
JULIE BISLAND:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, July 29, 2024.

For today's call, we have apologies from Marc Anderson. Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. All right, if assistance is needed updating your SOI, please e-mail the GNSO secretariat. Members and alternates will be promoted to panelist. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat only and have listen-only audio. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call.

Please remember to state your name before speaking. And as a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thank you and over to Sebastien Ducos. Please begin, Seb.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Hello, everybody, and welcome back to a few faces that have been missing two weeks ago. I had a bit of time off. Before we start, I just wanted to give you a bit of an update. For those that were missing, a month ago, we discussed a letter that I was going to send to Greg, and there was some discussion and pushback, etc. I did promise to have that letter amended for this time but I haven't been had any time to get back to it. I'm very sorry. This project from hell that has completely taken my

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

time and I haven't gone back to it, but it's not forgotten. And I am hopeful. Normally, the updated deadline for this project is tomorrow, so I should have my life back after tomorrow afternoon. Yeah, it's a different project. It's not us. It's not this, but it's taken my life. But anyway, I'll get to it. Apologies again for not having this done.

With this said, last time we spoke, the metrics had just been published but we didn't get to them. So I thought that this time, we would start with this. And then we will go back to the Impressions document. As we did two weeks ago, we were basically reviewing all the points. We still have a number of points that do not have owners. As of now this week, things that don't have owners, we won't look at. I hope that people can find in their heart to take stuff up if they're interested by what's in the list. But if nobody takes it, then we're not going to chase it.

You will have received this week a document—I think it was Caitlin that sent it—with a reminder on how we wanted to progress with this Impressions document. The ownership is one point and the fact that we're asking the owners to keep track of it and going back to it before each call, making sure that things are up to date, etc., is important. We continue having dedicated—well, not dedicated—but resources, the ICANN side, able to help us and help to develop, etc. But we need to be more consistent with the way we run our affairs to make sure that we're not wasting their time, too. But we'll see this in the second half of the call.

Unless there are other items that needed to be added to the schedule, but I see nobody with hands raised, I think that we should go to the—is it Metrics Report? This was received more than two weeks ago. If

somebody can open it. I guess, Feadora, you're the one that has the hand. Fantastic. I'll open the mic for anybody that had comments or questions about it. I believe that, Lisa, you also have maybe some things, some questions about it for us. So, any questions from the group on the metrics that you should have received? Sorry, I don't have the date in front of me. But this is 15 July? Maybe if you browse through it quickly, it'll wake memories, comments. Lisa, I see your hand up. Sorry, but I don't have that. Everybody's faces are on top of the screen, I see hands up but this time I don't. But I see your hand up in the attendance list. So go ahead.

LISA CARTER:

Yes, sure. I was just going to point out that this particular report does have the original update requested by Gabe to metric 10, which was to add detail on the count for—if you want to go ahead and scroll down there, that's probably helpful to everyone. So for all of those categories—domain not found, domain not supported, registrars supported, success—there's now not only this pie chart with the percentages, but there's a bar chart that shows the month by month numbers for the lookup, and then below that is a grid that kind of breaks down the count by type. So if you scroll down a little bit more, Feadora, keep going, keep going, keep going, keep going, keep going. Right there. Stop. So that's the count by month for each type listed. So that should be a little more helpful in terms of numbers. And then we added at the bottom percentage of total also. There's a plan to do this same sort of grid for metric 8. That's not in this report but we should have that in the next report as well. So I just wanted to put that out there while people are reviewing. Go ahead, Steve, I'll let you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Lisa. On the new metric 10 table, very helpful. Naturally, what we'd love to look at as a trend in the percentage that were successful, the percentage that were for each type. It's possible then for us to derive that. In other words, the percentage line you have in the last row of the table, can those percentages be displayed next to the integers in each column? Can the percentages be displayed next to the integers in each column?

LISA CARTER: So you're saying add a column between the ones that show with the percentage going vertically down by month?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Everything except that doesn't have to be a column. It could be, for instance, the very first cell, 98, space, space, 16%.

LISA CARTER: Gotcha.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It doesn't have to be a new column, which makes it a little more unwieldy with spacing. That would be phenomenally useful, because then we can observe looking down that column. Because the numerals, the integers alone, while they might be going up and down, what really matters is how they factor in the percentage of the total number of

responses, the requests that you had that week, that month. Makes sense? Anyone else have a comment on that? Thank you.

LISA CARTER:

With that same question, Steve, for metric 8, I'm assuming you'd want something similar, because we were going to do a similar chart with the percentages and the integers as well. So you'd probably want some—

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Metric 8 is more challenging, Lisa, because the columns keep increasing as you add more months. So there it would have to probably be under the number and not beside it. You would run out of space, I think. It will be a separate table too. It could be a separate table.

LISA CARTER:

Gotcha. So just for purposes of kind of thinking about the report going forward, we were talking internally about how we start displaying data as it grows over time over a year, etc. Right now it all fits. Potentially, what we may have to do is keep the grids but turn pages horizontally so that it can expand wider so everyone can see it. That way, we don't have to truncate data, for example, talk of like condensing past data into quarters instead of displaying it all. But I think for the sake of clarity, it might be more helpful to leave everything and just turn the page and we can see all the data at once.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would say that on metric 8, a column to the right of total, on metric 8, the column to the right of total would be helpful in percentages, rounded to the nearest whole number. You never need decimal places for these. So, 8%, 4%. The reason I say that is I don't think looking at the small numbers in the table, they're very tiny numbers, and I don't think a percentage would be all that significant, as you look at the months, scrolling up. So maybe no percentages needed on 8, just on the total. That would be my thought. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: That's what we envisioned as well for what we're working on. So that's what you'll get, actually. I don't know who's next. Maybe, Seb, you can.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I think I see Steve Crocker. If it's presented to me in the order their hands were raised, I have Steve Crocker first.

STEVE CROCKER: Thanks very much. Getting back to the metric 10 discussion briefly, can you put that up there again? Thank you. Yeah, that table. Thank you. So Steve DelBianco is suggesting adding percentages in there, and so it caused me to think about this a bit. I'm not certain about this, so this is more for discussion. The percentages will tell you the proportions of domain not found versus domain not supported. That's what you want, right? And you get to see how they carry over time by looking, if you have all those added to each cell, then you can scan down and you could see how that can shift around.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Precisely.

STEVE CROCKER: Now, what's not clear to me is what is driving those numbers one way or the other. In some sense, the numbers that would be of most interest from my point of view are just the success column. So for the people who actually are getting service out of this, what's happening with those numbers? So I've scanned down and looked at those, and I see it ranges from 159 November and fluctuates. It goes up, and then it sort of leveled off the last couple of months. And I don't know what to make out of all of that. But to me, that dynamic is of interest by itself, irrespective. This is my point, irrespective of all the people who are not satisfied for one reason or another. I can see that both kinds of analysis, what the percentages are, across these four categories, versus what the trends are, particularly in success, but maybe in the others. I guess getting along the same line, I would expect that there'd be a learning curve which would drive down the numbers in the first three columns, in the not found, domain not supported, and registrars not supported. So I'm a little surprised that those haven't tailed off. But I don't know what to make out of it. It's not enough to give me a picture underneath all of this of what's driving it, what people are learning, and so forth. We don't have any way of reaching out or at least we're not trying very hard to reach out and understand what the behavior is of the users that is resulting in these numbers. That's the thoughts that were coming to mind from this attempt to try to analyze this table a little more thoroughly. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. Gabriel, you're next in line.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: I'll go very fast. First, thank you to Lisa and the team for doing that update. I really do appreciate the fact that we get better clarity on the types of TLDs that were input. Secondly, I thought that you raised a very good point about how this analysis goes forward, that you're eventually going to have up to like 24 months of data, it's not going to fit very well. Even if you flip the page, it occurs to me, if you're doing horizontal, you still might run out of room. And so I just want to suggest and respectfully ask that if you should ever find that you're not able to get all of it into a single page, if you could just make sure that there's a link included right next to the table, that of the data that you can present, that you're linking to the full set, so that an interested party can easily go back and find it. I think that would really satisfy my needs for the most part. I hope that that wouldn't be too hard to do from a technical point of view. But I'm very, very grateful. I think that's a good point to consider for future proofing.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. I see a thumbs up. I don't know exactly where they came from, but I saw one at least. I raised my hand to recognize myself for a second. To your point, Steve Crocker, I agree with Steve DelBianco and I saw Sarah also, the percentage would be interesting, that I don't quite know indeed what we would be looking for. I agree with you, Steve Crocker. I think that, hopefully, we would see the domain not found and

domain not supported, and going down because people know better and are able to use this tool better. The registrars not supported going down because more registrars participate. Then the success, I assume, is the rest. So those that actually go and are able to send a request. Obviously, it's not a success on the result of the request but on the capacity to send the request. So yeah, I don't know exactly what the percentage will tell. But it's always good to have.

The other observation I have—and I'm sorry, I didn't pay attention to this before—but just for continuity, I think that if we have those table, we should have this table in the same direction. So if 8 and 10, even though they represent completely different data, but if they are over time, maybe we should have over time developing as a series of lines and not one table with time extends in columns, and the other one time extends in line. I don't know that it's particularly helpful at reading. But yeah, those were my two comments.

I don't see any hands. Thank you, Steve DelBianco. Ones are hard. I don't see any other hands. Was there any other discussion needed on this data? I don't think so. We might have but we weren't going to wait for the owner of that topic who's Farzaneh. She's going to come up to the call a bit later. We wanted also, as a last piece of that data discussion, discuss how to represent the data on jurisdiction. We'll discuss that afterwards, I guess. But there was that one last item because it looks like it's going to be the last piece, the last type of data is going to be added to this report. Steve Crocker, I see a hand up.

STEVE CROCKER: Quickly, this data could be subjected to additional analysis rather than making a request to do it, and then having the staff decide. Can this data be made available in downloadable CSV files?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, I believe that all the data there is also a CSV file. I don't know if it's immediately available or if there's a month of lag. But we discussed that. I see Lisa's hand up. One of the ideas also is to have, before we celebrate the first year on this, a capacity to have all the data that was reported monthly in CSV in a single CSV with all the months. But maybe, Lisa, you'll explain it better.

LISA CARTER: It's my understanding that the CSV portion of it, first of all, is manual. So someone manually does that every month. And that's sort of what we have. We don't have currently a metric by metric CSV.

STEVE CROCKER: How do you create the tables if you don't have CSV files to start with?

LISA CARTER: Manually created each month.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm not sure I know what that means exactly. And I suspect if I did, I wouldn't want to know.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Steve, actually, maybe there's a point that needs to be made. There is no such thing as a do my report but there is somebody that spends time crunching the data, picking up from the live data, and then compiles it. So presumably puts that person in an Excel sheet, and then into the PDF. But the process itself, there's not a series of queries that go through that database and generate a report for any given month in seconds.

LISA CARTER: Correct.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, as I said, I don't want to know the answer. But I'm having trouble understanding the data must be there in some fashion that is automated, and you must get it out in some automated form. And whether or not it matches the format here is, I guess, a separate question. Let me just tell you what I had in mind when I'm asked the question. Looking at this data, as I focused on earlier, I said, "Okay, so how are these numbers changing over time?" When I look at this, I see, gee, the totals sort of peaked up in December, January, and now they're leveled off and they're in the nominally in the 1500 range, more or less level, for the last few months. And then we have the breakdown into those four things.

So here's an interesting little exercise kind of as a game in a way. If we look at say the last three months—April, May, and June—and take each

of those four columns and try to predict using that three-month span, what would be likely to come out in July? Just make a prediction based upon that using very simple extension of that data. Then when we actually get the data in July, sort of look at that, and see to what extent that prediction held or didn't held, none of this is very deeply meaningful. But at the end of the day, with all this discussion about how to format it and how to make it look pretty and understandable, so we finished all of that, the bigger questions are, what does it all mean? And what do we learn from all of that? That's kind of where my attention is. Is 1500 a month spread this way? Suppose that persists? Suppose that is the persistent data for this, what did we learn out of this whole experiment? If we finished two years of collecting data, you get these numbers, and then what are we going to say? What is the Council going to say? What is the Board going to say? And what more particularly is the community going to say about what we've learned from this experiment? And how does it fit in making plans going forward? End of speech. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thanks, Steve. I'm not here to draft any conclusions. But the first thing that comes to mind to me is not so much the 1500 but the roughly 400 that we get per month of success. So the number of queries that actually match a registrar and an existing domain name, so having removed all the errors, that is a number that is to me doesn't represent the whole population of queries that make it to registrars, but is well within the field of what was expected, in the sense that when talking to different registrars, they were talking about hundreds of queries a year since GDPR that they were receiving. Now, this is all registrar

accumulated. So obviously, the total number should be a bit bigger if all the queries went through all the registrars through our system. But again, it's the hundreds rather than millions. I think that's already at a pretty significant number. Because again, in the overall SSAD, the big question that what is there in terms of cost, because the cost worked for transaction, but were based on a system that first needed to be built, and then divided by the number of transactions that we're going to see, that already is a significant piece of information, in my own view. I see Steve DelBianco's hand up.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me just respond quickly. Just speaking personally, I look at this versus what existed before GDPR. And my reaction is this just does not compute. The underlying demand, if you will, from what people would want, I'd be very, very surprised if you could actually validate that this represents a legitimate representation of what that demand is. If I were sitting on the Board, I would tell you "Throw this data out, start over. This just simply does not..."

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Steve, I think everyone will also agree that the overwhelming events that you're describing would also depend for GDPR to disappear.

STEVE CROCKER:

No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. I take GDPR as well intentioned and appropriate. That's not where I'm going at all, Sebastien. There is a huge gap in my mind between what's going on

here versus trying to really understand what the legitimate, lawful purpose, properly administered, properly controlled access to nonpublic data that still preserves privacy and avoids harassment and all of that. So that's not where I was going at all. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. Steve DelBianco, I see your hand up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sebastien, it caught me when you suggested whether we can use this 30% and the demand we're measuring as some indicator or prediction of demand of an SSAD. I agree with the point Steve Crocker just articulated. But even so, you've got to significantly ramp up the demand of a system where there would be no domain not supported. In other words, if CCs were in there, there would be no registrar not supported. Because under an SSAD, all registrars would be required to participate. Now, I realize none of them would be required to disclose, which was one of the reasons an SSAD had very limited value from the beginning. But in measuring the demand here, we have trained our requesters not to bother if what they're after is a domain that's in a CC or a domain that's supported by a nonparticipating registrar. So we are training them to reduce the number of requests they make. We are hoping to entice new requesters into the pool, knowing that they might have a very narrow universe. That's actually not working. Well, it's too soon to say whether we're increasing the number of requests from those who participated in prior months and/or are we inviting new requesters. There's some other metrics in here that can help with that. But I firmly

believe that any attempts to extrapolate for SSAD have to take into account the required participation of all registrars and the potential participation of CCs and that will change the demand significantly. It may not make it sufficient to justify building a system that has no obligation to disclose. But it does mean that the data cannot be easily extrapolated. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: All understood. Again, if we look at those three columns, the not supported, because it's either a CC or a gTLD that does not participate, same thing for the registrars, we're talking about hundreds again. It's hundreds and hundreds and hundreds. So all in all, we'll have 1500 or 3000 requests, or even if it's by a factor of four, even if it's 6 or 10,000 requests, it's still not [inaudible] million requests.

STEVE DELBIANCO: No. Listen, I don't think it's going to be half a million. But here's the thing is that we've trained people not to bother if it's a CC or a registrar that's not participating. So the numbers that are in here are not reflective of the demand if requesters had a better appreciation that more was in there. So we've trained people not to bother, so you can't say it's only going to be hundreds.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Anyway, this is why we're running this for two years and not deciding tonight with the results. Yeah, I'm happy to hear that if there is more demand then. That in any way since the very beginning, since then

we fully agreed that this would only be a sliver of the traffic that we could expect in a CD and we wanted to look at it under another light, it doesn't matter. So the old points are well taken.

Sarah, I see your hand up. Then I think I saw also a message from Farzaneh. So maybe we can then pivot to the discussion about the jurisdiction. But first, Sarah. And, Farzaneh, if you want to raise your hand up, I'll put you in the queue. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. I have a couple of thoughts on the topic of what volume specifically should be included for consideration. First up, ccTLDs are out of scope for the SSAD. They're not part of what's going to be included in an SSAD. I understand that there's a lot of desire to include them here. I'm not super clear on why. I don't think we should be considering ccTLDs. So separate from that, we can look at the volume that has gone through. And I do think that we can legitimately extrapolate for how many domains there are in the world, right? We know that there's somewhere around more than 50% of domains under management with the registrars who have participated in this project. So say, just for example, that we have half of the domains in the world gTLDs that exist. So here we know we've had a total of just under 1600 requests in an eight-month period, even if we're doubling that—okay, so 1600 divided by eight is 200. So that gives us 200 requests a month. Even if we had 400 requests a month, that's still a huge dollar amount per request if our total cost for the SSAD is 14 million. So I really do think that this is the information that we need and I think this is the context that everybody else is going to require for this project.

In terms of the question I see in chat about why ccTLDs—ICANN governs gTLDs. Sure, a ccTLD can decide to participate. Maybe that’s really good for everybody but it’s not the point of what we’re doing here. The point of what we’re doing is trying to create some kind of workable system that lets people request disclosure for gTLD data. That’s what we should be focusing on is the pilot to measure the demand. So we have to have a workable system to let people make requests and I think we have that. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Sarah. Alan Greenberg, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess I’d like to make a comment on the ccTLD issue. The SSAD and this group, we’re a product, essentially, of the GNSO. And clearly, ccTLDs are not the mandate of the GNSO. But at some point, we or somebody has to look at ICANN in general, and ccTLDs are within the realm of ICANN. We can’t mandate or force a ccTLD to participate. But if there is indeed a demand—and clearly this table indicates that there is a demand for finding out information about ccTLD registrations—then somebody has to look at the overall ICANN environment and requirements, not only the gTLDs. And maybe that’s not us. But if it’s not us, then someone else needs to do it. And that seems also wrong. So I think somehow we have to navigate with the support of either the ccNSO or the ICANN Board. But I think somehow we have to navigate into looking at overall requirements at ICANN and not simply the GNSO because that’s where we came from originally. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. I saw Lisa raising a hand as soon as you said ICANN. Lisa, go ahead.

LISA CARTER: That was coincidental, Seb. I just wanted to point out—I think we had a discussion in a previous Standing Committee call about ccTLDs and what percentage of the domains not supported numbers were ccTLDs. We went back and took a look overall at sort of the number of ccTLD requests and they accounted for roughly 8% of all the searches that were the unsupported searches in the system. I think Gabe also has an ask to add a metric for ccTLDs to this metric as a number separate from the rest. That’s still kind of in discussion on formatting and how that would work. But overall, the percentage was on the lower side for what was being searched that was a legitimate ccTLD. There are people just entering dot two-letter characters that were not as well as part of their “ccTLD search,” I will say. I just wanted to put that out there.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sorry, can you repeat that? If I enter a domain name in a TLD that doesn’t exist at all, that is a two-letter code that is not a ccTLD that exists, is that in the domain not found or domain not supported?

LISA CARTER: It should appear in domain not found because it doesn’t exist even though it’s in the correct format. But when we were searching to see what were the two letter entries that took place to give you that 8%

number, we just kind of pulled everything together and then filtered out all the nonsense not found ones and just looked at the legitimate ccTLDs to get that 8% number.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, okay. Good. Now, I see Alan's hand up. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a follow-on. If the ccTLDs are only 8% or some number like that, then in looking at June, who are the rest of the 689? Because the totals do add up to 1579 so they don't overlap. So what are the other reasons that domains are not supported if it's not the registrar is not supported or it's a ccTLD? They can't all be [edges].

LISA CARTER: So the domains not supported are for the ccTLDs, the .mil, the .arpa, the .int, all of those, as well in that category. As well as if someone incorrectly enters—I don't think Simon's on the call so I don't want to misspeak about it—but if the proper format is not included, a domain not found comes up if the proper format is entered, right? Second level, first level, etc., with the proper dot. If somebody just enters a string, and there's no dot, that actually falls into the not supported as well, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess my response is 689 is about 40% of the total. If ccTLDs are only some small fraction of that, then either there's an awful lot of dot

agencies and dot gov's that people are asking questions about, or if your last statement is accurate, then there's an awful lot of people entering things that don't look like domain names, and that's either problematic or a problem with the system. So I guess I'd like to understand more. Thank you. It's not going to happen today, I guess.

LISA CARTER: Yeah. Thanks. Understandable. From what I've seen so far, there are a lot of people just entering random things, not in the right format, etc. So that does account for some of the number for sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: And those don't get rejected by the system.

LISA CARTER: They get the message thrown that you see for these columns. So it would get the not supported message, if it doesn't have the right format, the not found message has the right format but it doesn't exist as a domain name in the system. So there's sort of a different way to parse the information depending on how the person enters what it is, what they're seeking. And people I think are just still pounding on the system to some degree to see what happens.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Lisa, can I suggest this—and the group will stop me if I'm talking out of turn here—but I don't know who it is, if Simon or somebody else that looks at this data, but can we agree to have them on the call next time

to maybe go a bit more. Because this is really the second or third call that we're spending time talking about this? There's obviously interested in better understanding what it is. And it's a completely different story. Indeed, if it's ccTLDs you're saying low numbers, if it's high numbers of .edu and .int, etc., maybe then we need to better explain what is acceptable. Or if it's just garbage that is sent out as and there's not much that we can do. I think that there is interest in better understanding this. And rather than have you having to second guess what's going on, let's get the people that know better on the call? And still understanding that we won't be able to look at the data ourselves but having somebody that can demystify is better.

LISA CARTER: Yes. With the agenda item maybe, and then we can make sure Simon comes on the call, that'd be great. Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That would be fantastic. Thank you. With this said, I see your hand, Farzaneh. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Hi. Thank you, Sebastien. I just wanted to discuss the reporting on jurisdiction. Is it okay to discuss it?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It's a perfect time to do it. What I don't see on those tabs is maybe your e-mail, if somebody could pull that up so we can go through the

questions. Otherwise, just go ahead, Farzaneh. You probably have the e-mail. We can follow your own questions.

LISA CARTER:

For the background, the questions in the original e-mail were actually questions I typed in the cell in the Impressions document, and then Farzaneh was trying to reply individually to each of those questions in e-mail. So original questions are actually in the Impressions document.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Basically, this is about, if you remember, we requested that law enforcement location be indicated in the reports. We discussed with Gabriel and the group agreed that something like that, that we can require the location of law enforcement request to be reported on the form when they submit a request. But there are some implementation questions that Lisa had and I think that should be discussed with the group.

One question is can you clarify the distinction between per country and per economy? RDRS is only capturing country information for the requester and country information for where the data will be processed. The user can select multiple countries for where the data will be processed. So the reason we have per economy there is that when we were discussing this with NCSG, our members from Taiwan mentioned that we also want Taiwan to be included and the Taiwanese law enforcement to be able to put the country's name there. And sometimes the lists that we use do not have Taiwan in the form. So that's why we said per country and per economy. And this might all

apply to other territories. So this is why we have per economy there, essentially.

LISA CARTER:

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you for clarifying that, Farzaneh. The drop-down list for when the requester has provided their address is a two-character list, and .tw is actually in there. I do believe the technical team did take into consideration economies, not just countries, so that should be in the drop-down.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Okay, great. So that's good. So that's done, I guess. Okay. So the second question was what sort of new metric for a requester country you wouldn't want to be displayed? Does the metric only need to show requester country if the request category is law enforcement, or is there some other way? How would you like to slice that data? I only slice watermelon these days so I don't know. So basically, what I got from your question is do we want to also report on other stakeholders, other requesters' location? Was that one of the questions? Because if that is one of the questions, then yes, the group agreed that that would be useful data to report on and included—

LISA CARTER:

So, basically, we would have to report on the country requester by request category because there's no other sort of selection of how to merge that data together. So the person would enter their information in the required data field, then they're selecting a request category. So

if we showed country by request category, numbers that would probably give you sort of what you're looking for. So then you could see when someone says it's a law enforcement request category, then you would see the country, the quantity, listed that selected that number plus the countries they were from.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay. So talking about had we want the data to be displayed?

LISA CARTER: Yes.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yes. Okay. Well, I see Sarah's hand is up. Sarah, do you want to comment?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I would like to comment on this, yes. So now that we have requesters, all of them being required to provide a location, I personally do not see a reason not to report on it across all request types. Indeed, for myself, really, what I'm looking at is the total volume because that's what I think is the most important. But once we're reporting on this anyways, we may as well be thorough and why not include all different request types instead of limiting it to only law enforcement requests? Thank you.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay, wonderful. Thank you. So we clarified that. Gabriel's hand is up. Gabriel, do you want to?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Yeah. I just want to say that I also don't object to having that for all types. And to Sarah's point about measuring volume, I think that would actually be really helpful in measuring the volume of our marketing efforts in getting awareness out to different constituencies. Because if we see, for example, requests come in from only English speaking countries or similar, that might really inform our outreach efforts in the future, and I think that that would be really, really helpful for that purpose.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Great. So we sorted that one, too. The last question is also for the jurisdiction request. Given the requester can select multiple countries where the data will be processed, do you want to see only data for law enforcement requester category? We decided that nope, we want to see more. So do we want to see multiple jurisdictions, like report on multiple jurisdictions?

LISA CARTER: To clarify, first of all, everybody, not just law enforcement, that has provided data on where the data will be processed, right? It's not just law enforcement. So that's not specific to only law enforcement. When you select the jurisdiction where the data can be processed, you can select more than one, right? So, potentially not one request can be

processed in multiple jurisdictions, etc., depending on the request category. And so the question kind of relates to what your thinking is in terms of seeing that information, given that one request can have multiple jurisdictions and every request type has to actually indicate the jurisdiction where the data will be processed, not just law enforcement.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Yeah. I think the more data we actually display and report on, the better. Sarah, your hand is up.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. I think if our reporting is to be accurate to the information provided by the requesters, then if they indicate that the data will be processed in multiple jurisdictions, we should see both of those places on the report. So, for example, if I get data disclosed to me that will be processed both in Canada and Germany, then both Canada and Germany should be reported that month, which might lead to seeing more jurisdictions for processing than we have number of requests, and that is okay, right? We just need to explain that to the reader. But it sounds to me that that is the most accurate way of representing the information. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Great. Thank you so much. My responses were along those lines. I will let the chair to announce consensus. But, Lisa, I hope you got your answers. Thank you.

LISA CARTER: Yes. And if those could actually please just be documented in the document, that would be great, just so we're all clear. And everybody's kind of on the same page, that would be really great, because then it's easier for me to translate that over to the engineers to discuss how to put it together.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, I will document those.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I don't know that I need to formalize the great consensus that we have. But indeed, if you can put it in the list, that would be fantastic.

I see the clock ticking and we have just over 10 minutes left. I don't know that it's worth going through the Impressions document in details. Unless there's one urgent point that Lisa wanted some answers on. Then maybe what we can do is to go through the Impressions document again quickly. Marc, it's still mainly on the requester slide. Without going into details, but there's still a number of items which we will leave in there, but if they do not have owners are not going to be treated. We identified last time one that could actually exist, and a few others that was sort of repetition in two other topics that did have owners. So it's not the end of the world if that topic is not kept. But there are other topics that still don't have that.

Again, there was an e-mail that was sent last week to the group by Caitlin, I believe, recapping what we expect you guys to do with this document, and the fact that we want the information and we need the

information to be able to work with it. Again, given the clock—there’s background here—I don’t think that we have time to go through it this week. But I really insist we will be looking only at those items that have an owner. Was there anything else on this, maybe Lisa or Caitlin, that I’m missing? Apart from the fact that people should be reading that e-mail and acting upon it?

LISA CARTER:

From my end, I just will note that on some of these, I actually did go in, add additional update or comments. So, for example, on item number seven on the requesters, for Gabe, I sent you an e-mail about setting up a meeting to discuss your additional comment from July 1. It’s for item seven. Please scroll down. Yeah. So we’re waiting to kind of discuss that. There’s an e-mail to you to give some date and times. I also have a note to Sarah about discussing her stuff. And then a couple of other clarifying questions. So my comments are all in there if people want to go look at their things and make comments back, that would be great. Other than that, I don’t have anything specific in addition for today.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Okay. I saw also a question from Gabriel regarding a request that was made to GoDaddy in particular, to add a link to the WHOIS response, pointing back to RDRS to try to make sure that we would funnel as much traffic to the RDRS as possible. I see that Roger is on the call maybe to answer for the registrar side. For the registry side, I did have these discussions with the technicians. It sadly collided with the midwinter holidays in Australia. A lot of this happens for the registry side in

Australia. The gentleman responsible for that was on leave for the month, and so I need to pick it up with him again. There wasn't outright pushback, but there were a lot of explanations on what we do already to make sure that that is funneled. And I'm not quite sure that it's enough. I think that we may need to extend the explanation again. There is indeed in the registry WHOIS response, there is a test at the bottom where we could explain that and we could add a line towards that. But I do not yet report a win at least on the registry side, but I haven't given up on it. Roger, did you have more to say about the registrar side?

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Actually, no, I didn't even know this was on here. I didn't see this. So I would have to look into it. Sorry about that.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: It wasn't on the agenda. It was a question I just picked up from Gabe in the chat.

ROGER CARNEY: Oh, okay.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So maybe for next time, for next meeting.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: Would you like me just to very briefly explain that for his benefit?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure, go ahead.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: The thought here is just to try to with the very same voice where you're telling a requester that that is being redacted to use that same voice to also tell them where they can locate or where they can put in a request to receive that redacted data. And it's been my experience as a requester talking to many and trying to raise awareness with the requester constituencies, but there's really only one mechanism available to us that is capable of reaching all requesters, and that is the data that's returned by existing WHOIS systems that have been used for decades already. And so if in the very same breath that you're saying redacted for data, there's a line in red that says, "Hey, if you have lawful reasons for obtaining this data, you can go to RDRS at icann.org." That would actually be the very best marketing and awareness raising that is possible for us to do to raise awareness for RDRS, in my humble opinion. So I've been seeking voluntary cooperation with anyone in position to explore whether or not that's feasible to make that happen. Because I note from Lisa's point prior in chat that to do any sort of action on that in a compulsory level would require policymaking that I don't think any of us have appetite for at present. But your help in exploring whether or not this is possible at a voluntary level will be greatly appreciated, especially as it informs our thoughts on SSAD in the future. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see Sarah's hand up. But just before that, just to clarify, Gabriel. The only thing that we or at least the registry side, what we understood is that it wouldn't be the response on a line per line. So the same messages repeated on a number of each item that has actually been obfuscated. And it would certainly not be there just a question of the way these things were. The response will be given at the text at the bottom, which is not quite as good marketing as having in the middle. But that wouldn't be possible, at least on the registry outright.

GABRIEL ANDREWS: That's a good point and that's very fair. And I think you understand the goal of trying to make it as close as possible to that same place, but understanding technical limitations, and I think that's entirely fair comments.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks. Sarah, I see your hand up.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I know we only have a couple of minutes left. I have sort of an AOB item, which I just didn't think to suggest before the call. My apologies. This is something I've been thinking about for a little while now. Today's call really brought it up and actually it's along similar lines to something that Steve Crocker said earlier in the call. What are we learning here? When do we start compiling the responses that we need to send back to the Council with our four questions for the assignment? Because we already have eight months worth of recording data. The

timeline for this project is a maximum of two years and I know how long sometimes it takes us to write a letter or come to an agreement on an outcome. So it feels like we should get started really soon on being more formal about answering those questions. I really enjoy these meetings, I think it's a useful work for the community. I'm not sure that it does need to continue running for two years. Maybe what we're seeing is some stability in the volume of requests. So maybe that stability means that this information is already informative. I don't know. We should think about it. But yeah, when are we going to start that? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Can I switch to an excellent plug here? Can I suggest a slightly different tack here? So there is the data that we're collecting from the usage. There is a piece of data that I feel is missing or not doing well enough yet. It's the data that we could be collecting from the post request questionnaires that we sent. I believe that this is something that we should be working on a bit better. I don't know that, first of all, that the response levels that we're getting are sufficient enough. We should maybe find better ways to get those survey responses back. I'm not entirely sure that all the questions, exactly 2%. I'm not entirely sure that all the questions or the way the survey is set is the right way to do that. So I'm all for looking at this data and if there's anything that we can draw from it. But I think that we might be shortchanging ourselves from not using or not having a tool there on the service side that is efficient enough. So I would maybe suggest to have a look at those surveys, see if they're set up the way they should be, see what could be done to get a better percentage of response there, if any, and make sure that we're

not missing also that view of the exercise that we're going through. With this, we are pretty much on a half hour. If there is nothing else—go ahead, Lisa.

LISA CARTER:

One thing I did want to mention is that for the survey that goes out to requesters after the results are provided, there have been updates made to that language, both in the subject line and the text to highlight the need for feedback on RDRS, because the current e-mail does not indicate anything about there being a survey link inside that e-mail. So hopefully visibility in the subject line will help people understand “Please go inside the e-mail, click the link, take the survey.” So that’s one thing.

The other thing is that we are actually talking internally about reviewing those questions for both registrars and requesters to understand if we’re asking the right question, if they need to change, etc., order of questions. So happy to talk with you guys further, if there’s a small subset of the group that wants to kind of be in a discussion about what that might look like, happy to set something up for that as well. I just wanted to put that out there.

And then for registrars, because only the people that actually process the requests get a survey, that number is always going to be on the smaller side, unlike requesters which goes to everybody who makes request. So, just those things. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you. So you heard it first. If anybody's interested in surveys and making the service better, please raise your hand or contact Lisa, myself, and we'll try to organize something there with the experts. With that said, thank you very much. We will be talking again in two weeks. Again, go back to the Impressions documents, recognize your own in there, make sure that your points are updated and up to date so that we can work on them. We can have ICANN work on them and get everything moving forward. Thank you very much and talk to you all soon.

JULIE BISLAND:

Thank you, Sebastien. This meeting has concluded. Everyone, have a good rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]