

---

**ICANN Transcription**

**RDRS Standing Committee**

**Monday, 22 January 2024 at 17:30 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/4AYEQ>

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

DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RDRS Standing Committee call taking place on Monday, 22 January, 2024. 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. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat. Observers are welcome and will be able to view chat-only and have listen-only audio.

Members and alternates will be promoted to panelists. All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. 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 Sebastian, please begin.

---

*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.*

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Devan, and good day, everybody. Good evening here in Europe, early evening, 6:30. And well, good morning and good afternoon to everybody else. So we are convening now, I think officially it's our second standing committee, but really the first one where we're going to start doing the work that we envision for ourselves for the next two years and discussing the usage of the RDRS. And to that extent, you will all have seen and received and reviewed the first set of stats that was published by ICANN last week.

Diana sent an email to everybody, but it was published today, maybe a day or two before on the ICANN site, in any case, early enough to have made an appearance in Domain Insight with an article from Kevin Murphy about it, who gave his impressions before we had time to give ours. But that's all good. I read that as being at least that there is interest and eyeballs on this, which is just good and important.

So maybe, and I'm not quite sure who on staff would want to take that task, but sorry, maybe we can open the report. And if somebody who's close to it on staff side, I see Yuko, I see Diana, I'm not quite sure who else might want, is there a hand up already? Eleeza, Eleeza, I see your hand up. Maybe to walk us through that first exercise and before we get into the discussion, Eleeza, go ahead.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hello, Seb. Thank you. And hi, everyone. This is Eleeza Agopian from ICANN. So I am very pleased to join you. I think I know most, if not all of you. I wanted to share that I'm actually going to be taking over as your liaison for the standing committee for the time being. Yuko and Diana, who have been leading this project for us since its inception, are moving into new roles within the organization, specifically focused on next round, because that takes up some of the oxygen in the room these days.

So I really wish them well, and it's a wonderful opportunity for them, and it's certainly great for the next round team, but of course leaves me with big shoes to fill. So I just wanted to share that they'll be transitioning into their new roles over the coming weeks, I should say. But in the meantime, I'm here, I've worked very closely with them on this project. I'm very familiar with it. So I'm happy to join you until such time that I am able to fill their roles on my team.

But for today, because Yuko and Diana in particular have been so instrumental in the project and in the formation of this report, I'm actually going to ask them to give you a little bit of an overview on it. I think Diana will emphasize this too, but obviously this is just one month and a few days' worth of data. So it's early days yet, as I think even Kevin noted in his Domain and Site article, but we're really interested to get your feedback and your impressions. And of course, we have webinars scheduled for this week, so we're very much interested to hear the community's impressions in those. I think the first one is tomorrow afternoon Pacific time, which would be late in Europe Wednesday in Asia, and then another one on Thursday.

---

I also understand that the Standing Committee doesn't have a meeting scheduled in Puerto Rico, but I just wanted to share that I will be there for anybody who else will be, and I'm happy to meet with anyone at that time. So with that long introduction, I'm going to turn it over actually to Diana, I think to walk us through the report. I know I'm sure you've all read it. I think she's happy to give you an overview or if there are specific questions you have, just let us know what you prefer. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Eleeza, if you don't mind, Diana, just one second, because I see Steve Crocker's hand up and Steve, if you want to make a comment now, otherwise we would let Diana go through the report if you have comments for after. I'll let you...

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I'll wait for Diana. My comments were on the report, the format and presentation of it, so this is probably better.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. So Diana, it's all yours.

DIANA MIDDLETON: Thank you, everyone. I just want to go over a few kind of basic information, factual information about the report, and then I'm going to highlight a few specific metrics that might be a little confusing and then I'm going to open it up for questions. Starting off, I wanted to note that this report is going to be published on a

---

monthly basis and it's based on the system usage data that was requested by this team and the council. This particular reporting period is from 28 November, the official launch date to the end of December, but future reports obviously will just cover the previous month only and all these reports will be published on the RDRS webpage. And then I wanted to note that this report is broken down into various sections. First, we have a brief introduction and then we have a table that has a summary of all the data that was requested, which is a total of 16 metrics that are broken down even more.

Further down in the report, we have chart representation of those 16 metrics and we've divided the data by user data, request type data, request transactional data, and outcome data and as a request from the community, we also added at the end a list of the participating registrars. Some notable data points that we wanted to highlight from this report, we had a total of over 1,400 requesters, a total as of the reporting period, 72 participating registrars, 53% of the gTLD domains covered. We had 219 requests submitted and 886 domain lookups resulted in non-participating registrars. And then the top three requester categories are IP holder, security researcher, and other. On that 886 lookups, I wanted to note that we've received almost over 4,000 total lookups overall, so it's important to clarify that, that means that a user plugged in a domain name and either discovered that the registrar was participating and didn't take further action, or just to submit a request related to that domain.

And now I want to kind of highlight some specific metrics. If you could go to metric nine in the report, thank you. I wanted to

---

explain this histogram because it might be confusing to some folks as it was really confusing to me at first. But this chart displays the number of requests since system launch by requester. So as you can see on the left side of the chart, if you can, I know it's kind of small for some. The y-axis, we have a number of requesters, and on the bottom of the chart or the x-axis, we have the number of requests. So reading the chart as is for the reporting period, we can see that 156 requesters submitted between one and two unique requests. And then looking at the second chart column, 16 different requesters submitted between two and three unique requests. And then five requesters submitted between three and four and so on. So I hope that's helpful in kind of understanding this metric. And then as we gather more data over time, it will be useful to see where the growing groups of users who submit only a few requests at a time versus those in greater numbers.

And then moving to metric 13, I wanted to show, thank you for moving the slides, that out of 219 requests submitted during this reporting period, 128 total were closed out. Now closed out means that the registrar took an action to mark that request as complete in the system and either approved, denied, or took another action as represented in this chart. So as you can see, 14% of those requests were approved or partially approved, 6% were closed due to data being publicly available, and the remaining 80% were denied. But I want to dig deeper into that 80% because that's likely a number that kind of set off a few alarm bells.

If you can move to metric 14. So as you can see here, the denial reasons most commonly used also include incomplete

---

information, other corrective action is needed, and an other category. And that's -- in the other category, we have found that the most common reasons here, because this is an open text field that we don't share in the report because we don't want to put any PII that might be in there, but the most common reasons that we found here were that there were test cases that needed to be voided, there was misuse of the service such as UDRP cases, domain registration, technical support, compliance requests, and even data subject removal requests.

So like Eleeza said, I'd like to reiterate, this is only five weeks of data, and we'll be keeping an eye on these figures, and also we'll be working internally to figure out how to better educate the users of the system. Because from this point, we've only been seeing what the RDRS is used for, I think we need to focus also on what it is not meant to be used for. So those were the main data points that we wanted to highlight and kind of cover from the get go, but I'm happy to walk through any others that this group might be interested in talking about or asking questions about. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Diana. And Steve, I'll invite you to make your comment, and then I'll put myself in the queue, and I see that others have joined. So Steve Crocker to start with.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much, and thank you, Diana, that's very helpful. I studied the report and scrolled down a handful of comments, so I've got five points that are fairly specific for you. First of all, on

---

the metric nine that you showed, maybe you want to scroll back to that a little bit. I'm guessing that those columns are actually exact, as you said, between one and two requests, the 156 people. I suspect that that's really a formatting issue about the x-axis, and I'm guessing that 156 requesters submitted exactly one request and that 16 requesters submitted exactly two and so forth.

So that might be a detail that you want to go and ask about, and maybe the formatting of this could be cleaned up a little bit for that. So that's one point. The report has, in its early part, a summary of the data from pages three through whatever to three through six. It took me a second to realize what was going on, because it looked like a lot of duplication, and then I realized there's the year to date, or from beginning of time total, and then this period.

Now, since this is the first period, those numbers were obviously the same, but what would be more helpful would be to present those pairs of numbers side by side with each other instead of separated in time. So just to be very specific, for example, if I look at 8.1 through 8.11 are the current reporting period, and then 8.12 through 8.22 are the current period -- sorry, those are the current period, and the earlier ones are the total. In the future, a more helpful way to present this would be to put those numbers next to each other. So two columns or an extra column, if you will, one for current period and one for total. That will cut down the size of the report and put the numbers in a more useful format.

Looking a little further, I tried to check whether or not the breakdowns were accounted for everything, and I couldn't quite get all the totals to match up. I could give some examples, but in

---



---

the interest of time, I won't, but I'll be happy to tell you which ones I was looking at, so that would be helpful. Those are the ones that are straightforward with respect to formatting and presentation.

Two other comments. In the listening to others in a couple of different forms share their experience, one of the sharp feedbacks that I heard was that people who were trying to test the system by asking for information about their own domain got kicked out because, this is publicly available or you can get it yourself, that's actually -- we don't have any trouble understanding that response, but just think it is really the wrong idea completely. The very first thing anybody does in testing a tool is to see if it works the way you expect it to work. That's at a different level from the formatting of this report. That's a feedback on the initiation of making the system available.

Separate but along sort of similar lines, some of the responses that people are getting back, including what I got back when I tried it, were just completely unhelpful in terms of explaining why I got denied and why I was turned down. This is not a problem that the ICANN staff can do anything about directly because the response is coming back from the registrar, but it is a very big problem with respect to the overall use of the system. Those are the quick responses that I can provide. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Steve. Now, if I may, I'll recognize myself since I raised my hand. Same as Steve, I went through the report and took a few notes down. I have to say that that first table is the one that we're on now. It's not like I found it confusing, but it was a bit

---

difficult to read. I think that Steve's suggestion to have two columns, the current month and the total cumulate, will help greatly. I don't have any other major suggestion beyond that, but that would already make it a lot more readable.

One thing that I did note, and maybe you can give me a bit more explanation about this, but in amongst the responses for not approving a request, some of the information was lacking information. Some of the response there was that the request was lacking information. Presumably, the lack of information enters, or at least that's how I worked it out when I discussed that internally. That enters us into some kind of a conversation between the requester and the registrar that I understand happens outside of this.

I wasn't quite understanding how we chase further information to be able to make a decision on agreeing or denying, but yet the request is closed here. If there was any possibility, I don't know if you have that as a copy to give, but I would love to understand, if only because it feels to me like then we need to give better instructions to the respondent side.

The other thing that raised a bit of a question on my end is how we tally requests that are made one month and possibly answered the next, anything that goes from one report to the next. I think it's important and interesting also to understand that. I know that we can't track how long it takes for a response to come, as we've agreed that registrars come later, like a week or two later, and start filling all the responses all at once in the system. But it would be interesting to make sure that we don't have requests that lay there over several reports.

---

---

We discussed also the subject of non-participating registrars, and there was long discussions about what we can do to incentivize them without pestering them, without making sure that at the very least they know this exists, and that they're aware that requests are coming their way. If they tell us that they don't want to play, that's fine, we don't have to bother them beyond that, but making at least sure that they know.

I don't expect to have names of non-participating registrars in the report, I think that's good, but is there anything that ICANN, is doing to reach out to these registrars for which we are witnessing demand, but that are not participating? Is this something that is being done with the registrar stakeholder group? Anything there would help, and I see Yuko's hand already there, but I'll continue with my questions and maybe you can answer after.

That was also part of the metric 14. I understand, Diana, your point of not sharing the others, because indeed it could have PII, but at some point, if we witness a type of response that is not in the dropdown and warrants an other, but that is recurrent, obviously we would want to add that to the dropdown to make sure that we can capture that in a richer way.

This goes also to the comment that Steve made, and Steve, your comment was received last time, picked up, and clearly as we were one of the registrars, GoDaddy was one of the registrars that you tested with your own domain names, there was a bit of head scratching as to how we could do this better. The giving clearer information as to why this is denied is taken on board. I don't know exactly what the solution is, but there was some looking into

---

it, and I think that this should be also part of the guide for respondents.

I don't know that this -- I agree with you, Steve, that the default try that people are going to do, testing their own names, I don't know, and I agree also with my registrar colleagues when they say that this is not an exercise in tire kicking and this is not a tool for it, and sharing personal information from an account holder. There's other means to do that and understand why the answer is there, but we should have an answer that is both clear, polite, and explained fully why this is denied and why this is, again, not a tire kicking exercise, but I also fully understand that the default way of testing it is to do it with a domain that is yours and for which the answer.

With this, I'll just yield here. Maybe we'll go to Steve DelBianco and Paul McGrady, and then maybe I can answer a first set of questions there, and then we'll go back to the group. Steve DelBianco, it's your turn.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Sebastian. I had two things I wanted to bring up, and the first is the notion of non-participating registrars, and I echo your encouragement for ICANN staff to notify non-participating registrars that requests are coming in for them. And that they should understand that while their names are not being disclosed as part of this, their names and the domains are being retained by ICANN, and when I encouraged ICANN to do that, and I'm grateful that you are.

---

I encourage you to retain that so that it could be used to not only encourage registrars who are being requested to participate. But that later on we could ask you to perform some analyses on the registrars most frequently having requests, non-participating registrars, and trying to learn more about where we should focus policy as well as focusing encouragement for voluntary participation. I fully concur, and I do hope that staff will be able to act on that now rather than waiting until the end.

My other point is that starting on page 9 of the report, we characterize this section of metrics as request type data, request type data, and the first one you have in there isn't really a request type as much as the priority level. That's what metric 7 is, a priority level, and I get that, and then metric 8 is the request or type. It isn't the request type. So when one reads this report, there's a conflation between the nature of a request and the identity -- the category in which the requestor entity finds themselves.

So when I looked at the screens, the sample screens, because I don't use the system, not being somebody who does the requests, it looks as if the disclosure requests are by requestor type as it indicates on the screen, and that is a description about the entity who's making the request. That isn't a description of the issue that drives them to want to request the data. That is what's known on the screen as issue description, and I'll just ask staff to confirm that issue description is typed in by the requestor in a free form text field right before they submit.

To my recollection, they don't pick that from a drop down. So we have no place in this report where we discuss what was the issue

---

that they were requesting the data for. We talk about whether it was urgent or not, and we characterize by the entity itself, the requestor type, but we do not compile any data on the issue descriptions. That is to say the nature of the issue, which I would think of as the mirror image as reason for denial. Reason for denial are statistically analyzed, and I appreciate that, but we don't have a similar analysis with the reason for the request, which is known as the issue description.

If that's still free form, I would hope that there could be analysis performed to determine whether there's a tight correlation, that every time an IP holder does a request, they were 31%. Were they all exactly the same, or were there important differences between the reason given for an IP holder to do a request, the reason given for other, which is in this case our second or third largest category. So I'm interested to know what staff is learning about the issue description fields as to whether they can be categorized and analyzed, and I had a me too point with Sebastian on reaching out to registrars who are not participating, 80% of the requests so far. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve. Paul McGrady. Go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Sebastian. So I have a question, and I think I know the answer to it, but I want to ask it anyways, and then I wanted to give some feedback to what I'm hearing on the ground from various users of this. The first question is, when the registrars are

---

responding on things that relate to where there's privacy proxy information, what radial button is being pressed for that? In other words, how is it being handled? It's not being treated as a no, but rather as the response is publicly available, is that what registrars are doing? I just kind of want to understand how privacy proxy, when that's the response, is that how registrars responding? And I'm hoping that staff can chat about that to make sure I understand it correctly. And then I have some feedback for staff.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. I had said originally asking staff to answer as the list was growing. Did you want to add something, Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY: I'm sorry. So if we're not allowed to ask staff that question, maybe they can answer it later. I apologize. I didn't mean to step out of turn. Let me give the rest of my feedback then, and then maybe staff can answer that question when it's appropriate.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Maybe.

PAUL MCGRADY: So that's my question. And then the feedback I'm getting is there's some folks who are surprised that the RDRS does not provide more information than WHOIS did back in the day. So for example, I think some of them are surprised that they're getting privacy proxy data back. And I've been trying to do some

---

education on that. But I think we probably need to do some education on that, that the PPSAI work, which was stalled for years, is a different stream than this, and this was never meant to resolve that issue.

The other feedback I'm getting is that the majority of requests from folks and the chart, metric 10, seems to back this up, but people are telling me the majority of the requests that they are submitting are for registrars that are not participating. And I'm glad that we are capturing participating versus non-participating, because I think that's a very important piece of information, but that's consistent with what I'm hearing. There's some frustration about that, of course.

The other feedback I'm getting is that in both of the categories, when something's denied, the other category doesn't often convey what that otherness is in the denial, and that the more information needed doesn't convey what the more information needed is for the requester to provide information. Again, I know that we're limited on what we can ask registrars that are participating to do, but hopefully as this evolves, registrars, when they do need more information, will tell the requesters what that is so the requesters can try again, and if there is an other, it might be nice to know what other means in that context. So that's the feedback I'm getting from folks on the ground who are actively using this thing. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Paul. So as Yuko took her hand out and then put it back in, I think I'll let Mark, we'll follow the queue as is on the screen.



---

So Marc Anderson, Alan Greenberg, and then Yuko, you'll have a lot of time to answer questions. Marc, go ahead.

MARC ANDERSON:

Hi, everybody. Marc Anderson for the transcript, and thank you, staff, for the presentation. I'm afraid I don't have a lot new to add. I'm going to echo what my colleagues have said so far, really. The first thing maybe, and I noted this on chat, I also had a little bit of trouble getting some of the columns to add up. I'm not convinced it's a problem with the report and not a problem with my math. I suspect maybe it might have something to do with the fact that there's a little bit of overlap between November and December in the report, and that might be confusing things a little. So I asked Steve to submit his list to the list so I could compare it against mine, but I also had trouble. Some of the numbers just didn't seem to add up for me.

And the other thing I really wanted to raise my hand for is talking about something Steve DelBianco and Paul McGrady both just talked about is the big disparity between participating and non-participating registrars. With registrars signed up representing 53% of domains under management, I did not expect quite so extreme a difference between a number of requests for participating registrars versus non-participating registrars. I appreciate that this is just one month of data, and I don't want to draw too many conclusions from one month of data or a little over one month of data. But if that trend continues, I think as a group we're very much going to need to drill down on that more, understand why there's such a big discrepancy and what can be done about it.

---

I think I want to ask staff for more data on this metric 10, understanding points about we're not necessarily looking for specific names of registrars, but that I think we need to, if we're understanding the effectiveness of this system and what can be done as far as next steps. This is really the metric that jumped out at me, and we need to drill down on this more and understand that more and what can be done from a next steps perspective. So that's all I'll highlight. Again, there's some interesting things in here, and I don't want to jump to too many conclusions after one month of data, but I did want to highlight that one in particular. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. Alain Greenberg, it's all yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Most of what I was going to say has already been said. I just want to echo a couple of things, not echo, but enlarge in a couple of things. If we can go to table number, the metric number nine on page 11. Assuming, as Steve said, that the operative number is the one on the left, so there were 156 at one request each, 16 at two and so forth, that number still adds up to more than 219. So somewhere these numbers are not quite tallying.

The other thing you get out of this table is if you add up the number of requesters, that is 156 plus 16 plus five and so forth, you get a number which I don't think is actually represented in the metrics. We have the number of requesters who registered for the

---

system, but I don't think we're showing anywhere, unless I missed it, the number of requesters who actually made requests in this period and cumulatively. So that's probably something we want to add in.

And lastly, again, these numbers don't make a lot of sense in some ways, and particularly the ones that Marc mentioned on the requests for non-participating registrars. And even though I know we're not going to show the names of the registrars, it would be really useful to see Registrar A, Registrar B, Registrar C, and see how the requests divide among the registrars. In other words, are these equally an average of five requests per registrar who isn't participating, or is there a skew and heavy load? It doesn't tell us which registrar it is, but it does tell us, do we have a problem? And I think that's something that would be really useful to know. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Alan. So, Yuko, I hope you took furious notes, because there's many questions targeted, assuming that you're the one answering for the team. But go ahead.

YUKO YOKOYAMA: Yes, thank you, Sebastian. And thank you for all the great feedback so far and some of the questions. I did take good notes. I am going to go through the questions that I captured, and hopefully I didn't miss anything. I'll try to answer them. So, first thing is that, Sebastian, you mentioned that non-participating

---

registrars, is there anything that ICANN is doing to solicit participation?

Yes, we do have an army of account managers at ICANN who deals with registries and registrars on a daily basis. So, account managers are tasked to talk to their accounts to, one, ask for participation if they haven't already, and two, if they say no, then what's the reason so that we can learn more from their feedback in terms of how best to approach this going forward. So, this is something that we are definitely working on in terms of driving up the participation.

Next question that I captured, and comment from Steve DelBianco, was that there's a conflation between the requester versus the request type, and if the issue description is free text. So, the latter one is the issue description free text? Yes, it is. And you're right, Steve, we do have this conflation of requester versus request type, which I believe came from the disconnect between what the system offer versus what GNSO Council's letter to the board asked in terms of metrics.

So, the system always collects the request type, not the requester type, but the asked metric was the requester type breakdown. So, I think there's the disconnect that we didn't catch in advance. So, it's meant to be a request type, not the requester type, because we don't keep that metric. So, we don't ask requester the type of what they are. We only ask the type of request that they're submitting. So, hopefully that makes sense.

Next question was from Paul. In terms of privacy and proxy, how it's being captured and if the publicly available was it? So, not

---

---

quite. So, we talked briefly about how to capture privacy proxy matter within the RDRS during the small team meeting last year, and we didn't come to an agreement that it was something that we wanted to keep a record of. So, publicly available outcome is the closest to the privacy proxy outcome, except that publicly available is a bigger bucket.

This is because if the data is publicly available when you go to lookup.icon.org and punch in whatever web address, and if it returns all unredacted information, the chances are that it's probably privacy proxy providers information, but small chance that it's actual registrant information, because some registrant chooses to remain public. So, publicly available not only capture the privacy proxy, but also some additional that is for whatever reason jurisdiction or by choice that they're remaining to be public in terms of their information.

And lastly, the comment that Marc has made about the number of participating versus non-participating PING, which was a metric 10. I wanted to provide further clarity that Diana has sort of touched upon, but she went it's a lot of information to go through. We noted that even though this wasn't a metric that was asked by GNSO Council, but we did have some additional information. Actually, if you could scroll down, whomever has the control to metric 10, thank you. So, while the non-participating registrars lookup was really high here, it's comparing the lookup versus the actual submitted request, which shows as 20% here.

But in terms of the number of PING, we found out that about an equal number of PING were conducted on, one, the participating registrar, and two, non-participating registrars. The number of

---

---

PING themselves were about equal number, except that the people did not proceed to submit in the request when the registrars were participating. So, that's why there's a huge gap.

It shows here as if it's 80% of registrars were not participating, whereas 20% were participating. It's just that people are doing a lot of testing, a lot of lookup, and when they find out that the particular domain is managed by a participating registrar, they just simply did not go through and submitting requests. So, that's the background information to show about the metric 10. And perhaps the report needs to be looked into to show that background information, as opposed to going with the face value of non-participating lookup versus the submitted request to participate in registrars. I think I answered all the questions, and if I'm missing something, please do let me know. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Yuko. On that very last point, presumably then, so what you're saying is that people, when they first arrive on the system, their requests are basically 50-50, participating, non-participating, which represent the divide on it in terms of the number of registrars, of registered domain represented by participating registrars, but that they don't go further, presumably because, again, tire-kicking, they're testing the system. So, that's definitely something that we would want to see over time in the next few months to see if that's something that is resolved, because as I've also seen in the comments.

I think from Steve DelBianco, who rightly points that people like Kevin Murphy, who don't make or break the market, but they do

---

have an influence on this market, jumping to conclusion on day one on these sorts of things, indeed will disincentivize participation. So, maybe something that we want to correct, and maybe also something that as a group we might want to add as a comment to Kevin's article. John McElwaine, I see your hand up.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks. John McElwaine, for the record. So, just, I'm going to put my question, which is in the chat, and state it, and maybe even state what I think the possible answer is. So, when we were talking about requesters in here, my question is, what does that specifically mean? I think a requester is a particular RDRS account, but it would be good to know if that's the case. So, for instance, as I think I am a requester, I'm making requests on behalf of a number of different clients, that doesn't get really picked up from the form. So, anyways, I believe that requester equals RDRS account holder, but I'll wait to get confirmation of that.

My other comment, to the extent we want to, the current category is not doing a very good job of tracking whether attorneys are filing requests on behalf of clients, I don't think. There's a number of different options for the requester type, and although we identify researchers and domainers, we don't identify attorneys representing clients or something like that. So, we might want to consider adding a category for that. For instance, as I've been putting down consumer protection when I file them, others may be putting down that they are brand owners, so there's just not a really good category for that.

---

And lastly, from my experience, I've got an issue with getting much data out of the denial reason type being cannot disclose due to applicable law. It doesn't really capture much for us as reviewing this as to why the denial is occurring. And I'm not saying that we need to have a real specific example, but maybe we can develop some more pointed reasons.

So, for instance, one of mine got denied on the grounds that there was, let's see, what it was falling into the category cannot disclose due to applicable law, but the registrar provided more information stating, we've reviewed your request and applied the legitimate interest balancing test, so there's the applicable law. And we've determined after careful consideration that one element requires that the information be necessary, and they didn't believe that the information that was requested was necessary. So, I don't know if we can develop a few denial reasons that are being repeated by registrars, because I have a feeling that they have their categories to maybe provide us a bit more insight in those denial requests. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, John. And I agree, whenever we can, without multiplying and having endless drop down to choose from, but whenever we can clarify the drop down or add a few drop-down answers to help us afterwards, we should. Gabe, I see you hand up. Go ahead. And Gabe, I see you're unmuted, but we can't hear you. Or at least I can hear you. I don't know if anybody else can. I don't think that we can hear you, Gabe. Do you mind if we go to Paul McGrady whilst we figure out what's going on? Well, thank you. So, Paul McGrady, go ahead, and then we'll try to



---

figure out if we can help Gabe with the audio or just read the comment in there. Paul McGrady left, so Marc Anderson, or did you lower your hand ready to speak?

PAUL MCGRADY: Just as you said, Paul McGrady, you go answer my question in the chat. So the answer was privacy proxy are being recorded as publicly available. They're not being recorded as denials. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Paul. Then Marc, you have the hand. And again, we'll circle back to Gabe in a moment if he's able to figure out what's going on with the audio.

MARC ANDERSON: Thank you. This is Marc Anderson for the transcript, and thank you, Yuko, for the context. That's helpful. Like Sebastian said, I'm curious to see how much of this is kicking the tires and how much of this is a trend that we'll see going forward. You mentioned some numbers as far as the number of lookups that were done via the system, and then the number which is a superset of the number that translated into disclosure requests. Since we don't seem to have a category for that, are those metrics you can share on the list? Is that something maybe we can see going forward that seems like useful data that we maybe didn't anticipate going into this? But very good context, and thank you for that.

---

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marc. Yuko, I see your hand up. Possibly to offer some answers.

YUKO YOKOYAMA: Yes, just to respond to Marc's request about possibly getting that additional context for this metric 10. This was initially something that we did not intend to publish because it was not part of the reporting metrics. So we would need to look into what kind of parameter we have within the system. If we can report out in the timeframe as we do for the rest of the report, or if it was always the current snapshot, we need to get back with the engineering team to understand what it is that we can report out and from there, perhaps we can consider if anything needs to be changed in terms of reporting out and how to share this information. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And I see Gabe's question, which I will read for the record. So two points; on the issue of pricey proxy. I would second that a good understanding of how PP is treated is absolutely valuable. And if the ICANN team needs the standing committee to make that explicit, I would suggest we do we discuss doing so. On the topic of metric 10, so the one that we have on screen now, are we conflating ccTLD lookups with non-participating registrar? Excellent question.

So that was A on metric 10, and B, I suggest the future report is out. What data is derived from the initial domain lookup ping that you could describe versus the later data collected from the full

---

request submission? So interesting question there about the ccTLD. How is that treated in your ping metric? Assuming that a ccTLD domain goes directly into an error, as we discussed before, there's not even an analysis of participating non participating registrar, because there's not always a clear and easy way to recognize an ICANN accredited registrar in the case from a ccTLD. Yuko, go ahead.

YUKO YOKOYAMA:

Yes, thank you. Just to get a couple of points across. One is about the privacy proxy. I believe we had discussed previously within the small team not to talk about the privacy proxy, but I think within the small team not to mixing privacy proxy with RDRS, but we're happy to engage in this discussion. So if the standing committee deems it necessary, we're here to explore what can be done.

In terms of the question A from metric 10, are we conflating ccTLD lookups with non-participating registrars? No, we are not. So from my very brief meeting with the engineering team, this data, obviously, since it wasn't in the report, we don't have the time to closely examine, but we are able to likely differentiate what error messages came out from the ping.

So ccTLD is not conflated with the non-participating registrar. So what I have as a very vague number is that there are close to about 4,000 total lookup, and a good majority of it was a result of domain not found or not supported. Not supported would include ccTLD. So domain may either not exist or it's within the ccTLD is the biggest failure from the ping, close to 4,000 pings that had

---

happened. And the rest were that half and half of about 800, 900 ping to non-participating registrar and another 800 or 900 or so on the participating registrar. So no, they're not. The 886 or 80% of this non participating registrar really is about a gTLD domain lookup that resulted in not participating registrars. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So is this possible to add that as a metric, that breakdown of the 4,000 ping or whatever there will be in the future, but the breakdown of what people's first impression are before they start going further and filling in the form. I think that might help and that would definitely help us better calibrate the communication out there to make sure that people don't give up on us, failing to recognize that they just simply hadn't asked the right question. Roger Carney, I see you. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. This is Roger. And again, I just want to add a couple of things here real quick before we end up. Just as an overall response from the registrars, it has been very positive. Registrars have enjoyed working actually with this and learning about it and providing feedback for it. So I think it's been very positive so far in the first two months, whatever it's been, since we've been doing this.

Obviously, the volume is a lot lower than participating registrars thought it would be. Hopefully that picks up so we can get more learnings underway. And probably one of the big things I think from the registrars was I think maybe a general understanding for

---

requesters to know that basically the RDRS is not providing anything more than it used to provide. So I think that more than WHOIS used to provide. So when it's privacy proxy, most registrars are going to return, hey, it's public data, so go get it. Some of them may actually provide links to privacy proxy documentation so you can go request disclosure from the privacy proxy.

But again, I think there's a lot of those things, asking for your own information. I know that people like to test that kind of thing, but it's one of those where in today's ways, it is blank. So you're going to get a response back saying go here, go to your control panel to get your own data and things like that. But again, overall, registrars have been very positive about this and experience and have a ton of learnings. The one thing I ask is registrars have been documenting impressions into a Google Doc, I think that ICANN started for us. And I'm wondering if the requester comments, especially the ones we've heard today, a lot of good things came in, if those are going to be added to that document so that people can view those when they need to. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Cool. Thank you, Roger. So in true Paul McGrady fashion, I would like to make sure that I'm ending this call on time, which is now. I'll allow the last few seconds before we get to 31. So maybe one last quick comment from Steve Crocker, who raised his hand before I said that, and then afterwards we will have to wrap up and share on the list the time for the next call. Steve, quickly.

STEVE CROCKER: Quickly, thank you. I think I sent a note to the group and I'll send it again. I set up a mailing list for anybody who wants to contribute experience. The purpose of setting that up was to reach out beyond the scope of the defined groups here, this team or the registrars, et cetera. And I don't know how much will come in, but the intent is to just share as widely as possible and with details that go beyond the statistics for those that want to contribute it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. With this said, it is then a wrap and we will share on the list the date and time for the next call in a month once the next month's stats are published. Thank you very much all and see you in a month.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**