have recommendations to make for what comes next. I think, Sebastien, as you said, we've heard from users about the number of clicks and maybe the usability or the ease of entering the system. And I'm wondering which bucket this feedback goes in? Is it a bucket for enhancements that we can make to the pilot during the remaining 18 months of it or is this feedback that we would want to consider for a potential recommendation about a successor system? Or maybe the answer is it's both?

As you said, this is feedback we've been hearing and maybe we want to take this on as something to consider for maybe our follow-on recommendations. I don't know that we have a place to track that, right? I think we have a nice Google Doc for tracking enhancements to the pilot. But if we were to consider this as feedback for a potential successor system, I'm not sure where that gets tracked. I'm sorry. I was a little bit thinking out loud. But I think my question is—I think I'm asking a question—is this discussion related to the pilot, a successor system or both? And do we have a place to capture something like this for feedback for what comes after the pilot?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. I see a comment from Sarah plus one. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Marc, thanks for framing that question. You posed a dichotomy of whether the feedback would be helpful for evolving the current system or for designing the next system, and then offered that it might be for both. I agree with that but I want to expand it even a bit further. We haven't spent much time and I think that's been kind of implied out of scope reaction to discussing successor systems. But there has also been an implied assumption, at least to my ears, that the successor system will simply be an improvement on what we have here.

Let me add a third possibility, which is start over and think about all this from a fresh point of view, I've been vocal and will continue to be vocal in a lot of forms, that the whole idea of having a centralized system run by ICANN is really the wrong track to be on. The whole idea of filing a system that doesn't have interfaces from the get-go to the requester side into the registrar side is a big mistake from the get-go. I could go on with this, but my main point here is that in terms of looking downstream past the RDRS lifetime, the choices are not simply go no-go on the original SSAD idea, but a broader set of topics to be taken up. Then having said that, the question of how to schedule that, when to allocate time and resources to do that, and to the point that Marc raises, where do you put comments that are arising, what bucket do you put them in so that they get dealt with? I think all of that is extremely important. The lack of having any structure in place for those kinds of discussions now means that we are wasting a lot of time and it will cost us even more time later. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. With this, can we go back to the agenda? I think there was another point that you wanted to discuss. Those are the two points that you wanted to discuss, Lisa, right?

LISA CARTER: Yes, those two. And then the next—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. So maybe we should go back to the Impressions document. There were a few exchanges on that last week. I just wanted to make sure you have it there. Exactly. I just wanted to make sure that we're all agreed on this. This document—and as Marc said, there might be another section for UX issues and whatever. It's a working document. It's not a perfect document. But this document is there for all of us to track what improvements, what we want to change, how we want to make the product evolved, be able to track that also but then making sure that ICANN dev knows what we want and how fast we want, and so on and so forth. As I've written, I have no issue with getting feedback from outside of this discussion. I do have issues about having feedback that comes outside without an owner. I need somebody who knows enough about it to be able to own it and champion it and help us prioritize and decide how fast these things need to happen or how less urgent they might be, or even for a second version after the pilot, whatever it may be. I heard you, Steve, and I fully agree with you on that. And so on and so forth.

So we have a discussion the other week and, Steve Crocker, I'm not putting on the spot but indeed you did show the fact that there was difficulties in getting all the information from the discussion into the sheet and I saw that somebody from staff helped, and so on and so forth. I do want now to make sure, as I've written, to make sure that every item that we're going to chase is being owned and being owned by somebody around the table, who, again, is able to defend it, to champion it and help us decide how urgent or less urgent it is.

So if we scroll down—I haven't looked today at the sheet, but I want to make sure that the same way the first few items were entered by Gabriel and then Farzaneh, that the rest here has a name that corresponds to our group. Then we're able to figure out how we want to prioritize this. I was hoping to have this in a way that can actually be discussed face to face. I don't know if we'll be able to have that for next week. Because otherwise, it's great data, it's important data, but without having an idea how we're going to tackle it, it's just information. Gabriel, I see your hand up.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: All right. Using a new microphone. Do you hear me?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Absolutely perfect.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay, thank you. I just want to follow up on the e-mail communication that we had. I'm taking ownership of tracking down the originators of the—if you scroll up—I think it was Taiwanese Police, Criminal Investigation Bureau of Taiwan. There we are. So I've reached out to the ICANN staff member that was facilitating that engagement that created that advice, but I need to go through them to find out the actual name and contact information of the folks who initially gave it. I just don't know them. But I'm chasing down that squirrel. We will have updates when I am able to make that connect but I can't guarantee you it's going to happen within a week because I'm relying on others to play game of telephone to help me there. But I do own that. I do not know what the CSC beneath that is and whether or not that's also my responsibility.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Let me look at this, Gabriel, too. Because I think at some point, there was a name mentioned and I seem to know that person. He was somebody that was working at some point with the Chinese and may have big jobs. Sorry. I was talking without an open mic. Sarah, your turn.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I apologize in advance. I've got like eight different thoughts here. Okay. First up, these new items that were entered in, I think if we click into the suggested text, we see that they were entered by Valerie Heng. I have a question, which is did Sebastien just say that all of these different items entered by Valerie came out of the CSG discussion session in San Juan, or were they from something else? That's my first question, but I actually think it doesn't matter. So I'm going to just keep talking instead of letting you answer.

Okay. Next thought, what is this document for? I think that the use of this document has shifted over time, and I think that's okay. There are two different things, right? There's gathering everybody's thoughts on the platform is one thing. And then separate is making a specific request to change something and coming to a group agreement to do that thing. So that's one thought. What is this document for?

The next thought is I find it very difficult now to read this document because it is messy. It shows up for me in many different colors, which is actually helpful, but there's comments, there's suggested text, there's responses in the sidebar. So I would like to request, can ICANN staff please either clean up this document or can we come to an agreement to do something different? Which I'm going to get to in a second. But if we are to maintain using this document, what could happen that I think would be useful would be accept all the tracks changes, add columns for priority and perhaps a column for a level of effort or perhaps that stays in the same column as priority because they are related, and add a column for notes and discussion. And I think that that would make it much more easy. And status, right? Like what is the status? Some of these things are done, some are in progress, some not. Where is that written down? It is hard to find.

Then finally, I don't really care what document it is, but I think we need something where this group vets change requests and comes to agreement as to whether they should be made or not and then prioritizes those changes. So far, we've done those with the requester group on one side, like one set of requests and the registrar is on a separate set of requests, and that's fine. Or they can be together. I don't care. But we need something where we can go through all of those and I'm not sure that this document is still cutting it. I see Steve's comment in the chat to keep priority and level of effort separate. Fine, sure. Okay. Those are all of my many thoughts. Thank you very much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. Any comments on this? Gabriel, I see your hand. I assume it's a previous hand.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I'm sorry. I'll take it down.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's okay. It's good. Okay. Let's work indeed on cleaning this up. I like the idea of the extra column as Sarah suggested. And on cleaning up, indeed. I'm getting a bit lost here.

We heard from Gabriel that he was going to chase the law enforcement input, question that you asked Sarah on the mic. Yes, I think that it's multiple sources. That's what I understood from Valerie. Particularly, this law enforcement one, it didn't come from the CSG or someone. It came from another discussion. That needs to be also tracked. But indeed, CSC, where does that come from and whose it is, I'd love to know. Stephanie, I see your hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I apologize for not having tuned in on this recently. But I'm not particularly comfortable with the idea that we are accepting suggestions from random folks who we don't know who they are. Obviously, if somebody comes in with a terrific piece of feedback and we like it, that's fine. But this issue of who on the team, in other words, on the group, owns it I think is an important one. If somebody thinks that a random entry from someone is a great idea, then why aren't they pushing it forward as a member of the team? Thanks. Am I being unduly bureaucratic? It wouldn't be the first time.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't think you are. And I think it might be the first filter to evaluate the relevance of a point. If nobody picks it up, then maybe it's not relevant. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. That gets to what I was saying about this group, vetting and prioritizing requests, and what is the purpose of this document. Gathering impressions versus making specific change requests. For these ones that Valerie put in, maybe this whole group has to go through them and decide what we think about them. But normally, my expectation had been that each Stakeholder Group, Supporting Organization, Advisory Committee has a representative here in this committee who would represent those requests that that group wants to have done. So if that's not what we're doing, then maybe we could make that part clear as well. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sarah, I think that it is. But again, there are entries in this page now. I don't know where they're from. And I wouldn't even know who's shoulder to tap to have an initial upon it. Stephanie, I believe that's a previous hand, and I'll let Steve go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Just a quick comment. I've heard a couple of mentions of representatives from various groups as if our group here, our Standing Committee, was a balanced representation of all of the stakeholders. In my view, the contracted parties, the people who have the data, are well represented. The requester community is much more diverse and is not organized in a way that maps directly into our process here. Some are represented, some are not. But the result is a pretty unbalanced situation. Thank you.

And the comment that we have, one person from each SO and AC and SG may be true, but still doesn't change the force of my comment. And if you like, the implication is that our SO and AC structure doesn't map very well onto the requester communities. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. I don't know how to manage things that don't have owners in this particular case. Even if it doesn't map exactly, somebody will have to raise their hand and at least help us figure out what the issue is and how we can fix it if it needs to be fixed at all. Sarah, I see you hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I know it's not really on topic for this whole group, but to this other point about balance, I can't imagine what else we could do here. We have one registrar representative, we have one registry representative, and then we have one from each other group, right? I don't think it would make sense to have, for example, three people from the SSAC with one rep from each other group. I can't imagine how we would manage ourselves if not by following that ICANN community setup. Okay. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sarah. I see your hand, Gabriel. And then Alan. Then I wanted to still have a bit of time. There was a discussion in the chat about this country field, to have some precision there. But Gabriel, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Okay. Very quickly then. I just wanted to highlight something I already said in the e-mail distribution list, is that I know how very hard it is to solicit feedback within constituencies and it's arm twisting and you don't really get great response rates. So I want to ensure that when we do get unexpected, unanticipated feedback, that we have still mechanism to capture that because it still can be gold. And it might be best then to Sebastien's idea that then we just have an expectation that if feedback arrives unexpectedly, that one of us as Standing Committee volunteers should raise a hand to then own chasing down the originator of that feedback to make sure that we understand it, to make sure that there's a channel of communication that's opened in case there needs to be follow up. And that's just maybe a responsibility that we should take on ourselves. But to not close the door to unanticipated feedback, I think, is critical. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Gabriel. I had the same also from some—Stephanie I think, everybody agrees to do that. It doesn't mean that we'll filter it. We just need to have ownership of most stuff once they're [written]. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm probably repeating what's now being said 17 times, but the second column is called name. It's not unreasonable to have a person's name there. And whether it's someone on this group or not, at least we know who it is. Indeed, when we have the discussion, we may have to call in someone else from outside the group to present it. But as Gabriel says, this may be really valuable information. And because no one on the standing group happens to be an expert on that subject doesn't mean we shouldn't consider it. But at the very least, we need not the name of a group but the name of a person and that implies at least an e-mail that we can know how to contact them. Whether that's done by respecting access to this form or simply having better instructions at the top, I don't much care. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. Farzaneh, I see your hand up. A good example of bringing a subject matter addressed afterwards, then join our discussion. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: I just want to say what I said in chat. For the requesters that are not somehow represented, we have that feedback, the survey thing, and they can use that to weigh in on the problems that they see.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. We haven't really had time to discuss this whole survey thing today and maybe it's a bit longer conversation to start right now. My bad if I got blindsided by it. I didn't realize that we had the survey where we're going when they were going, and I certainly didn't realize until we had a meeting in Paris, how low the level of response was on this survey, at least on the registrar side. But on the other side, I understand that it's been the same. It is definitely going to be a tool for us to better understand what we're doing and what we need to do. So I would like also to be able to spend some time on it. This is not development. Again, trying to see the agenda of things that need to be done in the next few months. Maybe we need to knock this one down first. But before we start sending further surveys, it would be very good to be able to look at it and figure out if it works, if it gets the information that we need to get, or if we need to improve it.

Lisa, I saw your hand up as soon as I started talking. So I'm sure you want to talk about that.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Sebastien. I just wanted to say in terms of the surveys itself for the registrars and how the surveys sends out just to kind of reconfirm, I just talked about it a little bit in the Prep Week session, but for the registrar side, only registrars that process requests during the designated period. So for this first survey, it was between November and the end of March, March 31, 2024, only people that actually process requests receive that survey. That also means that, for example, if somebody like GoDaddy had two or three people processing, each of those people would have received a survey to fill out. For the requester side, for every request that is completed or closed, meaning the registrar has marked approved, denied, partially approved, etc., the requester receives a survey after every closed request. Those go out frequently. So requesters individually, if they submit a lot of requests, could be receiving literally hundreds of surveys. Something to consider there as well is if they're getting it over and over and over, there could be somewhat of a desensitization to always seeing that link to fill out. I just wanted to put that out there to keep in mind. But yes, please discuss amongst the Standing Committee the questions, etc. You guys can all see them now and any feedback you can provide will be helpful for us for the next one. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Lisa. Gabriel, I see your hand up. We've got two minutes on the clock.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I wanted to steal those last two minutes. This is still an agenda item four, but the Sankeys I've been generating, but more specifically to some of the source data on that. In our current monthly reports, there's a metric 10 that shows the distribution of the initial input domains, whether they are part of a participating registrar, non-participating registrar, whether it's a non-functional

TLD from the purpose of RDRS. And this is something that's been presented in metric 10 as a percentage. It is something that I think that we would really benefit from seeing the actual quantified numbers there too. And then as well as the monthly pie chart, donut chart that they have, if we could also have one for cumulative.

I think that, Lisa, you helpfully showed a cumulative figure for this in your presentation for the six-month recap. But I went back and I tried to check the work and I found that I wasn't able to reach the same numbers, but I think maybe it's just because I was doing the math wrong and it just goes to highlight why I would so benefit from having both just the straight quantified number, as well as the cumulative for those past reports. And I wanted to raise this here because in that side conversation we had, we need Standing Committee approval to actually make any changes to the metrics. Does anyone on this call object to having metric 10 also show cumulative and the hard numbers in addition to the percentages that are shown?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Well, it makes perfect sense, Gabriel. I see a plus one from Marc Anderson. I think it's a good idea.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Thank you for giving me those two minutes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Time's up. But I think everybody reads on that, Gabriel, and we should try to have that implemented as soon as possible. With this, we are at time. I will see those of you who are coming next week on those three meetings that we detailed at the top of the agenda. For everybody else, see you online and see you soon. Thank you very much.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Sebastien. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This meeting is concluded.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]