Who Is Painting

An investigation of 331 No Paint paintings that arrived in two school mornings

@jeffrey · Aesthetic.Computer · ORCID 0009-0007-4460-4913

4 November 2026

Abstract. On Monday 2 November 2026, visits to `nopaint.art`, the home of the 2016 painting game No Paint, rose from about 18 a day to more than 400. The first explanation was search traffic, and the first measure of it was wrong: the first-party visit collector showed no paintings being saved, because the 2021 build saves through its own endpoint, which that collector never sees. Reading the endpoint's database directly showed **331** paintings saved with *Done* in 48 hours, against a prior rate of about three a day. They arrived in four blocks of 80 to 100 minutes starting at 8:15 and 11:30 on Tuesday and Wednesday, Lima time. The access log still held 146 of Wednesday's uploads; all came from Peruvian networks, and eight came from an address whose reverse DNS names a school's `.edu.pe` domain. This paper records the investigation as it happened, including its two wrong turns, tests one competing explanation (judging for the .ART Award) and rejects it, and describes the instruments built the same day to answer the next questions: a 50/50 sticker test, a funnel for the AI studio `notepaint.art`, and a bilingual note form for teachers.

1. INTRODUCTION

The question that started this was casual: what did the network do overnight? The answer was a single outlier. Of 625 page visits across the Aesthetic.Computer network in the twelve hours to 9:50am Pacific on 4 November, 405 were to `nopaint.art`, and 86% of those visitors touched the canvas. The site had averaged fewer than twenty visits a day the week before.

No Paint is a painting game from 2016, made with Alex Freundlich, Ella Fleck, Camille Klein and friends [Scudder et al., 2016]. A painting grows one proposed mark at a time and the player answers *Paint* or *No*. The 2021 build, made in Construct, still runs at `nopaint.art`; it was refreshed in 2026 as the entry for the .ART Award [.ART Domains, 2026]. Its AI successor, `notepaint.art`, lives beside it, and since 2 November a sticker on No Paint's title screen has pointed at it.

The investigation asked four questions in turn. Who were the visitors? Were they making anything? Where were they? What would we need in place to learn more without guessing? Each section below answers one, in the order the answers came. It follows the network traffic report [@jeffrey, 2026b] and the earlier network audit [@jeffrey, 2026a] in posture: every number comes from a primary pull. Two early answers were wrong, and both are kept, because how they went wrong describes the instruments better than a clean account would.

2. INSTRUMENTS

Six sources were read. They differ in what they can see, and most of this paper turns on those differences.

- **Visit collector.** A first-party script on every studio domain posts one cumulative record per page visit: surface, dwell bucket, whether the visitor interacted, a referrer *host*, and a fixed allowlist of milestone actions. It keeps no identifiers and expires rows after 35 days. It counts AC's own media saves but not the 2021 game's.
- **Search Console.** Google's clicks and impressions for `nopaint.art`, lagging two days [Google, 2026b].
- **The classic save endpoint.** *Done* in the 2021 build reserves an eight-character code from `server.nopaint.art`, then posts the PNG. On lith, the server behind the network, the host is rewritten to a function that stores each painting in the Mongo collection `nopaint-classic-paintings` with a `savedAt` time. Each saved painting is public at `server.nopaint.art/painting/<code>.png`.
- **The access log.** Caddy writes JSON lines for every request to lith [Caddy Web Server, 2026]. It rolls at 50 MiB and keeps three files for at most 72 hours, so on a busy server its memory is shorter than three days.
- **notepaint's public sitemap.** Every saved notepaint painting is public by design, with its note in the page title.
- **AC's recent-paintings feed.** The public list behind `aesthetic.computer`'s `done` command.

3. THE SPIKE

Table 1 gives `nopaint.art`'s visits in 24-hour windows ending at 18:38 UTC. The jump falls inside the window that opens Monday morning in the Americas, and it is not a bot artifact: the collector marked one automated visit in the last 24 hours, and 85% of human visits were engaged, meaning they interacted and stayed visible for at least ten seconds.

In the twelve-hour window, 154 visits arrived with `google.com` as referrer and 195 with `nopaint.art` itself,

Table 1: Page visits to `nopaint.art` from the first-party collector. Engaged means interacted and visible for 10 s or more.

24-hour window ending 18:38 UTC	Visits	Engaged
29 Oct–1 Nov (per day, mean of 3)	18	7
2 Nov	36	19
3 Nov	337	292
4 Nov	440	372

which is what a reload or a return to the page produces. Search Console showed about two clicks a day for the site through 2 November, the last day it had. That gap was the first open question: either Search Console had not caught up, or the visits were coming from a Google surface that does not count as a search click, such as Discover [Google, 2026a]. It is still open; Search Console's data for the spike days had not arrived when this was written.

3.1 First wrong turn: nobody is making anything

The collector's milestone counts showed no saved-painting action on `nopaint.art` or `aesthetic.computer` during the spike, and AC's public paintings feed showed one upload, from a regular. The first report concluded that the visitors were not making paintings, and supported it by searching the 2021 build's project file for an upload URL and finding none.

Both supports were wrong. The project file stores event logic as numeric references into a compiled expression table, so the URLs are not in it as plain strings; they live in the runtime script, where `server.nopaint.art/upload-painting` appears in the clear. And the collector counts AC's own media saves, which the 2021 game does not use. The correction came from the person who wrote the save path. The lesson is narrower than "check your work": an absence in an instrument is only evidence if the instrument could have seen the thing.

4. WHAT WAS MADE

Read directly, the classic endpoint's collection held 331 paintings saved between 10:21am Pacific on 2 November and 10:15am Pacific on 4 November (Figure 1). The thirteen days from 20 October to 1 November had averaged 4.3 a day. Only one code was reserved by *Done* and not completed in the last 24 hours, so almost every attempt to save succeeded.

Figure 2 shows all 331 in save order. They are not test images or repeated blanks. They look like No Paint paintings always have: noisy grounds, stamped shapes, filters, the occasional face or word, each one the result of dozens of accepted and rejected proposals. A handful are near-duplicates saved seconds apart, which is what two students at one screen produce.




Figure 1: Paintings saved with *Done* in the 2021 No Paint, per UTC day. The 4 November bar covers the day to 18:15 UTC.

Table 2: Networks behind the `POST /upload-painting` requests still in the access log on 4 November (oldest line 13:36 UTC). Addresses is the number of distinct source addresses.

Network	Uploads	Addresses
Integratel Perú (AS6147)	72	11
América Móvil Perú, Claro (AS12252)	43	7
Entel Perú (AS21575)	23	6
A school's network (`.edu.pe`)	8	1
Total	146	25

4.1 The shape of the arrivals

The saves are not spread across the day. Grouped by gaps of more than 25 minutes, 322 of the 331 fall into four blocks (Figure 3): 79 saves from 8:17 to 9:49 and 52 from 11:32 to 12:54 on Tuesday, then 111 from 8:15 to 9:00 and 80 from 11:36 to 13:15 on Wednesday, all in Lima time (UTC−5). The busiest ten minutes held 38 saves. Nothing arrived on either evening.

Lima time is not a guess fitted to the bars. It came from the next measurement, and the clock fit afterwards: two blocks a day, starting at 8:15 and 11:30, of about one class period each, on consecutive weekdays.

5. WHERE THEY WERE

The access log no longer reached Tuesday, but it still held 146 of Wednesday's 191 saves. Each request's address was mapped to the owner of its network through Team Cymru's public DNS service [Team Cymru, 2026] and to a reverse-DNS domain. The script printed only network names, domains and counts; no address was printed or kept. Table 2 is the whole result.

Every upload came from Peru. Three of the four networks are national mobile and home carriers, which do not identify who is behind them. The fourth is a business line whose address resolves to a school's own `.edu.pe`



Figure 2: The 331 paintings saved with *Done* from 2 November 18:21 UTC to 4 November 18:15 UTC, in save order, left to right and top to bottom. Each tile is the saved PNG scaled to 64×72 pixels. Every image is public at `server.nopaint.art`; none carries a name.




Figure 3: Saves per hour on the two school days, Lima time. Each bar is one clock hour. The four class blocks start at about 8:15 and 11:30.

domain: a Catholic school in metropolitan Lima. That is the only institution the data names, and it accounts for eight uploads from a single address. Twenty-five addresses for 146 paintings is about six paintings per address, which fits shared classroom connections or phones on a school's carrier better than one student per device.

What the data supports is narrow. Students in Lima, in at least one school and possibly several, used No Paint in morning class periods on Tuesday and Wednesday. One school is identified. Whether its class made most of the 331 paintings or only eight of them, the log cannot say.

5.1 A competing explanation

No Paint was submitted to the .ART Award on 26 October; the deadline was 1 November and the spike began the next day. Could the traffic be judging? Three observations say no. Judges would land on the submission page, `nopaint.art/story`, and every collected visit during the spike was to the home page. The award's published process has a jury, semi-finalists in November and winners on 4 December, with no public vote or open gallery that could send a crowd [.ART Domains, 2026]. And a jury does not make 331 paintings from Peruvian carriers in school-period blocks. The timing is a coincidence, or an indirect path this data cannot see, such as a teacher finding the refreshed site.

5.2 Second wrong turn: the sticker

The investigation's first design was a 50/50 test of No Paint's title sticker, sending half of visitors to `notepaint.art` and half to `aesthetic.computer`, to see which converts [Kohavi et al., 2020]. It was built before the classroom was found. In that light the test asks stu-

Table 3: Instruments added on 4 November 2026, and the question each one answers.

Instrument	What it records	Question it answers
Sticker split on No Paint	Each page load draws an arm at random: the sticker points at `notepaint.art` or at `aesthetic.computer`, same words. Shown and opened are recorded per arm; `?ad=` pins an arm.	Which destination keeps a No Paint visitor, measured as engaged visits per sticker shown.
notepaint funnel steps	Per visit, whether the visitor wrote a note (never its text), pressed Paint, was asked to sign in, ran out of Braincells, hit a failed move, accepted, pressed No, saved.	Where studio visitors stop.
Sticker report	One read on lith joins the arms with destination arrivals that carry `nopaint.art` as referrer, and lays out the funnel.	Both of the above, as one table.
Teacher note form	A chip under the sticker opens a short form, in Spanish for Spanish-language browsers. Notes are stored in `nopaint-teacher-notes` and arrive as an AC mail letter.	Who is teaching with No Paint, in their own words.
Classic save read	A read-only query over `nopaint-classic-paintings`: saves per day, since a time, and reserved-but-unsaved codes.	Whether people are making paintings, and when.
Network read	Aggregate owner names and reverse-DNS domains for upload requests in the access log; never addresses.	Which country and kind of network the makers are on.
No Paint report	One read-only report, as a CLI script and an analytics tool, that folds classic saves, the sticker split, the funnel and teacher-note counts into the daily network report. Note text stays out.	All of the above, every morning, without a manual query.

dents in an assignment to leave it, and its report, built on the visit collector, could not see what that costs, because the collector cannot see No Paint's own saves. The test is kept, with that limit written into its reading; Section 7 lists the instrument that would close the gap.

6. THE AI STUDIO BESIDE IT

Over the same days 30 paintings were saved on `notepaint.art`, 24 by guests. Its notes are public in page titles. Most guest notes are one word—*hi*, *Hola*, *Ola*, *ok*, *good*, *67*—and the studio's image model lettered the word onto the canvas. A few wrote scenes (*a dog eating*, *shiny apple*, *a Russian man hugging a bear standing in a wild forest*) and got pictures. On the day measured, the No Paint sticker was shown to 404 visits and opened by 79, about 20%; notepaint then saw 95 visits and 11 accepted paints. The leak is inside the studio, and the one-word notes suggest why: a newcomer reads the note box as a text field, not a prompt.

7. WHAT IS IN PLACE FOR THE NEXT QUESTIONS

Everything in Table 3 was written, tested and pushed on 4 November. None of it records what anyone types, and none of it keeps an address or an account with its rows.

Three gaps remain, ranked by how much they would change the next decision.

1. **No Paint's own saves are invisible to the visit collector.** A successful *Done* could record a `painting_saved` milestone from the page. That one line would let the sticker test count what it costs No Paint, and would have prevented the first wrong turn.
2. **The access log forgets in under three days.** The network read must be run while the question is fresh, or a daily aggregate (network name and count only) must be kept.
3. **The source of the arrivals is unknown.** Search Console will show within days whether Google search, Discover or neither carried them. The teacher form may answer it sooner.

8. ETHICS, PRIVACY, LIMITATIONS

The makers are probably minors, in class, who did not opt into being studied [Livingstone et al., 2019]. Three choices follow from that. The paper names no school, though the data names one: the school's domain is withheld and its description kept to what a reader could not search on. Network attribution was run once, in aggregate, against logs the server keeps anyway, and its script prints no addresses. The paintings are shown because the game publishes every saved painting without a name, and Figure 2 reduces each to a thumbnail. The teacher form exists so that the next fact about this class comes from the teacher, with consent, and not from another inference.

The limits are plain. Tuesday's network data had rolled away before it was read. Referrer hosts are a floor,

since privacy settings can omit them. Carrier attribution cannot separate one school on phones from several schools. Lima time was inferred from the networks and fits the blocks; no teacher has confirmed it. Visit counts are page visits, not people.

9. CONCLUSION

A spike that looked like search traffic was a classroom, or several, in Lima: 331 paintings in two mornings, saved through a 2021 endpoint that the newer instruments never watched. Two answers were wrong first, both for the same reason: an instrument was asked about something it could not see. The instruments built in response are small, and each one is tied to a question we could not answer on 4 November. The best of them is the simplest. It asks the teacher.

References

.ART Domains. .ART Award 2026, 2026. https://www.award.art/.

Caddy Web Server. Log directive and JSON access-log encoder, 2026. https://caddyserver.com/docs/caddyfile/directives/log.

Google. Discover performance report, 2026a. Search Console Help. https://support.google.com/webmasters/answer/9216516.

Google. Performance report (search results), 2026b. Search Console Help. https://support.google.com/webmasters/answer/7576553.

@jeffrey. Network audit: Who uses Aesthetic.Computer and what do they make?, 2026a. arXiv preprint draft in repository.

@jeffrey. Aesthetic network traffic report: Sixteen domains, four instruments, and the distance between a request and a person, 2026b. https://papers.aesthetic.computer/aesthetic-network-traffic-26-arxiv.pdf.

Ron Kohavi, Diane Tang, and Ya Xu. *Trustworthy Online Controlled Experiments: A Practical Guide to A/B Testing*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Sonia Livingstone, Mariya Stoilova, and Rishita Nandagopal. Children's data and privacy online: Growing up in a digital age, 2019. London School of Economics and Political Science. https://www.lse.ac.uk/media-and-communications/research/research-projects/childprivacyonline.

Jeffrey Alan Scudder, Alex Freundlich, Ella Fleck, and Camille Klein. No Paint, 2016. Painting game, 2016–present. https://nopaint.art.

Team Cymru. IP to ASN mapping service, 2026. DNS interface at `origin.asn.cymru.com`. https://www.team-cymru.com/ip-asn-mapping.

Source bundle

The attached ZIP contains the paper's machine-readable text sources and a plain-text inventory. It supports accessibility, audit, quotation, and reproducible editing; the PDF remains the canonical reading edition. Private evidence, credentials, raw datasets, generated PDFs, and unlisted assets are excluded.