TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call, taking place on Monday, the 26th of August, 2024. We have no listed apologies for today's meeting. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share at this time? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing none, if you do need assistance updating your GNSO SOI, please email the GNSO Secretariat. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat and have listen-only ability. 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. Please note, all chat sessions are being archived. And as a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With that, I'll turn it back over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Terri. And good day, everybody. So, I'm just looking quickly who's around the room. I guess the people will show up maybe in the next few minutes. So, unless there are any new items on the agenda, as I came in, I heard you, Sarah, mentioning something in the AOB. Can you repeat for everybody else? Sorry, I didn't catch exactly what it was.

SARAH WYLD: I didn't say exactly what it was because I was going to bring it up during the AOB. It was a new idea that someone had for the impressions document, but it might affect more than only registrars. So, I thought it might be worth discussing.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Okay. You're going to bring it up in AOB. Fantastic. Okay. I'll keep some time for you there. Seeing no other hands. Okay. So, last time, for those who weren't there, and I see that Simon is there. We weren't quite sure if you were going to be able to make it, but that's great. We had a discussion about metric 10 on lookups and trying to understand the large quantity of lookups that are not for domains that are in gTLDs and that are sponsored by participating registrars. And looking at it in details, or in details, no, because we don't have the actual details, but looking at it a bit deeper, the fact that a lot of those domains were malformed domains or not domain names at all appeared. And then in the discussion last week, it also appeared that because of the user interface, the way the user interface works, when a user types a domain name, and I'll use Sebastien.com, I had no idea if it exists or not. I didn't check. But as I would type Sebastien.com as a domain name that I want to look into, or want to have the registration data for, after the third character, so after SEB, there would be a first iteration of a search that would validate or try to validate the domain name. And then for every new letter that I would type, it would do that search again until I'm fully done. But in the case of Sebastien.com, I would have basically eight or nine errors being generated before I get to the final result. And so we wanted to understand from staff, and I see immediately your hands up, how that is logged and how that is recorded and if it fits our needs. Simon, I see your hand up immediately. Go ahead.

SIMON RAVEH: Okay. I'll get Lisa to go before me. Okay.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Simon. So, just an FYI that you have, I think you have in your inbox, Sebastien, my response to your email for explanation. But for the example that you gave where you're typing Sebastien.com in full and then you start with SEB, and then you maybe add an A, etc. For the first search, right, the condition to start the search is for the SEB, it would be three letters typed, and then a 750 millisecond delay in typing anything additional, right? For your example of SEBA, you would have had to wait another 750 milliseconds for that to be typed as another search, and the same for on and on and on. It would have to be a 750 millisecond pause between each of those additional letters you're adding to generate a separate search. Otherwise, it's all part of the same search, if that makes sense.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, it makes sense, except that I've never timed myself. I have no idea how long it takes me to type my own name, but a few seconds, I would say. Not milliseconds, I'm not that quick. So, I don't know what it means in terms of actual queries for a typical domain name of nine letters plus endings.

LISA CARTER: So, basically, it means that if you did not pause for at least the 750 milliseconds, that would all be counted as one query. That would not be counted as had been discussed previously for all these separate queries because you've added additional letters. Does that make sense?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I guess if I type fast enough. Simon, did you want to add to this?

SIMON RAVEH: Yeah. For a typical user, the typing, and again, it's not the whole, it's between letter to letter, right? So, 750 millisecond pause, that's what will, together with the three-letter minimum, that's what will trigger the search. And specifically in your case, it didn't. So, we got one search, not like the five or whatever you mentioned in the email.

LISA CARTER: Also, just by way of explanation, the way that's designed is to better the user experience, right? Not having to click enter, etc., adding to the clicks that people are already sort of indicating are a lot, allows the user to do the search without as much delay. So, that's why it's set up the way it's set up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, absolutely. In terms of user interface, I wouldn't want to lose that. I just want to make sure that that itself doesn't generate bad data. That we're not shooting ourselves in the foot basically by having an intelligent database. Steve Crocker, I see your hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I'm having a peculiar reaction listening to this. This is a discussion about how this current tool works and what the glitches are or how it feels and so forth. I keep focusing on the fact that this is a two-year experiment whose result is supposed to be input to what would we do to build a real system. And this discussion about the user interface here, I have to ask, are we taking this seriously as how to experiment with what the user interface would be to a real system? Or is this simply the pragmatics of dealing with this system as it currently exists and how to make best use of it? The distinction in my mind is really, really important because this is a very, very expensive process that we're engaged in. It's expensive in the amount of time that we're spending. It's expensive in the amount of attention that it's taking away from everything else. And it's expensive in the amount of time that it's consuming before getting on to the real order of business. So I'm making the point here with respect to this user interface discussion. I want to make another point, if I might, which we'll put under AOB if there's time, but also related to what's the nature of what we're trying to do here versus what the long-term project is. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. So just to answer quickly, at least in my view. We're not getting into too much of the weeds of the interface at this stage. I agree with you, this is a pilot and we'll only go so far with it. I just wanted to ensure that the interface itself is not generating garbage data that we would have to sift out. And in the present case, generating a flow of mistaken queries just by the way it's operating. What Lisa and

Simon answered seems to point to the fact that it's not. And so that's then a door that we can close. But that was the main word. Indeed, discussing the interface of a follow-up product or things like that will be discussions that we're not going to get into the weeds of.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I appreciate the point that you're making. But there's been this long-standing request to have API available so that people can connect up their own systems or have alternative user interfaces. So it's one thing to clean up the data that we're getting out of this, but it's another thing to say whether or not that data, even if it's completely clean, what is it actually going to tell us about what a future system should look like? And I would not think that there is a great deal of value that's going to come out of whatever numbers we get out of this, because this interface is, as we've discussed many times, this interface is very limited compared to what a professional real interface would look like for a real system. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. Okay. Let's not get into that particular discussion. On the API, I do know that indeed, it's been something that has been on the table for a while. But it has also been deprioritized, including by you, saying that this team didn't need to produce when there were other ways to do it more simple outside of this. But anyway, Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you very much. And I agree whether the 750 millisecond is the right thing, or even if you need enter, is not really relevant to this. However, understanding the data and trying to understand to what extent the real need is for registration data compared to what the system is being able to deliver, I think is a relevant issue. I'm still somewhat confused by the metric 10. And I'll give you two specific examples. We got an email saying the number of false lookups due to pauses is quite small. I think it's at 5%. I don't remember the exact number. But that means in the August report, the total number of number 10 is 1600, which is far, far in excess of everything. Even if you look at the number of successes, that is, domain names, which map to a registrar and exist, it's still 400, which is way, way in excess of the number of requests made, which I think was 160 or something. So I think there's still a lot of fuzziness of trying to understand how what people are typing into the first screen of the requests results in such a small number of ultimate data requests afterwards, and understanding why two thirds of them are seemingly disappearing before you hit submit for the overall request, I think is an important issue to understand here. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. And then I'm not quite sure if we have the answer, I assume and Lisa, correct me, I assume that the difference between people that type a name that is a valid name, and then don't proceed with their request, either because it is essentially faced with the form, they realize that they don't have the information that is needed, or because they whatever, they choose not to go forward, too complicated, whatever it is. Because we don't have any particular stats afterwards until the actual request is sent. We don't have any stats as to where people might be abandoning the process. And I don't know that we should.

LISA CARTER: So yes, so the searches are separate, obviously from the request, right? Like we're never going to really know why someone abandoned if they actually typed a fully formatted domain name that was for participating registrar and still did not submit. We wouldn't know why they ended up not submitting. If they've typed a fully formed domain name, and the registrar is not participating, then it's likely that they could have used the form to download and submit externally to the registrar that's not participating, which I think one of my old accounts mentioned that they did get a form and they liked that. But otherwise, there's really no way to know because the system itself is really looking at what happens after the request is made, and not spending a lot of time on delving into the random things people could use to type in the search box. If it's not a fully formed domain name, there's lots of kind of things people could do that we have no control over. Metric 10 itself, I think the only thing within those metrics that really could give any indication of demand is the registrar not supported, right? Because that was obviously a fully formed domain name that got typed in. And then it turns out the registrar is not participating in the pilot. Everything else is some version of this is gobbledygook, or the domain doesn't exist, or it wasn't properly formed as it was entered, etc. So I think really, only that registrar not supported is what you could look at for any type of real demand in terms of searches.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you. Alan, I see your hand back up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. And Lisa's answer is exactly the issue that I'm raising. According to the statistic, 25.96% of the 1,635, that's something over 400, were fully formed domain names that were found, and the registrar is participating. Yet there were only 164 disclosure requests. I think we need to understand why people are dropping out. Maybe it's the poor interface, but maybe it's something else. And since we're talking about two thirds of them dropping out, we're not going to find out from the statistics. Lisa's right. But whether we use surveys or focus groups or whatever, somewhere along the way, we need to understand why this system, perhaps the interface, but it might be the overall functionality of the system, is causing such a large percentage to drop out after they've already determined the domain name exists and the registrar is participating. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Sorry, Alan, can you just explain your correlation between the search and the registrar? I don't think I understood what you're trying to say.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, of this 1,600 searches, 25% is above 400. And yet the requests that are, and I don't have it in front of me, Alan said the requests that are 160 something. Between the 400 successful searches and the 164 requests, there's two thirds, as Alan said, there's two thirds of users or, sorry, that ran a search and do not push request.

LISA CARTER: Gotcha. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And indeed, Alan, those are not people we're going to be able to survey or I wouldn't know where to find them. They haven't pressed send on the request. I don't even know, they're not identified. There's no data that is recorded for them in terms of who they are or what email address they might receive a survey at or anything like that. So, unless we run some kind of a controlled set of users and capture just by looking at them doing it, capture the fact that they might not finish their request, I don't quite know how we would identify these individuals to ask them why.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know either. But I think the number is so startling that I think we need to look at talking to some of our semi-captive users and try to understand this. We may not get an answer, but I think it's a core question. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. An interesting question for sure. Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you, Marc Anderson. I raised my hand because this is a conversation we've had previously, and John McElwaine shared with us a use case when we discussed this previously, and he's also typed that into chat. John shared with us on a previous call that in his case, he will use the tool to do a lookup and then based on the results of that, he will reach out to his client and determine next steps. Hopefully I've got the gist of that right. We did have that discussion. I know John shared with us his particular use case, and I certainly wouldn't expect every single successful lookup to result in a disclosure request. You know, there would undoubtedly be some drop-off between the two, and I don't know what we have to compare it to that would be similar what would be a normal amount of drop-off and what would not, but I just wanted to raise my hand and note that I do expect some amount of drop-off and remind everybody of the use case that John shared with us and put into chat as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, and yeah, thank you for noting that, Marc. I must admit that I had forgotten that conversation. But good point, John, and it doesn't really answer the question, it doesn't give us much information as to how much of that use case is an answer to what we're looking for, but at least, yeah, it's a good reason and a credible reason. I agree with you, Marc, we don't need to map one for one between the searches and the actual request, but I can understand Alan's concern when two-thirds of them disappear somewhere in the world. Steve DelBianco, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Sebastien, and pursuant to Alan's question, on previous calls, I've suggested that we do outbound phone surveys with known participants, requester side. There was some pushback that that would be really expensive, so I don't seek to cause ICANN to spend more money on this than is worthwhile, but are there other means by which we could interview requesters who've registered and been active so that we can understand in a back-and-forth conversation, it takes 15 minutes, it's anecdotal, it is not statistically significant, I get all that, but don't we need to understand a little bit better? We have a small population, and if I did the interviews, I'm afraid someone on the call wouldn't trust my interpretations and questions, so it needs to be somewhat objective, perhaps staff, perhaps no more than 10 15-minute interviews over the course of the next couple of weeks with known requesters who've got significant activity. Just to ask them, tell me about your use pattern. Why do you sometimes get in and abandon it? Try to figure out whether their habits have changed over time, what is their objective, what do they do when the registrar is not participating, and they might explain that they pursue other means. We can only learn more as a result of trying to allocate roughly two days of staff time to do these outbound calls, and I'd like to put that on the table as a suggestion. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, Steve, I note support in the chat for your suggestion. Obviously, we don't, as the standing committee, we don't get to see that list of requesters, and I have no idea—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Which is why I suggested staff do it, Sebastien, staff does know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Exactly. Exactly. So that really puts the ball in your court, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, we can take that back, Sebastien. I can't say whether or not we have the resources to actually do that, but I will take it back to the team and get back to you. That potentially might be something you want to.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Lisa, this is Steve. I was suggesting that folks like you would be able to be in the best position to have a knowledgeable conversation, and so when you say you don't have resources, that might mean that you don't have the time, they don't have, ICANN is not going to free you up to do that, but I'm really only talking about a day or two of time, but I think you'd be perfect at it.

LISA CARTER: Thanks, Steve. We'll discuss it internally and kind of get back to you with that. Potentially, if that's something you guys are asking for as a request, maybe we could document that and the thoughts you had on what that needed to be in our impressions document as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So can I, as a first step, and I don't need to have their names, but to ensure that you could define a target audience, maybe looking at the data, whoever looks at the data, to try to identify maybe three to five top users, recurrent users, if they do exist, and see then what we do as a next step, but try to identify how many people could be part of that for that panel.

LISA CARTER: I will also just say that because that requires using people's personal data, that's definitely something we would have to come talk through with, on our side about, because now you're going into people's PII and you're reaching out to them without their consent to reach out to them, et cetera. So it's definitely something to consider as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If that becomes a barrier, may I suggest that we modify the code so that you ask a user, would you be willing to do a 15 minute phone call with ICANN staff, and if they say yes, we'll treat that as consent for PII access.

LISA CARTER: Yeah. Thanks for noting that, Steve.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And as John notes, it is okay to do that in the US, apparently. I'll have to trust you on that, John. Okay. Does that close the current discussion on topic 10? I think that, if I remember right, Gabe had questions on it last time he was on the call, but I don't think they joined us this time. So we'll close it for now, unless I see any hands coming in the next few seconds.

We can go to the second topic of the RDRS usage metrics report and talk about the cadence of publishing those reports. And so in my discussions with staff, with Lisa specifically, the question of the frequency at which we're publishing those reports was raised. And this question comes predominantly from a staffing issue. These reports take a huge amount of time to produce, a huge amount of time to produce each month. And whilst staff, and I'll let you explain that in detail, Lisa, whilst staff was suggesting to continue publishing an individual monthly report, there was wanting to know if we would be willing to look at doing that quarterly instead of monthly. So every quarter we would publish, staff would produce, and then we would publish the report for the last three months. I'll let you explain maybe from your point of view, Lisa, and before I share what I already shared at my point of view. Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Sounds good. Thanks, Sebastien. So we were kind of talking about this in the interest internally of efficiencies in that publishing every quarter would kind of be in a more efficient way to kind of get the data out there and it reduces the cadence and speed at which all these monthly reports get published on ICANN.org. That's not to say that, for example, if the standing committee would still like to see something that we couldn't internally kind of give the standing committee the CSV to look at. But in terms of publishing on the website, it would be changing the cadence of publishing those reports to the website itself. And so we just kind of wanted to get feedback and kind of a sense of what you guys think on maybe changing that cadence, etc. So, yeah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah, I don't personally look at the reports for very long but I do sure look at them every month. And I know that other registrars do as well. So certainly before this decision is made, I would want to take it back to the stakeholder group and discuss it. And for that I would need—like maybe you could just send an email with the reasoning because that would make it easier for me to make sure I'm capturing that information correctly. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: And if you had the CSV of the summary, would that be sufficient? Like if the standing committee is getting the CSV of the summary on a regular basis but the report is not published itself with all the charts, etc. Would that help?

SARAH WYLD: It sure might. It sure might help. It sort of depends on, I mean, I'm much more likely to look at a report with a chart than to look at a CSV and find it easy to interpret. So, again, I would just want to take it back to the stakeholder group to discuss it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it strikes me that all of this information could be put into an Excel spreadsheet, essentially just cut and paste the data from the CSV and it can show you charts. They wouldn't be pretty as they are in a published document and formatted, but I would think that the charts could be presented pretty well automatically just by putting the data into the spreadsheet. Almost all of those charts are standard things in Excel. I haven't thought is through, but it sounds like one could do that. It's not a published pretty report, but it would show you all of the same pretty well the same information that we see in the report. Just a thought.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Marc, I see your hand up.

MARC ANDERSON: Hi, it's Marc Anderson. I'm trying to wrap my head around this request. I'm trying to think of what it means, what it'll mean for us comparing the first, what are we at, eight or so reports or eight-ish reports in, I think. And then for the remainder of our time, the staff asked would be to switch to quarterly so we'd have eight reports monthly, and then we have, I guess, five-ish or five quarterly reports to round out the two-year pilot period. I'm not quite able to wrap my head around what that means as far as comparing the first eight months with the remainder of the pilot period. I'm sure there's a way to compare apples to apples, but that's a concern I have in my head. And then the other thought I have is Lisa, you said this takes a tremendous amount of staff time and effort to put together the reports. And I don't want to waste anybody's time if it's taken an unreasonable amount of time, but I think it would help maybe if you quantify that a little bit. You know, how many staff hours are we talking to put together the report? And that would give an idea of just how cumbersome this is and what kind of resource savings we're talking about. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, I just wanted to say, as far as the reference on comparing data, if there were monthly reports and then a subset of quarterly reports, there would still be the CSV that could have each of the months of the whole two-year period within it, so that the data could actually be compared easily in that way in terms of being dumped into other tools, et cetera. So there would still be an avenue or a way to actually look at each month's data, even though the reports themselves might be quarterly, right? You'd still have sort of a CSV that had all the different months individually.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So essentially, and this is a distinction from the conversation that we had that last week, Lisa, I didn't understand that bit, but essentially, we would continue having a monthly CSV. What you suggested, Alan, to have that in Excel, she actually was discussed too, and I think that staff is eventually preparing that, so to have that CSV data in one document, one column per month, I assume. And so we'd be able to see the evolution of that data over time. But then withholding the, between quotes, the pretty document, the PDF with the text explanation, with the graphs that go with it, and that only for a quarterly application.

My initial instinct when I heard this was to say, well, we should at least finish what we're doing in terms of monthly report for the first year, complete the first year, and then maybe change the cadence after that first year, after ICANN in November. This said, again, I hadn't understood that that meant only for the PDF. If the CSV is available monthly, I personally, it's mainly the CSV that I look at. I have to be honest, I look at the numbers more than the PDF. But if the CSV is available for my own personal use, it does make a huge difference. But I can understand that others prefer reading it in the PDF and have the full graphs and everything goes with it. So maybe something that we park for the time being, we can talk about this again, before ICANN, the week, if possible, I'd like for us to continue doing what we're doing, at least until the first year is completed. Does that make sense to the group? I see no answers. So that must be great. Yeah. Thank you, Marc. Okay. Okay. Again, Lisa, Marc's questions is still valid. If it is crippling for the team, please do share how much time you spent on it and how much time it would free your team if we were to lift a foot on it. But again, the whole exercise here is to gather that data. If we stop publishing it or slow down the publication dramatically, I just want to make sure that we continue having the tools we need to be able to draft that report.

LISA CARTER: Absolutely, absolutely. And I can check on the number of hours taken to get everything prepared and get back to the Standing Committee on that with the number.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you very much. So, we've gone through over half an hour of our call. Let's move on next to the next round of RDRS enhancements. And we've gone through the habit of starting from the requestor side because it was the first of the two tabs, but we're going to shift it this time and start with the registrar side. I understand, Sarah, that you had one or two points that you wanted to talk about. Items 2 and 18, if we can open the Impressions document and look at it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Items 2 and 18 on the registrars tab, correct?

SARAH WYLD: Yeah. I was hoping to see it on the screen, too, because I have dodgy internet here. Are we able to have it on the screen?

LISA CARTER: Is Feodora on the call? Feodora, can you actually show the chart? They're perfect. Okay. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. This is Sarah. Just a general comment on the sheet. I will say I find it easier to understand the status of different items compared to the document, so that's an improvement, but I do still have a strong frustration when, as was earlier today, I don't have full control over the ability to filter the sheet. And that means that when somebody else applies filters, then I can't see everything, and then I lose track of what I'm seeing and not seeing. And so I really would appreciate if we could consider just allowing the members of this standing committee to have full control over the sheet. And if somebody changes somebody else's input or something, that would be inappropriate, and I'm sure that nobody on this group would do so intentionally. I'm so sorry. There's very loud construction noise. I just have to close my window because I cannot hear myself.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That's all right. I had motorbikes in the background a second ago. So there's two sides to your question. First of all, I don't know about the filtering, and Feodora or Lisa might be able to enlighten on this. There were fields, the dropdown fields, that we wanted to limit just to make sure that, yeah, the priorities are not changed willy-nilly. That people even just by playing with it are not changing priorities that have been agreed upon. The filtering, I'm not sure at all why it would be blocked for you and others, but to be frank, I haven't played with the filters myself.

SARAH WYLD: I think it has to do with protecting the cells. And so it might just be that the functionality of one precludes the other, and we have to decide what's appropriate.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. That makes sense. The other question, and this is also for staff to confirm, is this limited to us, or is this one of those sheets that anybody can access from outside?

LISA CARTER: Maybe Feodora can speak to that because I think Caitlin and Feodora created the actual document originally, and I think there were people that came into this document because it was public to everyone to add some of those items that no one has claimed. But then also to Sarah's point, the filter that was happening, which you couldn't see originally, was on the status to hide the things that had been completed. So I took that off. But we can handle this however, I think. If we don't want it to be open to everyone anymore, and it needs to be restricted to just any committee, that could also make it a little easier to manage and make it more comfortable to open up all the sales, etc. So I don't know, Feodora, if you want to chime in on that.

FEODORA HAMZA: So in terms of access, thank you, Lisa, everybody who has the link can access it indeed. That's why we have restricted the certain columns. But we were, as in the original impressions document, there were externals who edited, so we wanted to give that opportunity as well. So only who has the link can access it. So it also depends on who has shared the link further than the standing committee or whatever. So that's the current status. But we can see if we can change it if that's what everybody agrees on.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sarah, what are your thoughts here, since you're the one that wanted to have the flexibility? I would assume that beyond the standing committee, we don't need to share this link widely. And if indeed we can limit it to us, then to open up the rights, we can trust each other to do the right thing. Sarah, I see your hand up and then Alvin going in and out.

SARAH WYLD: Yeah, thank you. This is Sarah. It is certainly possible to make it so that the standing committee members can edit the document and other people can view it without editing. I know in some other ICANN groups, they collect the Google emails for everybody so they can make sure to add the right one. And so I lightly apologize because although this is a topic that is important to me, I think it's not why this was on the agenda. And so if you wanted me to speak to the specific items that are, I think it was 2 and 18, I can do so when we're ready. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, and I will ask you in a second. I see Alan, Lisa, and then maybe indeed we can close and go to the actual agenda. And Steve, you had your hand up for a minute and took it down. So if you want to...

STEVE DELBIANCO: When Sarah gets finished explaining number two, I have a question about number two.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, okay. Then we'll do that then. Alan and then Lisa.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Just to note, anyone who has the link has editing privileges, we can all change the content. We just can't filter and sort. So it makes no sense to me. I mean, I can erase whole areas, whole sections, but we can't change the sort order. So something is a little bit messed up. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So yeah, the idea would then be limiting it to this group, but allow—

ALAN GREENBERG: But right now I can go, if you go to line eight, just up one.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please don't. No, no, I agree with you. You can empty a cell, absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine. I was just going to erase one letter and put it back, but everyone has full... Anyone with the link, not just this group, has full editing privileges right now.

LISA CARTER: All I was going to say was possibly consider changing the status for anyone with the link and view, and then maybe do something for the specific people on this call that can actually do the editing. And as long as everybody's on the same page, I think it's fine. So whatever you guys want to do, I'm good with.

ALAN GREENBERG: But the way it is right now, it doesn't make any sense at all.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. So I guess we'll shift to limiting it to the participants in this group, and then open widely. I see comments also about the fact that it can quickly get messy, I guess. If we allow people to do more things with the sheet, we might need to also keep versions from time to time to get back to if things get a bit too messy. Now, Sarah, can you please walk us through item number two?

SARAH WYLD: Yes, happy to. Thank you. Sorry that I cannot recall if we had previously discussed this in a meeting. So the concern here is that sometimes the requester selects a category and the registrar believes that it should fall under a different category. For example, they might select law enforcement, perhaps in order to be able to request confidentiality, or perhaps because they believe that it relates to a legal situation. And instead, they should have chosen IP lawyer or consumer protection with it. I can't remember what the category is called. So the proposal is that the registrar who receives the request should be allowed to change the category. And so I know that there's some other text here about creating a way to report abuse or a process to take action. Those are being discussed separately. And the specific request here in bold is to allow registrars to recategorize requests. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER: Yes, so I just wanted to indicate that for this request Sarah's asking about and taking it back to the team, the idea would be to allow the registrar to do currently what they do currently for priority, which is change an expedite to a standard with that functionality would be similar to this. So they could change request type from law enforcement to researcher or whatever it is. But I think on the side for priority changes, you can only change it one time. So I just kind of wanted to throw that out there is if we're mimicking that functionality, which would be kind of, I think, easier thing to do because it already exists, but that's how the prioritization change functionality exists.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't see Sarah immediately responding. So I'll give the hand to Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Sebastien. What Sarah's getting at seems to be saying that a registrar can determine from the nature of the request and the information provided that it's a malicious, it's abusive. It's not just a mistake, Sarah, you're attributing bad intentions and not just a casual mistake where you want to recharacterize. Because in the registrar's request number two, it talks about categorizing it as abuse, sort of intentional mischaracterization where they pretend to be law enforcement, for example. And I remember from the meeting we had in Kigali, we discussed a few examples that that you brought up at our little round table. And a couple of them, it's possible that they said law enforcement because they thought they were helping to enforce some particular law. I doubt it, though. But it's difficult to attribute a mischaracterization of law enforcement as an intentional form of abuse. If you feel highly confident that you can do that and would trigger action, we have to determine whether staff would take an action, and it would be enforcement staff, not the staff supporting the RDRS. And I would also guess that we would want to preserve their requesters' original characterization, as well as preserving your override to say, I don't really know what they are, but they're not law enforcement, and I consider this abuse. Did I catch that right, Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Okay, thank you. Hi. So, thank you. I think that we could or should or can separate the question of intent from the effect of the categorization. And that's what I was trying to get at when I described the issue a few minutes ago, and apparently was not effective. But the request here in this moment, number two, really is to just allow registrars to recategorize requests and set aside the question of abuse or intent or how that's going to be handled. And so what I did not want to do was remove from the document the previous discussion and what I had initially included in the request. Initially, when this came to me from other registrars, what I heard was a lot of concern about intentional miscategorization for whatever reason, and the desire to be able to report that and take action. But even if we can report it and take action, it doesn't solve the issue that the request is in the wrong category. So I think it would be helpful. Like, yes, I see it says that in the box. I see. It's difficult for me to create a new row when things are filtered like how they were. And so I didn't want to cause confusion by removing information that would take away context from previous discussions. I would like to request the ability for registrars to recategorize requests and set aside the question of abuse and the reason why the request might be in the wrong category as a separate issue. I hope that helps. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: And to make it clear, because, Steve, you mentioned that, from what I understand from Lisa, that recategorization would be a change of the data. So we're not keeping a record of what the requester says that he or she is and what the registrar feels that that requester is. We're keeping that information only once and the requester gives their version and then the registrar corrects it. Is that right, Lisa?

LISA CARTER: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's not the only way to do it. I mean, you could add a field where there's an override.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It is not the only way to do it, but that's how Lisa suggested to do it.

LISA CARTER: Yeah, so the idea was to kind of mimic the way it works for changing the priority, Steve. So currently when the registrar changes the priority, if the user submitted it as expedited and the registrar says, nope, this is not categorized as expedited, I'm changing it to standard, what you will see in the priority metric in the monthly report is that if it was originally recorded as expedited, that tick box or that number one that's adding to, oh, this is how many expedited goes from expedited to standard. Right. So it reduces the number of expedited and increases the number of standard. And there's no sort of historical information that shows you this used to be expedited. And now it got changed. It literally just wipes it out in one field, adds it to the other. And that's what shows up in the metric. So it would happen similarly for this request that Sarah's talking about. Unless there's some other explicit requirements or requests that are being made on this, which originally there were not. So that's all.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Does that clarify the problem or does it bring more complexity in the answer? I wanted to note also, because you referred to it, Steve, in those discussions in Kigali, I think that there was also a bit of confusion. And John McElwaine, I'm going to take you as an example, but when an IP lawyer uses this system on behalf of one of their clients, do they need to appear as the IP lawyer? Do they need to appear as the rights holder? There were some discussions there, too, on how these were qualified. It's less dramatic than saying that one is law enforcement. But there was also some differences there. I don't want to belabor this more. Lisa, do you have the answers you want? Sarah, do you have the topics? Do you feel comfortable with how things have been shared?

SARAH WYLD: If we can confirm that we'll move forward with this request, then that would be comfortable. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Yes, that's the thing I was going to say, too, Sarah. Just to confirm that the standing committee is like, yes, move forward with at least the portion of the request that is related to allowing the registrar to make the change. And then I can bring that back to the team internally and we can start doing whatever is needed to prepare.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So, committee, we confirmed that we're ready to go with this, but understanding that we're then overriding information given by the requester. I see no issue. No hands raised. I think that we're good to go. Can we go to then item 18? Still in the impressions document. We're going to have to move a bit faster than this.

SARAH WYLD: This one's really quick, so it should be okay. Feodora, we need item 18, not row 18, so if you keep scrolling down, please. There we go. 18. Okay, so here's the thing. When a user completes a case, it leaves them on that request screen, which is surprising at how slow that makes things. If it could instead just go back to the actual screen of requests upon completing a case, that would bring a surprising amount of efficiencies to the registrar who are processing requests. So, I see it says low level of effort for ICANN, and presumably I didn't put that in. If we can make that a higher priority, it would be really, really helpful. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: So, I do have a question on that, Sarah. So, just speaking internally with the team, the reason they originally were leaving the registrar on that page, I think, was so the registrar could sort of clock the request that they had actually responded to, etc. If we move them back to the request list, they can default to moving them back to what's pending, but then if they need to see anything that happened with the request they finished, they're going to have to search for it and remember the ID for it, etc., on their own. So, I just did want to make that clarification that you're losing a little bit of something with the request to send someone to the pending list for the next request without taking note of what they just finished or that they might need to understand what that number is for whatever other reason.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you, Lisa. I think that was expected and worth it. I see we only have two minutes left. Is it possible that I could take a moment now to describe my AOB item? Because I don't think we would have time to get through whatever the last agenda thing was anyways.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, I was going to suggest that, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD: Amazing. Thank you. So, I've had a request from a registrar saying that it would be really useful to be able to see the public RDDS response within the RDRS, like alongside their request. Show, what is the public WHOIS? And so, I actually put this on the sheet while we were talking if you want to scroll down just a little bit. So, like right now, a domain could have a privacy or proxy, or it could have real public data, and the registrar doesn't always actually look it up to see what's public as part of the review. And so, sometimes the requester gets a response saying, yeah, we've disclosed the data, but it turns out to be the same as they already had access to, and then they're not happy. And so, if the public data were displayed, it would make it easier. And maybe, maybe that would also be useful to requesters. This is why I wanted to raise it. Would they find that useful? Okay, thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, I see a hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: [inaudible] appreciation and approval for what Sarah's just raised. This is just beginning to grapple with the actual utility and reality of the system as opposed to the more low level stuff that we've spent most of our time on. The big question that we're going to face is what should, what's needed to make decisions going forward, and the kind of requests that Sarah's just raised is touching much closer to the core of what we really need to know. Thank you very much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm very sorry, my connection is very unstable right now and I did not hear what you said, Steve, but I guess everybody else did. I'll have to pick it up on the recording. And I see other plus ones in the chat. I will send an email to the group about two new tabs that we've that have asked staff to add. One on feedback of the final report you can look at it. We'd like to start collecting ideas for the final report. This is early days. We have time for this. But Sarah, you mentioned that in a previous call, the fact that you thought that we could start pivoting towards that and that's why we added here to information. And the next one is on outreach tracker. We had a discussion last time about ICANN organizing outreach activity and not referring back to the to the standing committee and I was a bit surprised that these things should happen. I would want the standing committee to be a lot more involved in these. And one of the corollary to that is also to be able to track whatever outreach you might be doing on your end outside of ICANN just to make sure that we get visibility and we can we can see what is done and what still needs to be done. With this, we're two minutes over time and I would like to give you the rest of your day back. Thank you very much all and we'll be in touch in two weeks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]