
ICANN Transcription

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team Call

Thursday, 04 November 2021 at 13:00 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/Lg2HCg>

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

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. And welcome to the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team call, taking place on Thursday, the 4th of November, 2021, at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourselves now?

Hearing no one, statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

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.

Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail the GNSO Secretariat.

All members will be promoted to panelists for today's call. Members, when using chat, please select Panelists and Attendees or Everyone, depending on your Zoom update, in order for all the see the chat. Observers will have View Only chat access.

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call.

Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior.

With this, I'll turn it back over to our Chair, Michael Palage. Please begin.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. I look forward to a very productive call today. I, first, would, as usual, like to begin with some administrative stuff quickly.

Last week, we did receive approval from council regarding the appointments of alternates. So I believe Marika said we would be sending out notifications. Marika is not on the call today, but if I could, Terri, do you know what the process is going to be for the notification of the alternates? Has that notification been sent out yet?

TERRI AGNEW: Hi, Michael. No, it has not been sent out yet, but if we follow through, we'll notify all groups so they'll have the notify us that an alternate will be put forward via e-mail.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Perfect. So if we could take that today ... I know Sarah has said she will not be here next week, so we want to make sure that the registrars have the ability for doing that.

Next, the other thing that we received confirmation from from the council was for the potential appointment of a vice-chair. We have had that permission. At this point in time, we're not going to undertake that just yet, but we have done that.

The next important thing is we have a new member joining our team this week. This is Olga Cavalli, who has been appointed as the GNSO Council liaison.

So welcome, Olga. Would you like to say any words real quick?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, of course. Hi, Mike. Thank you very much. Good morning from Buenos Aires, Argentina. Happy to join this effort. I'm here to help you in this important work. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you very much, Olga. The third and final administrative work item that we need to take care of is the adjustment of the call

time and the duration for our meetings beginning next week. We've already had some of our European colleagues that have had the time shift. Next week, most of our North American colleagues will do that.

Terri, could you please update on what we have decided and how we have consulted with our Asian colleagues to make sure that this is suitable for everyone and what changes will be taking place?

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you, Michael. Going forward, the meetings will take place weekly on Thursdays. It will be adjusted to 14:00 UTC. We will be scheduling each meeting for 90 minutes but with inspiration to ... And each meeting at 60 minutes if possible. But we just wanted to get it on the calendars for now. And we will be [pulling] the meetings right now until the 23rd of December. That also includes Thursday, November 25th, but, Michael, I do believe, for U.S. Thanksgiving weekend, there is a gameplan. So I'll let you share if the meeting will be held or if there's an alternate plan if that's possible.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Correct. So if I could, what I'd like to do is, at this point time, just give a little bit of a heads up as to what we're going to be looking at over the next couple of weeks as far as the narrow time. And then, when we get to the next item, we're going to bring Barry in, who will open that up and give us a much bigger perspective.

So over the next couple of weeks, our hope today is that we could perhaps reach some time of rough consensus on what a working definition is based upon the current wording in the ICANN agreements/contracts and what ICANN Compliance is doing.

If we are successful with that, what we will do is we will then be given four weeks. Each stakeholder group will be given four weeks to go back to their respective groups and produce what you would call your aspirational definition. I know there have been a lot of individuals have expressed concern thinking that the definition as embodied is not exactly where it needs to be. So groups will have four weeks to actually come up with those alternate, if you will, aspirational definitions on where they think the definition should evolve to.

Now, what we're going to do is, during that four weeks, which will encompass the U.S. Thanksgiving holiday, we are going to use that intervening time to work on coming up with questions to ICANN Org. As you may recall, this is something we have created a document for. We have been encouraging the volunteers and group members to start putting forth questions.

And the objective here is we would use these next three weeks to try to formulate those questions so that, after we return from the Thanksgiving break in early December, we will actually have ICANN Org, hopefully representatives from both Legal and Compliance, on the call to answer our questions. But we really want to get those questions vetted before, and we want that done by the end of Thanksgiving week. So hopefully, if we're moving forward and we're moving efficiently, we will not have to have a

call on Thanksgiving week. The meeting can be purely, if you will, remote via the list, via e-mail.

So that is the aspirational goal of how we want to try to use a carrot to get our work done sooner.

So that is, I guess, the close of the administrative portion of the call today.

And I now want to move forward with the workplan. And this is something that you may recall we started last week during our plenary call as part of ICANN72. And what I'd like to do now is to hand this over to our good friend and colleague, Berry, from ICANN Org who can lead us through what we have, I think, what has been discussed, and what we are proposing to submit to council. Berry, you have the floor.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Michael. Berry Cobb for the record, your resident wet-blanket project manager. I think most of you are familiar with the PDP 3.0 aspects for managing policy development. While the scoping team is not a PDP, it's still adhering to the same principles of defining and measuring the work ahead of us and ultimately getting to definitive or target delivery dates on key milestones.

So really the next steps from here are, as we discussed on our last call, the leading team was aiming towards an aspirational delivery of the final report to the GNSO Council at the ICANN75 annual general meeting, which is mid-September. And I'll dive into some of the details for that.

Next steps about what we're doing here from a project plan perspective in the leadership team will forward the project plan over to the GNSO Council, I believe, on Monday the 8th, in time for the motions and documents deadline. This will be an AOB item. But what it means is that this scoping team will commit to hitting the delivery date by the annual general meeting.

So once we do that, then of course, on a monthly basis, we'll be producing our project packages that include the summary dashboard that you see before you. It will contain details about what we're doing, what we've done, and what we plan to do. It'll contain the detailed project plan, some meeting activities, statistics, and, finally, the more tactical workplan which is the things that we're working on directly in front of us: action items that are assigned to the team or to leadership, as well as a forward-looking view of what we'll be working on at the meetings from a best-effort perspective.

So the key aspects about the project plan, which is pretty similar to what we had discussed last week: as you know, we have four assignments in front of us per the council's instructions. Essentially, we'll be working Assignments 1 and 3 before we can work Assignments 3 and 4. What we've got planned here is that Assignments 1 (enforcement and reporting) and Assignment 2 (measurement of accuracy) will in essence be worked in parallel. And the duration that we've assigned to these is approximately twelve business weeks. That takes us into roughly the end of January.

So what I've included in the e-mail that I sent to the group yesterday is Assignments 1 and 2 towards the end of January.

And then, as we start into Assignment 3, I think one of the challenges that we have in putting this plan together is that what is somewhat elusive or nebulous is exactly what the scope of work is going to look like.

So the general plan or idea here is that, assuming that we do complete our work on Assignments 1 and 2 by the end of January, we're going to spend the month of February of next year really deep-diving into exactly what Assignment 3 is going to look like, what its scope what might be. The instructions that were provide a general direction, but I don't think any of us has a clear indication of exactly what that work is going to look like.

So the aspirational goal here is that, in preparation for ICANN73, we'll have more definitive visibility into what Assignment 3 will look like, what its scope might mean. Some have suggested that there's some survey work—those kinds of things. The output of the February deep-dive into Assignment 3 will help inform communication back to the GNSO Council.

So we're already planning that there will be a pretty substantive update to the council at ICANN73. And as a part of that, then we should have a better idea of the sizing of the work ahead of us. And then, as necessary, we can communicate back to the council that more time might be needed. Maybe less time is needed. We really had a challenging time understanding the effort that may be involved with Assignment 3.

So we get to ICANN73, assuming we're on track. Then of course we're hoping to deliver the final report to the council by September[.] And, as noted, subject to change, depending on

what we uncover for Assignment 3, these talking points that I just mentioned here will also be communicated to the GNSO Council when we send over the project plan so that they at least have a heads up that we don't have 100% certainty about our deliverable dates so that they're prepared for some future flexibility.

So I think I covered all of the talking points. Happy to answer any questions. Or, Michael, if you have anything else to add. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

No. Just perhaps, if could, before turning it open to the floor and other comments, one of the things I think we heard last week during the plenary call was some of the concerns about the unknowns in Assignment 3 and how to account for them. So we think this proposed path forward is the best way to keep our foot on the metal moving forward yet provide, if you will, a timeout where we could reassess whether we're going to be able to make our ICANN75 deliverable or whether we may need to readjust midstream.

So I think this is what we heard last week and it is a good embodiment of that. But before we send this off to council, we would really like to open it up and hear if anyone else has any questions or comments. The floor is open.

Steve, you have the floor.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Very well organized. I want to follow up on a comment that Berry has written in the chat that relates to something very strongly on my mind. When we stand back and look at the whole process, there's a lot of emphasis on what the criteria ought to be with respect to accuracy and the measurement, etc. So what is the purposes that are intended to be satisfied and how we can tell and where does it fit into the plan, actually, that there's a specification of the intended uses and then a comparison of whether or not the specifications of accuracy will or will not be fit for purpose? That is, if you satisfy those requirements, will you have also met the requirements that it will accomplish what it's supposed to accomplish? So that's just a standard issue in any system design, and it's very, very common. Stories are replete about systems that were built to specification and in fact don't do what they're supposed to do. I'm pausing because you all can fill in the blanks there. Do we have an explicit a direct address to that issue? Where does that fit into the plan?

MICHAEL PALAGE: So what I guess my response is I think, as a scoping team, we are generally, I would say, afforded a little latitude in where we go. I think one of the things we want to be cautious about in perhaps expanding that broader scope is relitigating other aspects. So I know, obviously, there was EPDP Phase 2A that talked about access. I think it would probably be best if we avoid that access question. Now, you're right about accuracy. What is the purpose of accuracy? What are the benefits? What are the purposes? I think asking those questions would be in scope. My only caution

as Chair would be trying to perhaps relitigate something that has already being done before. That would be my initial response.

Is that acceptable to you, Steve, or do you think perhaps differently?

STEVE CROCKER: It's not quite the same.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay.

STEVE CROCKER: First of all, I should mention that Lori led a homework session yesterday and several of us, I guess, on the non-contracted party side were get together in chat. And Scott Austin, I believe, raised a very good point of—I don't know if this apocryphal or accurate—but if you tell the judge, "Well called the number and it rang," is that a sufficient of providing notice to the other party? And the suggestion was the judge would laugh that out of court.

So turning that into a serious question and a serious use case, what would be satisfactory to meet the requirements? So we know, in standard contracts, paper contracts, there's usually a clause that says, "Notices shall be sent to the following," and presumably—I've fortunately not had to dwell in that area but I assume all of the attorneys on the call know full well how this works—if you then send certified mail to that address and then there's an issue and you can document that you sent it to that

address, it doesn't not matter that the party didn't respond or didn't do what they wanted to. You've got sufficient evidence that you did the right thing, and the burden is then on the other party.

Is there a corollary, is there an analogue, in this setting, and are we trying to achieve that? And maybe the answer is no, which would be unfortunate for the people who need that sort of thing. And if the answer is yes, then what is that big picture? How is its vision?

So I'm not talking about the access. Let's just presume that the people who need it will get access. Not trying to litigate that. But is the level of accuracy that we're specifying going to meet the requirements? Is it going to be sufficient to accomplish that? And that's just a particular use case.

And the more general point that I was making is, for the scoping that we're doing here, are we including—and where are we including—the acknowledgement that there are abuse cases that need to be supported? And we can judge the requirements that will be set against those use cases.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So I see the queue. Alan and Beth, I recognize that you have your hands raised.

What I would like to do is I would like to step back for a minute. I think we're beginning to get into the discussion of the definition, which I think is a good thing and something that we need to achieve today. But what I would like to do right now before getting into that substantive discussion, which we will have, is I do just

want to just wrap up the timeline. So if there is anyone that has an issue regarding the proposed timeline that Berry went through ... We'll get to the definition next; I want to talk about timeline. Is there anyone who finds that an issue?

Alan, do you have an issue with the timeline?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. My issue was a follow-on to Steve.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: It applies to the timeline only if we don't end up doing the work that we need to do but not specifically on the timeline as presented.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Beth, are you addressing Steve substantively or do you have a comment about the timeline specifically?

BETH BACON: I have a comment about the tasks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes?

BETH BACON: So they appear on the timeline.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes.

BETH BACON: So is that okay?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes.

BETH BACON: Okay. So I am going to reference Steve. So I'm not trying to jump the queue and break your rules. But I am going to say, from Steve's comment, it was kind of what I was thinking as well in that I think we have different ideas about what we are actually putting out from this group.

So I think that maybe some clarification there would be really helpful, and then we could all start on the same page. And then we're not as concerned with if we're going to get to what we are going to get to if we understand what we are actually trying to get out of this because, again, the scoping team is not something that happens all the time. It's not an issues report. It's not a PDP. It's a thing that we sort of made up because it's helpful. So I think that some of that would be really helpful. And if maybe we can include it in the timeline or just expand on what's written so that we all start on the same page, I think that would helpful and it would

avoid us going back and forth and jumping forward and back to results versus that we haven't defined the thing yet.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Scott, do you have a comment specifically regarding the timeline?

SCOTT AUSTIN: I don't want to jump the queue either, but—

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. So, again, getting back to the timeline what we have proposed here is that, over the next three months, we will be working concurrently on Assignment 1 and Assignment 2. Our goal hopefully in the next three to five minutes is we will begin a substantive discussion on what that current working definition that ICANN Org applies from a compliance standpoint is. We want to start with that. Hopefully we will have rough consensus on what that definition is today. We may not achieve it, but that is our aspirational goal.

And what we then want to do is spend the next four weeks having each group go back and discuss what their aspirational goal is. And I think that is part of what is in the scoping document. They talk about what is the current definition, how it may potentially change. So that is what we're going to do.

So with that, Berry, I will consider this issue of the proposed timeline closed for now. And it is my hope and desire that we'll be able to deliver on Assignment 1 and 2 and be able to report back positively to council early next year.

Now we're going to get to the topic about the proposed definition. Now, what I would like to do, if I could have Terri pull up the ... There was an exchange. And this is one of the things I'm really glad about: that the non-contracted parties we're meeting intercessionally, doing their homework. That is great. What would also be helpful out of those sessions is if you can actually provide some written comments.

So what we're going to do right now is ... Sarah, on behalf of the registrars, put forth a definition. I made a friendly amendment. Sarah came back and then made another friendly amendment. So what I would really appreciate is if ... Terri, is it possible that you can get that latest definition and if you could just everyone where that it is going to be embodied or where this is being memorialized in our various documents?

BERRY COBB: This is Berry. Terri is not driving and I'm trying to search for the latest definition.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So you're doing your best Marika on the fly, Berry?

Sarah, I acknowledge that it was a team effort, but it was you who [pressed Send]. So I want to give proper attribution to the rest of your colleagues.

Okay, thank you very much, Berry. So just to be clear, you're going to be driving for the remainder of the call? Is that correct?

BERRY COBB: Yes.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you very much. We're in good hands.

So what I'd like to do is there was this evolution ... And I do have some questions that unfortunately I was not able to respond to Sarah and her registrar colleagues before today's call on. But what I would like to do is ... Can the people on the call right now, before talking aspirationally about what they would like to do, discuss this substantive definition that has been put forward? I understand that there are some people that have reservations about this. However, these terms and concepts do appear in the registrar accreditation agreement. They do appear in the WHOIS compliance notification. So we're trying to again start with what is currently embodied in the contracts before we get into aspirational stuff.

So if I could start a new queue ... And, Berry, is there any way for the older people to perhaps zoom in a little and make that a little easier for us to see? Thank you.

So, Alan, you still have your hand raised. Would you like to make a substantive proposed change to this, or do you still want to follow up on the comments that Steve had made?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I want to follow up on the comments that Steve had made because I think it's relevant to this discussion.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are talking about the definition of accuracy, but our task is—and Sarah posted it—is to undertake an analysis of the accuracy levels measured to assess whether contractual data accuracy obligations are effective at ensuring accurate contact information. The definition is only one part of it. And we could have the best, most accurate definition in the world, but what it applies to is also relevant. And I'm not sure that we have covered that in either the timeline or the plan of how to discuss it.

So a definition is fine. We can make it as perfect as we want. But that's not necessarily going to answer the question of, "Is it sufficient?" because it's not only the definition that applies but also the scope. And I'm not sure I understand how we're going to address that part.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So I'm not disagreeing with that statement, Alan. I think the definition is a prerequisite to being able to apply that to the data set that currently exists to see whether there's a problem. So I think that is part of the logical way I think we need to approach it. If the group thinks that it should be applied differently, I'm more than willing to hear that.

Scott, you have the floor next.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Thank you, Michael. I'm only making these comments because Steve—and I thank you, Steve, for raising them in that discussion yesterday; so I think they're important ... But in terms of whether it should appear here, I just don't want it to get lost in the shuffle down the road because we're on fairly accelerated timeline and when we're looking at very specific things.

But in context to the point of this judge and the issue of what kind of response we receive from opposing counsel, that was in the context of a consent order, which essentially assumes some kind of [inaudible] or some kind of getting together between counsel and for me to tell the judge that all I did was call and the phone rang. That is not [inaudible] an affirmative response. The key issue where it came up was in the context of Sub-Part F that uses the term. And this is out of the language within the document, an affirmative response.

And this brings me to just stating that I think one of the important things as an [inaudible] of this group is the difference in technical speak and legal speak and that there needs to be some kind of—

MICHAEL PALAGE: Scott, if I could interrupt briefly, is it possible that you can perhaps get closer to your microphone? A lot of our colleagues are saying that you're muffled and it's very hard to hear you.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Okay. Let me see if I can turn it up.

MICHAEL PALAGE: That sounds a little better already.

SCOTT AUSTIN: That's better? Okay, great. My point was that I appreciate Steve bringing up the issue I raised about meeting the judge or appearing before a judge and the notion that, for me to say I called opposing counsel and the phone rang, in response to the judge saying, "Have you received an affirmative response from opposing counsel for your consent order?" Is the context that phrase [inaudible]?

My focus here was really in the language in the document that speaks to the notion of an affirmative response. And I think that one of the overriding [inaudible] or an undercurrent or however you want to express it in a group like this, a significant brain trust with people with tons of experience in many different areas. Is the distinction in understanding between technical and legal and terms like validation and verification? And they have very different meanings.

So I want to make sure that that context is given. I think it's a useful analogue. I think it needs to be fleshed out because I think an affirmative response is something that, to me as a lawyer, means more than just checking to see if the phone rings. But I know that's operational validation. I know that's in a different [inaudible] context from a technical standpoint. But I think that document and what we're searching for, at least to be meaningful to folks in the IPC who are lawyers and concerned with rights and concerned with getting through to the appropriate registrant respondent, if you will, in the [DRP] context, [inaudible] are thinking in those terms and that that's one of the things we're trying to address. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. So if I can—and, Sarah, I do recognize your hand—Steve, as I read it, the requirements for operational validation right now talk about an affirmative response. So the phone just ringing I do not believe would meet the current definition. And let me qualify: because there is choice between e-mail or telephonic operational validation. We're receiving an affirmative response. So if a registrar was to opt to telephonic operational validation under the current definition as I read it, the phone ringing in and of itself would not be sufficient. There would have to be some type of acknowledgement by the recipient of, "Yes, I hear my phone ringing and I got the message." There needs to be some type of affirmation.

Now, again, under the current definition, I believe that it is written, there is a choice between either e-mail or telephone. So if

someone replies to an e-mail, that would be sufficient and there would be no need whatsoever to in fact call.

Now, it is possible that some within the non-commercial group may perhaps want more. Maybe they want e-mail and phone. Maybe that is something that you view as aspirational, in line with the European SCA (Strong Customer Authentication).

But what we need to agree to is not what is aspirational or today's assignment but what currently appears in the document. And that's what I think we really need to focus on.

And we now have 53 minutes left. And hopefully we can end earlier today, but I would really like to discuss this definition. So while Sarah is speaking, it would be helpful if ... With what you see on the screen right now, do you have a proposed redline that you think is consistent with the current contractual obligations in the various documents that we've looked at?

So with that, I am now going to turn it over to Sarah. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Well, gosh, Michael, you kind of stole my thunder here. What I wanted to say is that I do not understand where this example of the phone just ringing has come from. So as far as I understand, nobody is considering that that would be an affirmative response.

Also, I'm not sure that we're required in this group to identify what an affirmative response actually is. I feel like that would be

something kind of determined between ICANN Compliance and the relevant registrar.

But, anyways, I don't think anybody it's just ringing. It's, as you said, an actual interaction with the person who answers the phone.

And so the verification method, which is e-mail or telephone, as we've said, is here in the definition in the top paragraph there. I do have some hesitation around including those specific examples because it's incorporated from a contractual obligation, and I kind of feel like a definition should stand on its own. But as you said, it does reference or encapsulate or encompass the current contractual obligations.

And so I do think that this is accurate to what we're currently doing—"accurate," ha! And I definitely agree that we all need to be on the same page on how we're using those terms "verification" and "validation," which I think shouldn't be too hard for us to do. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Steve, you have the floor.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. So let me try to move this forward. Let's assume that the operational validation includes an affirmative response. So let's assume that the contractual requirement that either phone or e-mail is provided is taken. The question that I think is quite important is, where is the relationship between that

requirement, assuming that's the one that is taken, and whether or not it actually serves the purposes that are needed? And, within the scope of this scoping exercise, does that question get addressed at all, or are we limited to just saying, "Well, these are what the contracts say. These are the operational. These are the procedures that have to be followed"? and the question of whether or not it actually serves the purposes of the community are outside the scope of this work. If so, then we should document that very clearly and say that's sort of beyond our paygrades, colloquially, and that, if people want to talk about whether or not this whole system, even if it works as specified, fails to meet those needs, there's some other place for that kind of discussion.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Thanks.

Beth, I saw your hand up and go down. Do you want to speak? Do you want the floor right now?

BETH BACON: Well, I was going to pass, but since you're giving it to me ...

MICHAEL PALAGE: There you go.

BETH BACON: See? You could have skipped right over me.

I want to say thank you, Mike. I appreciate the logical steps we're going through. We should have a definition so that we can have a foundation and a shared understanding of what we are even talking about. And then, if we go down through our assignments, Question 3 is, is it sufficient? So that's Steve's question.

So I think that, if we all look at what we have written—and we do have good information as to what we're doing ... When I was talking about what are we thinking about with regards to outcomes, that's maybe more what Steve is getting: how are we presenting this information? I personally think that a scoping team is meant to present facts, data, a snapshot that can inform then an issues report saying, "Okay. Well, this is really good information and we see this. This is the definition. This is the activity associated with that currently. These are the needs to identified desires of the community as well the contracted parties and external forces and things that we've heard. Here's where our scope of our PDP will lie to make improvements or changes or discuss if that's necessary."

So I think that's what I was thinking when I was saying, what are we doing with regards to outputs? But I do think, Steve, your question is going to get answered in #3, or at least that information will allow future people to answer that question.

STEVE CROCKER:

So, quickly, with respect, if the result in 3 is that the specifications that have been developed in 1 and 2 aren't sufficient to meet these various needs, that would seem ... Well, two possibilities. One, that either is a signal that Question 3 should have been

taken up before Questions 1 and 2, or that's merely a documentation of the limitations as opposed to any attempt to adjust the requirements to meet the needs.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Steve, I think, if we find that there is a problem, that is kind of what 4 accounts for. So I think that is the logical approach. So one of the reasons we've been given rather, I would say, some strong suggestive guidance in how we want to go about following our tasks is, after we do that analysis ... Now that could potentially be external surveys. That could be surveys conducted by the registrars. We don't know what those options are. This is the black box we were talking about for Assignment 3. But once we undertake that analysis of "is this accurate?" I think this is where some of the concerns may come in from your aspirational definition. Then that would potentially drive #4.

So what I want to do here is, Scott, I will let you speak, and then we're going to be halfway through our call. So what I am going to do at that point in time is I really want to focus our discussion on the definition. And if no one else has any comments, I do. And I will actually be attempting to make friendly amendments to the definition that currently appears on the screen.

Scott, you have the floor.

SCOTT AUSTIN:

I'll try to be brief. Sarah just said something that really caught my attention and it was along the lines of it's not just ensuring that the phone is ringing. It is actually communicating—let's use the term

“communicating”—with the registrant that’s referenced by the account holder as opposed to being [inaudible]. If that is the case, and that is what ... Because I think what we’re really focusing on here is what is the existing definition [that the] WHOIS accuracy programs participation section have, which is in the third paragraph of the table that you’re focusing on right now. But I’d like to hear from Sarah and/or anyone else from the registrar/registry group that’s on if that is consistently the average of how this is interpreted because I think the problem with any definition is that multiple parties here will be interpreting it. And perhaps we do need some guidance in terms of what those terms or what the accuracy program section [inaudible] specification section [inaudible] really is supposed to be because now I think I’ve heard two different versions of what that is. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, Scott, what happens here ... Sarah, I will let you respond and then I am going to be a little firm and move forward to discussing the definition. During this time, Scott, a lot of your colleagues are still having problems. Would it be possible for someone to contact Scott and perhaps maybe arrange a call so we can perhaps get a landline, something a little better?

So—

SCOTT AUSTIN:

I heard you, Michael, and I’ll try dialing in.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Thank you very much. Sarah, did you want to respond?

SARA WYLD: Thank you. Yes, I'm happy to respond, but also, I feel a little bit bad because now I think Scott is going to have to drop off the call. So maybe he won't hear the answer.

My understanding of this question is, what is the standard implementation of this requirement for operational accuracy? And it's a bit hard to answer that because I have not done a survey of all registrars to ask them how they have implemented this. I have some experience at the different businesses where I have worked or personally purchased a domain name, but I don't know how much of that is representative of the entire body of registrars around the world.

So I do believe that e-mail verification is more common than a phone number verification, but both of them are options. I am familiar with registrar platforms that allow a phone call to be made or a text message to be sent to the phone number. If you send a text message, it would include a link. You click the link. It goes to a webpage. You check a box on the webpage and click Save. There we go. I have verified that this phone number really does come to me.

So that could be an example of an implementation, but it's very difficult to answer what is the standard overall method. And so if we decide as a group that that is information we need, then that might be something to consider including if we do a survey of

providers. But maybe we don't need that because maybe that's not really the scope of what's to be addressed by us. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Sarah. And hopefully that is something that we could do. I know early on you were a big advocate of potentially doing surveys that did not necessarily attempt to reach out and engage the end registrant for obvious GDPR concerns that have been voiced by the registrar constituency. But hopefully this is something where the registrars themselves would be able to respond and give us some important data points.

So now, three minutes over, I want to get back to what's on the screen. And I will again open the floor. Is there anyone who has a particular proposal to mark up the definition as it appears now? I want to give everybody a chance to weigh in. And if not, I will be proposing some questions to Sarah and the rest of her registrar colleagues on hopefully some friendly amendments that they may want to take into consideration.

Beth, you have the floor.

BETH BACON:

Thank you. I'm going to ask a very logistical and yet annoying question. So once we look at this definition—thank you for that; it's delightful—and we make some suggestions and things, if we have questions and thoughts—we're going to have another week or so; you said four weeks to shop it back—but if we have other amendments or changes that we would like to make to not identify something that we want to change, in that we don't want to make

it a different requirement but something that we don't think reflects the current definition, is that something we're going to be able to do in those next four weeks, or is the next four weeks just to go back and work with our stakeholder groups and say, "How do you guys feel? Do you think that we need more different/other/something?"

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So I would not view this as a "speak now or forever hold your peace"-type moment regarding this definition. If there is some discussion to perhaps move this one way or another, I think we're probably right now in the 90% range of what I think we need as a working definition based upon what's in the contract. That's my opinion.

However, if there are people that can say, "Mike, you haven't considered this. You haven't considered that," that's where we'll obviously try to tweak it or move it. But I we cannot agree on what we would call a rough consensus working definition, it's really hard to take that and give that as a reference point for other groups to begin discussing what they potentially view as their aspirational definition.

Okay. I see lots of hands. So Melina, you have the floor.

MELINA STROUNGIS:

Thank you, Michael. And I also agree with Sarah's proposal in the chat. Just so I understand, now we're focusing on the accuracy information—so what is currently the case, not what we would like to see—and I'm wondering, would it be helpful in this definition to

also take, when determining what is currently the accuracy definition in place, into account the purpose behind what is currently in place, for instance, by referring to what is in the ICANN bylaws and the various purposes referenced therein when coming to define accuracy, basically?

MICHAEL PALAGE: I would tend to agree with that. And I know we have Thomas and Stephanie that may want to speak more authoritatively on this. But I know one of the things that they always commented on is, when the data is collected, what is the purpose of processing that data? So I think, from that standpoint, I would be of the opinion that I would potentially see that being within the questions that we could ask. If I'm calling balls and strikes, I think that would be a fair question that we could look at from an aspirational standpoint as well as part of Assignments 3 and 4. That's my current best guess on what I see before me.

Does that answer your question, Melina?

MELINA STROUGIS: Yes. Thank you, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Lori, you have the floor.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you, Michael. I just want to clarify. I understand that we're looking at the reality language, so to speak. This is the reality of

the registrars and registries today. And then to your point, Mike, there's aspirations. But my own feeling about this definition, we should at least have it acknowledged ... In our preparatory reading, we had these three elements to consider. And then we learned that two of the three elements are in the working definition that the registrars and registries are using, but the third element is not. What I would like is to have it somewhere acknowledged in this definition that there is this third element, even if it is not in the contracts to recognize there's an element that we should potentially be discussing. Whether or not we want to include that in a recommendation moving forward about how to scope an element, to me that's something.

I'm not troubled by the fact that this is what the registrars and registries are using. This is what they're using. That's a daily fact. What I am troubled about is that this important third prong just isn't recognized anywhere. And if they're not working with the third prong, at least say, "There is a third prong and we're not working with it." But I just don't want it to be discarded. That's my concern.

MICHAEL PALAGE: And, Lori, if you could—I was multi-tasking, trying to take notes—for my benefit, could you just articulate again what you view as a third prong?

LORI SCHULMAN: I think it was referred to either as verification or validation, that there is a person at the other end and it's the person that is the person.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. All right. Thank you.

LORI SCHULMAN: I don't know a more technical definition of that, but that's what I'm concerned about. I understand the operational. I understand it's the tactical. It's the third one that's the most problematic in terms of how to operationalize that. I get it, but it has been part of the reading, part of the briefing, part of the analysis, of what accuracy really means, and I believe it should be recognized even if we're not working with it. It should be recognized as part of a definition of accuracy but a piece that we're not currently working with under the contracts.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. What Lori is referring to is what I would call verifying a person's identity. So, for example, they tell me their name and they send me a picture of their identification time and I make sure that the name on the domain name matches the name on the card. That is not a thing that we do. It is not a contractual obligation. I don't recall seeing it in the reading. So I guess I missed something. I would definitely appreciate if Lori or somebody on the team could tell me exactly where in the existing reading that is documented so that I can make sure to catch up and be on the same page as everyone else. But ultimately that is

not a requirement. It is not a thing that we're going to start requiring here in this scoping team. So I do not agree that it should be considered or included in the definition. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Sarah, you could not have teed up my first intervention better. So I actually want to literally address the topic that you just raised. So for the remainder of the next 34 minutes, we are only going to be discussing redlining what is on the screen because we need to get this done. So this is one of my proposed redlinings. Sarah, the issue of identity ... You specifically said you don't think that identity was referenced anywhere.

If I could, Berry, I'm going to need you to drive here for a minute. Can you pull up background briefing assignment #1? Oh, we're already in ... Oh, could you search for the term "is about identity"? Search for the text string "is about identity." There we go.

So what happens is, Sarah ... What I have heard from you ... And this is going to address your comments about "shall strictly." It's almost like a double "you shall." I'm thinking of Animal House and double-secret probation. You use the term "shall strictly." The problem I have with that rather rigid definition ... I would agree "is" is probably the better word. That is what I would propose as a friendly markup. Remove "shall strictly" and replace it with "is." And the reason why is, in this background briefing document, it says that, if the complaint is about identity—i.e., the registrant is not who they say they are—Contractual Compliance may ask the registrar to provide further information. Going back and forth, my job—[call] balls and strikes— ... I cannot reconcile this reference

to identity checking by ICANN Compliance to fit within this current definition that the registrars have put forward.

And the next thing, if I could ... And where I think this may go is the registrars have been doing a lot of visible heavy lifting. I've received comments from my registry colleagues that they also too are doing heavy lifting as well in the background. They're just being a little more quiet.

And what I tried to do on the mailing list is I just forwarded a number of provisions or policies where the registry operator will be involved in perhaps collecting some additional data. Now, this generally occurs in more of the niche TLDs—.bank, .pharmacy, .aero—but it does happen with some of the larger TLDs, such as XXL, where they talk about the identity verification.

So my specific proposal here would be to strike "shall strictly be defined" ... [Accuracy is] syntactical accuracy. And the reason I'm doing that is referencing that specific point about ICANN Compliance talking about identity.

So this is my question to the group, including my ICANN Org colleagues. Could someone understand why ICANN Compliance would undertake an identity check? What is their authority for doing that if it doesn't exist in the registrar agreements or the registry agreements? What is the legal basis that they would be doing an identity check? That's the first main question that I have and I think perhaps goes to the third prong that Lori was asking. I don't think we're there. I'm not saying that we define identity, but my proposal would be to strike "shall strictly be defined," and

alternatively say “is,” unless someone can come up with a different definition.

And I see lots of hands, which is good thing. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Yes, Michael, that surprised me, also—that section in the document—because I don’t understand why Compliance would ask for that information. There is no contractual requirement to verify identity. I could image that, perhaps, if there we a complaint about identity and the registrar closed the complaint, that maybe there’s some way that Compliance is just allowed to access information? But any kind of complaint that comes to a registrar? That doesn’t sound right either. So I don’t know. I guess this is a question that needs to be posed to ICANN Org as to why they included that in this documentation.

I do still strongly disagree that anything related to identity verification should ever be included in this definition of accuracy.

So I don’t mind the tracked change here, changing from “shall be strictly defined as” to “is,” but I do not consider that that would in any way include identity verification. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you. And, Sarah, I have begun coming up with my own list of questions for ICANN Legal and well as ICANN Compliance. So this is going to be some of the fun stuff that we will be entertaining over the next couple of weeks.

Beth, you have the floor.

BETH BACON:

Okay, I can work a computer. Hi, everybody. It's Beth. Sorry, I have way too many screens going.

Sarah kind of hit on all the questions that I was going to bring up with regards to A) I don't see where it says identity verification, B) it's not a requirement of the contract, so Contractual Compliance can't or should not or is very unlikely to be asking a question about something that is not a requirement in the contract because they enforce the contracts.

Then you moved into talking about some registry validation activities and other data. We don't have an input here from the registries because we were still discussing it. And, frankly, this might be my fault because I didn't realize that we were going to be coming to consensus on a definition today. The registries are still working on an input.

But I have a concern about expanding this into things that are not A) on this paper, B) haven't been submitted, C) are not universal amongst all registries because I think, to the extent there is validation for certain registries or certain business models of registries, those are certainly not universal and they are not standardized.

So I think that that is kind of a false hope in saying, "Hey, registries also collect all the data and there's other verification or validation activities," and, frankly, there's no standard approach there. So I am concerned if we do get into that. I think that is a

much broader discussion rather than kind of nodding to it in a discussion of a base definition. So that's my piece. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Beth. Real quick, I'm going to call on Melina. Melina, during the GAC drafting communique last week, I believe they were specifically changes made in the communique regarding accuracy. Originally, it said "registry and registrar." It then was changed to "registrar." And I believe the language was "applicable registry." They did make a change to recognize that there are some registries that will do that.

If you will, two questions to you, Melina. Has the GAC communique been finalized and shared with the community? That's Question 1. And perhaps Question 2: can you speak to what may finally appear in the communique on accuracy regarding registries?

MELINA STROUNGIS: Thanks, Michael. You have to give me a few minutes to go and check because I don't remember [inaudible].

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Do you know if it's available right now—the GAC communique?

MELINA STROUNGIS: Let me double-check with Ryan, who's also on the line.

MICHAEL PALAGE: It is available.

MELINA STROUNGIS: I think it is available, yes.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Berry, can you pull that up? I think this would be helpful because I know I was paying attention to it during the GAC drafting session. So can you open up that link? Thank you. And if you can go to the accuracy section. And then I believe it was the third paragraph. Okay.

MELINA STROUGIS: I don't think it's there.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Oh, here we go.

MELINA STROUNGIS: It's here, yeah.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yeah. Scroll down to the third paragraph: "by registrars and certain registries." There we go. So, "The GAC gives particular importance to verification, validation, and correction by all registration data by registrars and certain registries."

So, Beth, to your point, I understand the concern of the registries and other contracted parties: that the actions of some registries may somehow open up Pandora's Box as to their obligations.

What I think I am trying to achieve here is to come up with a definition that is the most narrow definition but in fact the broadest definition that could work the, shall we say, thin registries of the world, as well as the uber thick and niche registries, such as the .banks and .pharmacies of the world.

So that is one of the reasons why ... Berry, thank you for this. Can we go back to the thing so we can propose some more redlines? This is one of the reasons why, Sarah, in, I think, my original definition I talked about registration data elements. And I agree there's not a lot of definition on that.

So perhaps the friendly amendment I would make here is "registration elements processed by registrars and applicable registries." So what I would try to do here is actually model the language after what appeared in the GAC communique because I thought they were striking a proper balance. This is my opinion. But that would potentially be my ... So now I see lots of hands, so I am going to be quiet.

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

BETH BACON:

I'm sorry, Mike. Can I respond?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: I apologize, Alan. Is that okay with you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

BETH BACON: With such enthusiasm. Thank you, Alan. I appreciate you very much.

So first of all, I have a very big concern that I think that you just put in words in my mouth.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Oh, I'm sorry. You have the floor. Please correct it. I'm sorry.

BETH BACON: I'm about to do that. So I didn't say the registries were concerned about scope creep. I said that we are concerned because that is not a standardized practice and there's no baseline there for us to define. If that's a practice that we, in the future, in Step 3, say, "Now we have a definition," about, and then we talk our time and say, "What are the actual needs and outputs of an accuracy? What's the purpose of an accuracy operation? What need is that supposed to meet? Is it not meeting that need?" maybe there's something that we could do differently. And then you could look at

other resources and other activities. But I don't think that's a baseline definition. And I think that, by saying "certain registries" or "applicable registries," I think that's very vague for a definition.

So A) it's not a concern about scope creep. It's a concern about having an accurate, clear foundation from which to start. And then B) Steve got a few good questions in the chat, asking, "What are the specifics of registries?" And first of all, it's not necessarily a verification of identity. It's a validation procedure. And, again, it's very subjective to the registry. So maybe those are questions we can ask during our research portion of this activity, but I just wanted to make sure that this is a stable and very clear definition from which to jump off.

So I appreciate the opportunity to respond, Alan. Again, thank you for your patience.

MICHAEL PALAGE: And I apologize, Beth. I never want to put words in anyone's mouth. So thank you for clarifying that.

Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. This discussion is making me worry that we are trying to take the operational process that is an attempt to verify accuracy in our contracts because clearly our contracts only propose reasonable things that will cover most cases and try to make that the definition. And I think they may well be two different things and I'm not sure that just saying what the process has to be

followed, which is essentially what our definition is talking about, is the definition of accuracy.

If you look at GDPR, accuracy has to be as accurate as necessary for the purpose. And it's not clear that this process will achieve that. And I know we're not trying to achieve GDPR, but I'm just giving it as an example.

We've been told by our registrar colleagues many times that the problem is not providing inaccurate data but providing data that's accurate but not yours. And we've heard many times of things like someone says their Facebook and they give us their Facebook real address. Well, fine.

So I think, when it comes down to it, identity is going to be a subject that is relevant. It's not something we ask you to verify regularly, but it may become a question and I don't think we can sidestep it. So I agree with your medication, and I would perhaps replace "is" by saying "is generally," which allows the escape hatch: there are times when something more will have to be done, perhaps based on a complaint. But nevertheless, just verifying that the information is syntactically accurate and someone responds may not be sufficient. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Thank you, Alan. Roger, you have the floor.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Michael. I'm a little confused here. I raised my hand several different topics ago, I think.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I apologize for not seeing it sooner.

ROGER CARNEY: No, that's okay. Just to address Alan's comment, I think he's back on the aspirational side and not talking about how it's defined today. Again, it's different to me how it's defined today and where we want it to go. So I just wanted to say that.

But I wanted to go back to your comment on the identity thing. Can we pull that text up?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yeah.

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Thank you. If you read this, I think people are reading it incorrectly. This says, if ICANN Compliance has a complaint about identity—so someone complained about identity—ICANN Compliance isn't asking the registrar to check identity here. ICANN Compliance can go back and ask the registrar what they found. They're not asking them to do additional work. They're not asking them to do identity. This says, "Compliance may ask the registrar for further information on their findings," not to find something new. This is further information on their findings. So ICANN Compliance isn't asking for registrars to do anything new. They're asking for additional details on what they already found.

So there is nothing in here that says registrars have to do identity compliance checks. Hopefully that makes sense.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Roger, I guess what I see is I would agree with your statement that this is not saying they must do identity checks. I would agree with that. The fact, though, that they talk about, if you will, a complaint about identity, the simple answer is, if we receive a complaint about identity, if it was truly out of scope, I guess, ICANN Compliance would do nothing. I'm just trying to look at the extremes and how to thread the needle on this one.

And just mindful of the time, we have 15 minutes left. I feel pretty confident that we are not going to be able to thread that needle on what is meant by this. So I think it's in our collective best interest to come up ... Perhaps the contracted parties could come up with some follow-up questions as well as the non-contracted parties on what this definition means so that we can get clearance and guidance from ICANN Org, whether that's from Compliance or Legal, on what that means because I do think this is important to clarify things. Thank you.

Berry, you are highlighting stuff with the validation or verification requirements.

So, again, the question would be: "would typically close. What would be the typical situation in which it would not close?" And these, I think, are some of the questions that we really need to drill down on, including perhaps some guidance on what does, if you will, an affirmative response perhaps mean.

Volker, you have the floor.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Thank you. I'm a bit disappointed that we are spending most of our time spinning our wheels delving into the aspirational issues that we decided earlier we would leave to Phase 3.

However, with regard to identity, there's one section where identity comes into play, which is in the transfer policy, where registrar is allowed to deny a transfer when the identity of the registrant is at stake. So it might be a complaint with regard to the transfer policy, where the registrar claims that this is their reason for denial and then ICANN will verify that.

It can also be that we have a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint and ICANN wants to see whether the registrar has done what they've required—i.e., have taken reasonable steps to investigate and, if necessarily, correct the inaccuracy in the data. And if the complainant complains that the inaccuracy is due to him not being the registrant, even though he's listed at the registrant, either to be having sold the domain or whatever the case may be, then ICANN will use that as a question to the registrar if they have done the reasonable steps that they're doing to address the claimed inaccuracy and investigate it. But that's, I think, the only sections. And it doesn't require the registrar to actually investigate the accuracy. It's just something that Compliance uses to test whether the registrar has complied with their obligations with regard to the transfer policy or WHOIS inaccuracy correction duty.

So it's more of a question, "Has the registrar taken reasonable steps to investigate what has been claimed?" and not, "Has the registrar actually done an identity check?" because in most cases that is not really possible on the Internet.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Volker.

Beth, I do want to address your comment in the chat there about us, if you will, litigating on the edge case. I always think it's important to remind everyone we are not proposing any policy. What we are doing is we are scoping. So from a scoping perspective, I think it is important that we scope on those edge cases to make sure that we ask the questions so that, when council decides to move forward with this—is there a need to move forward?—they will have that data.

So, again, I don't want to say we are litigating. I want to say we are looking at, can we come up with a definition that is inclusive of all of the use cases consistent with how it appears in the contract currently?

So we have twelve minutes left. With what we have right now as far as the proposed redline, what I would say here is, if we talk about data elements ... Well, let's leave that alone right now. I think we're pretty close on a rough consensus operational draft. I think I stated at the beginning we were at 90. I think we are at 95% as I said mentioned previously in the call in response to a question from Beth. Nothing we do here today is intended to be written in stone. What this is intended to do is to provide a basis

for groups to go back and discuss their aspirational definitions that may come forward when we get to the later phases.

So what I will do is I'm feeling this probably a good time to end the call unless there are any final questions, comments, or concerns.

BERRY COBB: Michael, this is Berry Cobb.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: I'd just like to point out Lori's recent chat. And I think that that's a good example of the comment that I pasted at the very beginning of the call that Mr. Crocker was responding to. What Lori put in the chat is, to me, almost near a textbook example of the homework that we're assigning out to be done over the next month. And it is to take this current working definition, which I term as current—what is our current state that we're dealing with today ... And the aspirational definitions that we're asking for groups to come up with I term as desired state or future state—something along those lines. And think of it in the context of a solution looking for a problem. We don't want that.

What we're looking for is, if you do have an aspirational definition, then as Lori puts in here that accuracy is divorced from identity—and she believes that's a gap in the current definition ... And so I think, as a loose example here, Lori would take the current state

definition, redline it in a way or add text to it that would perhaps include language that would marry identity with accuracy ... But most importantly, which is the basis for the text that I posted at the beginning, what problems are you solving to get to your desired-state definition. And I think we've seen instances of that in the interventions today when people were talking about issues about not being able to contact the registered name holder and those kinds of things. But the identification of what problem is being solved with this future-state definition ... And it should be in bulleted form and pretty clear about either citing specific examples that have been encountered. Maybe there's external reports that have pointed to the fact that this was a gap or a current issue that is being experienced today.

So I just wanted to put some emphasis and focus on that as to hopefully provide clarity as to where we're going. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Berry. That was very helpful and, I think, did help us draw us to a close. I'm just looking. It's very hard to multi-task, doing multiple things at the same time.

In the chat when we're talking about identity, one of the questions that has come up to me as I'm reading through all this document—and this is a question perhaps, Sarah, you may go back and consult with your registrar colleagues on—is, in all of the agreement, it always talks about accurate and reliable data. Those two words are use inextricably together. Now, interestingly enough, our scoping is only about “accurate.” At no point in time is “reliable” there.

And the reason that I say this—and I think this is one of the examples we may have discussed offline—is, if someone were to come forward and put some fictitious information in a domain name registration that they used a disposable e-mail account or a disposable phone for, but on it's face it was clearly inaccurate or not valid—again, Mickey Mouse; Lake Buena Vista—in that situation, that could be accurate per the definition that we just discussed here today. But I guess the question that I have is, is it reliable? I'm just asking, does that reliability somehow factor in? Is that a yin and a yang? Can you have one without the other. So reliability is why we do verification.

SARAH WYLD: Michael, can I speak to that?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Please, Sarah. I would love that.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I do think, as Beth said, those are some assignments—three questions. “Accurate” and “reliable” I think are pretty much used to be the same thing. They're used as synonyms, even though they're not really. So in my personal way I look at it, “accurate” is the validation part and “reliable” is the verification; get an affirmative response. But I'm not sure that that's how other people consider it, and I don't really think that that's something that we need to spend a lot of time on. It doesn't seem like that's going to make any significant any changes here.

I will say, of course, that a disposable e-mail account is not necessarily inaccurate. It could be something that the person does maintain for the duration of the registration record, and there's no reason why that is inappropriate any more than a Gmail address would be inappropriate.

And then also there could very well be a person named Mickey Mouse. Right? So who are we to say that they're not who they say they are? If somebody writes in and says, "This domain has my e-mail on it but I don't own it," then that's a thing to deal with, yeah. But it doesn't necessarily mean that it's inaccurate. It could be a mistake. If I have swyld@gmail and somebody writes to s.wyld and they think it goes to Sam or they put the wrong e-mail on their signup, it's inaccurate but not necessarily malicious. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Beth, you can bring us home. You have the last word this week.

BETH BACON: That's not good for everyone. Thank you very much. So I have a couple of questions or confusion about a couple of the things that you said in your wrap-up there, Michael. Oh, you, too, Lori. Thanks.

So you noted that you're trying to get this definition to maybe get capture some edge cases, maybe capture some things that aren't already done, like reliability. But my understanding that's kind of Assignment 3. And earlier in the discussion, you noted that this is to capture what is done now without judgement to whether it's good, bad, or ugly—just capture what we're doing now so that we

have something to measure against when we get to our other assignments. So now I'm not sure what you want. So I think that would be very helpful clarification. I think I'm flag-in-the-sand for the team. Let's get something, a shared and foundational understanding that there's no judgement to whether it's good, bad, or ugly or whether, by Assignment 3, we're going to say, what were we thinking?

And I think that a few comments on the call, like from Lori and others, saying there are concerns ... I think not capturing in this definition doesn't mean that we're not going to discuss them. It just means that this is our foundation.

So I think that sort of confused me a little bit. I will wrap it up, but I just wanted to put that little note in people's minds, since we are going to do another couple days on this, it seems, or some e-mails, that some clarification as to what we're doing is helpful.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Beth. And I will leave you with the last word. Thank you, everyone. I look forward to seeing everyone next week. Please do the intercessional homework. Steve has asked for the chat to be, I guess, circulated on the list. If we can use the e-mail to make more efficient use of our time, I would appreciate that. And I look forward to seeing everyone next week. Stay safe.

Oh, Beth did you have your hand up or is that an old one?

That's an old one. Okay. I think we are done.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]