ICANN Transcription

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team

Tuesday, 05 October 2021 at 14:00 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/oQluCg

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, taking place on Tuesday, the 5th of October, 2021 at 14:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will 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, we have no apologies listed for today's meeting. However, Steve Crocker will attend the first half an hour of the meeting only and Sophie Hey will attend the second portion of the call only.

Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has update to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please email the GNSO secretariat.

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.

All members will be promoted to panelist for today's call. Members, when using chat, please select "panelists and attendees" or "everyone," depending on your Zoom update, in order for everyone to see your chat. Observers will have view only to the chat. 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 multistakeholder 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, Terri. Can you hear me fine?

TERRI AGNEW: I certainly can.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Perfect. Hello, everyone. I'd like to, again, extend a heartfelt thank you for everyone for volunteering for this effort to participate in the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. As I have tried to communicate through some of the introductory e-mails, one of the goals that I'm trying to do here is to reinvest and reaffirm the multistakeholder model. That's one of my objectives here. I'm hoping to make this as collegial as possible. I know some of the previous PDP processes have been a little tense. This is a scoping team. So since we're not actually trying to impose any

consensus policy, hopefully that will facilitate a more collegial collaboration among the participants.

So with that, I want to stick to the proposed outline here and kick it off with, basically, allowing everyone to do a quick introduction of themselves. And for those that have participated in the survey, if you feel comfortable reciting what you had stated in the survey, that would be welcome. If you'd like to give an alternate response, that's equally acceptable.

So with that, I would like to perhaps kick off. Steve, I know you said you were only going to be with us for the first 30 minutes. So perhaps I will give you the honor of going first to make sure you're first in the queue.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Michael. Very briefly, I've been focused for quite some time on a holistic view of the WHOIS problem, so to speak, of which the validation and accuracy issues are an important—not the only piece but an important piece—of the overall. I think I'll just leave it at that. I'm officially participating as an SSAC member. But more broadly, I have a deep and enduring interest in trying to bring some resolution to the not-a-problem of registration data that has bedeviled us for not just years but decades. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, Steve, if I could … And I appreciate your passion on this. If you could talk about what you see as what we could potentially avoid as pitfalls. Obviously, you mentioned it's been two decades. What do you think we could perhaps do differently to avoid some

of the impasses that ICANN Org or the multistakeholder model has run into in the past?

STEVE CROCKER: It's impossible to say all of the possible pitfalls because people are good at inventing new ones. But two that come quickly to mind are the following. One is getting into very detailed discussions about what I call boundary conditions or what some people call corner cases, particularly in areas like validation of data. In my mind, it's more important to talk about the center of the problem rather than the edges of the problem because there will always be problems around the edges.

The second is something that I know you, Michael, and many of us are aware of—is that the consensus process in ICANN has often been used, or at least sometimes been used, as a way of avoiding reaching consensus. I think that's not a positive outcome for anybody except possibly for those stakeholders that are driving it in that direction. But certainly not a positive outcome for the multistakeholder process, not a positive outcome for ICANN, and definitely not a positive outcome for the Internet as a whole.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. I appreciate that. I am just going to randomly go alphabetically according to how people show up in my Zoom participant list. So next up, Alan Greenberg. Alan, you're on mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm trying to get off mute. Thank you very much. I'm going to have to change my name so I'm not always first. I represent ALAC on this group. I've been involved in GNSO activities since pretty well my first [inaudible] 2006. I was liaison to the GNSO from the ALAC for eight years and I've participated in more activities, PDP and otherwise, many that were related to WHOIS, for much of that time since then.

I have believed accuracy is one of the more important issues that need to confront. And it's something that there's been a large fog over, in many ways, for many years. I'm hoping we can help to start our path going forward there. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Thank you. Next up on the list, I see Beth Bacon from the Registries Stakeholder Group. Beth?

BETH BACON: Hi, folks. I am here for the Registries Stakeholder Group. I'm very happy to join the team and I'm glad we're able to start chatting through this issue. I think that, at this point, there's been a lot of questions about accuracy and how it's important, what's currently required, and what may be needed or desired by different groups across the community. So I'm glad that we're able to talk about those things. And really, I think the priority here, for me, is to keep us really tight to our scope of identifying exactly what accuracy is and what requirements currently exist for us. And I'm looking forward to a nice conversation with all of you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:	Thanks, Beth. You talk about staying narrow on focus. I think that was one of the things that Steve talked about, perhaps—the edge cases and focusing on the center. Could you perhaps identify what you see as potential pitfalls of us staying not focused or getting to the penumbra or edge of our discussions?
BETH BACON:	Sure. And again, this is me speaking for me. I'm here with the Registries but I haven't talked about this too much yet with my colleagues. It's not even necessarily the edge cases. I think that it's important for us to say, "We're here to see what accuracy is. What is it currently in in the environment? What are the current requirements?
	I think that it's less the edge cases and more letting the outside influences, outside concerns, those forcing items like legislation and discussions in other venues, desires of what folks would like to see. I think it's keeping that out of the conversation because this is to scope the foundations and understand our current environment, as I understand it. So I think that's what I mean when I say scoping. So I would like us to really get a nice snapshot of where we are, what's the facts, and then we can look at those other things that are very important. But we can start from a shared foundation.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Thanks. I appreciate that, Beth. So I'm going to go to Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN:	Hello. I'm a member of the Intellectual Property Constituency. My day job is as senior of Internet policy for INTA. I echo what Beth and Steve have both said. Mike, I really appreciate the tone of how you started this meeting. I think this is about collegiality, absolutely. I think we're here as a scoping team with the responsibility to ask reasonable questions, to make sure those questions are focused, to make sure they're pointed, and that we keep realistic business risks in mind on both sides of the equation.
	We know that we've had fractures in the community about what is reasonable risk. But I think when we scope this particular project, we should acknowledge that. We shouldn't hide from it because I think it will be important. How do we answer the questions from a legal point of view and a technical point of view? Because here, where the legal and the tech meets the road, I would hate to ask questions that are not legally or technically feasible.
	And like many others here, I am a veteran of many work groups. And I have found that the groups work better when the scoping questions are clearer. I have been in groups where the questions have been vague or so broad, it's made it very difficult to come to conclusions and it's also created a ground for amplification of differences rather than coming together on where we agree.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Thank you, Lori. Next up we have Manju, I believe from the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group.

MANJU CHEN:	Hi, everyone. Unlike everybody else who spoke before me, I am not a veteran. This is my first time to join a scoping team. And I really look forward to what is going to be different than a working group because my only experience was with the EPDP Phase 2A working group. And yes. Thank you very much.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Thank you, Manju. And I will save some follow-up questions for Stephanie, a more veteran of this process. So welcome to the process and hopefully we make this enjoyable so that other people can contribute. I think that's the key, is making this as inclusive as possible and bringing as many voices in.
	Next up, Marc, you get to go second. I think Beth did a good job of outlining, I would say, the Registry concerns. Is there anything that you think she missed or would like to articulate on from your viewpoint there? Marc? Did we lose Marc? I think we just lost Marc.
MARC ANDERSON:	Can you hear me now?
MICHAEL PALAGE:	I can hear you now. Yes. Perfect. Welcome back.
MARC ANDERSON:	All right. Thank you. Sorry about that. Hi, everybody. This is Marc Anderson from the Registries Stakeholder Group. To answer your question, Mike, no. I think Beth did a great job teeing things off for

the Registries. For my part, I'm trying to come into this with an open mind. I want to understand the issues involved and the different opinions and views. Mike, thanks for kicking this off with a goal and aim towards keeping things cordial and collegial. I think that's a great message to start us off. So thank you.

For those of you I've worked with before, nice to work with you again. And for those of you I don't know, I look forward to getting to know you better as we go through this process.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thanks. Next up, Melina.

MELINA STROUNGI: Yes. Hi, everyone. I hope you don't hear the horrendous background noise that I'm having because unfortunately, there are some construction works here. So I really hope you can all hear me clearly. So yes. I'm working at the Internet governance sector of the European Commission. I'm here in my capacity as a GAC member, together with my colleague, Velimira. We will be sharing this position because due to time constraints, sometimes it will be me in the meetings, sometimes it will be her in the meetings. So I just wanted to let everyone know about this.

We very much appreciate this collegial approach and to be part of this effort. I have no problem to share. What we put in the document is essentially the same two replies that you will see. It's basically both mine and Velimira's input so we decided to have one voice. So we have shared the same input in the survey.

Basically, what we would like is to have really an open mind and also holistic approach in the scoping effort, which would mean that when talking about accuracy, we would not limit ourselves to the GDPR definition of accuracy which would cover personal data but have a rather more general approach towards registration data in general.

So yes, I would be more than happy to further discuss the input of the survey. And looking forward to meeting everyone. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Melina. I think next up, we get to hear from our first registrar. Roger, you're up.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Michael. I like going later. It's nice. What everybody said was excellent. I do like the positivity so far. And I think Melina said something really good that I'd like to tag on to, is there's a lot of different definitions of accuracy floating around. I think that's important for this group to identify those and maybe come up with different terms or whatever, but kind of express those different ideas of what accuracy is.

And going all the way back to what Steve said, focusing in on the scope of which ones are those definitions are is important for this group to hit on and work through.

I assume it's not going to be all of them. I assume it'll be a small group of however we get to those definitions of accuracy. So that's what I'm looking forward to. Thanks, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Roger. Ryan Carroll, I think you're next up in the queue.

RYAN CARROLL: Hi everybody. I've actually just joined maybe five seconds ago. Sorry to be late. So I don't exactly know what I'm in the queue for.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. What you're in the queue for is we're kind of just doing a general introduction, giving participants to restate those that participated in our surveys at a high level what you view as your objectives in participating in this group and what you identify as potential pitfalls or problems that we might avoid. So hopefully that has teed it up and you're a quick thinker and you can respond.

RYAN CARROLL: I'll do my best. Ryan Carroll here from the National Telecommunications & Information Administration in this group on behalf of the GAC, here to carry on lots of the historical work that the GAC has done on accuracy and provide perspective from governments to the importance of accuracy to lots of the different governmental missions that the agencies that I think we collectively represent take forward.

I don't have a ton of insight on—well, I guess I'll start by saying that I'm not new to the GAC or even some of the issues here, but I am new to the topic of accuracy a bit. So a pitfall for me would be

not knowing what I'm talking about, so I'm going to do a bit of homework to be an effective interlocutor here, but I think our goals here are to really try to see where we can take the accuracy discussion given all the work that's gone on on registration data in the last few years and see if there's not a new way to have this discussion that I think has been had in a lot of different ways in the community.

That's sort of a baseline there. Hopefully that's enough.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Ryan, and sorry for putting you on the spot with only 30 seconds of notice. Next up, Sarah from the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

SARAH WYLD: Hi everybody. Happy Tuesday. I am very excited to contribute my knowledge of data protection requirements and my experience from working in different capacities in the registrar community for around 15 years. So I look forward to meeting our broader community's needs, which of course requires that we identify and confirm with data what those needs are. I think we need to be very careful about making assumptions.

In terms of my answers to the survey, I won't repeat them here and now, I'll just paste them into the chat so that everybody can see if they want to. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Sarah. Stephanie Perrin, you're up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I apologize on behalf of me and Manju. We are behind in our input. We are latecomers to the group. I think we were hoping for some fresh blood on this particular file because certainly, I've been at it a long time.

Background, I guess I started with WHOIS in 2005 when I was director of policy at the Canadian federal privacy commissioner responsible for coming up with our response to the WHOIS discussions of the day.

Then I joined ICANN after joining the EWG in 2013, and I've been at it ever since. So it is no surprise that my perspective on the matter of accuracy is coming from the lens of data protection. ICANN is responsible for the management of how the domain name system was commercialized, and therefore, they ought to be looking at accuracy, in my view, the accuracy demands that they impose on the contracted parties with a data protection perspective. In other words, do not collect more information than you need and do not force more accuracy than you need, because that is an added burden on the individual Respondent, the data subject.

We have consulted our colleauges. We expect the input to the survey and questions to you as soon as possible. I realize that you're trying to stick to deadlines, but I can only plead being really guilty and really busy. So we'll get it to you as soon as we can, but

I think anybody who's worked on the EPDP has a pretty good idea of how I view accuracy. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Stephanie. We do appreciate the time commitment that everyone makes. Thank you. Next up, we have Susan Kawaguchi from the BC.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Hi Michael. Unfortunately, I was out on vacation until last night so I did not do the survey. But a quick recap. I represent the BC, I'm a consultant—as most people know, I was with Facebook for a lot of years, and eBay—and utilized the WHOIS information to combat fraud and abuse of the companies' users. I currently consult mainly for Appdetex but I do have some other clients also.

I started out in 2005 on the WHOIS issue, was on the WHOIS review team, the RDS, EWG, you name it. WHOIS is sort of my thing. Have always found the inaccuracy of the WHOIS data a mystery, and that continues as redacted data is revealed and that we're finding a high level of inaccuracy continues. So I'm hoping we can come to an agreement on that definition. I agree a strong definition of accuracy is important, and I'm looking forward to working with those that are not the usual players and the usual players, because we all know each other. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thanks, Susan. Toba, I believe you're the second Business Constituency representative. If you could speak next.

OLUWATOBA OBANIYI: Yeah, absolutely. I am very new to this, so please forgive me if I'm not aware of many of the protocls. I saw the documentation quite a lot. But a little introduction. My name is Toba Obaniy, I'm CEO of a company called WhoGoHost here in Nigeria, West Africa.

From our experience, because we offer webhosting and domain registration services, we've seen quite a lot of abuse-related cases, and the fact that people seem to be able to get through with anything because the process of registration—you really need nothing. You can just provide any information and data.

Over here locally, there's been some discussions about trying to solve this problem using KYC, which obviously is not very effective, because that simply means that bad actors can just do business with providers outside the jurisdiction of law enforcement here.

But it just clearly shows that it's a very big problem, at least from my perspective, especially around abuse and how easy it is for people to get away with creating accounts simply for defrauding people. And there's not a lot being done to solve this problem. It's a serious problem for the Internet and it's not slowing down.

I'm hoping that during this discourse, we'll be able to come up with reasonable solutions that can help us to fight this by coming up with solutions that can work across the board that can make it easier for us to track or at least get some sense of accuracy when registrants get online. Thank you very much.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Toba. I want to thank you for being our only representative from Africa. The one thing I did want to comment on, just to set expectations, I don't think this group as a scoping team were looking at gathering facts, not necessarily proposing solutions. It is the hope that we will set a foundation of facts for either ICANN Org or the GNSO Council to look at what those specific solutions may be.

So I just always want to come back to that, because if people think we're setting solutions or consensus policy, that potentially brings us down the slippery slope of contention. So we're data gathering, we're scoping, and just want to make that note.

Volker, you are last, but you have the final say.

VOLKER GREIMANN: What an honor. Thank you very much. My name is Volker Greimann, I work with CentralNIC and I'm a representative for the Registrar Stakeholder Group on this scoping team. This is my first scoping team, but I wear the battle scars for many PDPs, so I have a feeling of what this scoping team should achieve to make any future PDPs that might result from this easier and much less contentious.

These are making sure that we have the right definitions from the start to avoid having to have endless discussions down the road. These would be questions such as what do we actually mean by accuracy, what ICANN purposes are served by that accuracy, who is responsible for maintaining accuracy or achieving accuracy. And if these questions cannot be answered by this group, then

any future policymaking groups will have a much harder time. So making sure that we have the right definitions based on facts, based on ICANN's purposes, based on what ICANN is all about, then we have achieved our goal. If we do not meet those objectives, then I fear for any future policy work. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. So what happens is the good news is we are on time. We have completed our welcome and introductions in the 30 minutes allotted. Lori, I see your hand up. Concerns, questions?

LORI SCHULMAN: I just have a question because yes, this is my first scoping team too, and as I mentioned in my little thoughts, having been on the receiving end of poorly scoped PDPs, it can be a nightmare. And I'm just throwing it out there for the group as a placeholder because I'm not sure this is exactly the right time, but it's on my mind that as we go down this road to agreeing to what we hope is a common term or commonality in how we define accuracy and therefore can lead questions from that definition to help guide whatever comes next to negotiations, would it be helpful, would it be useful and thoughtful to flag best practices as best practices? Not as recommendations, not as solutions, but in our research definitions, we're going to run across literature and ideas about what works and what doesn't. And would it be helpful to create some sort of, I don't know, guide or directory or helpful hints, for lack of a better word?

MICHAEL PALAGE:	I think that is a perfect segue into our next topic, about the resources that we as a scoping team will have. And I'm going to be calling on Marika in a minute or two to begin walking through those various documents. But to address your point, I would just point to the dialogue—and Steve unfortunately just dropped off. Him and I had a dialogue about the SAC 58 which talked about some of the different levels of validation or verification. And then I pointed to him to some new documents, the NIST and the [EITS.]
	So to me, I want to gather facts. I'm less concerned about the labels. Let's gather the facts. And if we have the facts, they will be the foundational basis for future work. And if future teams want to argue over whether it's a best practices or this or that, I don't think that would be the best use of our time, arguing over definitional. Let's gather the facts, then let's let other people argue how they will be defined. That's kind of my ... I want to keep us focused on that narrow remit. So hopefully that answers your question.
LORI SCHULMAN:	We'll see.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	We'll see. There we go. I'll try. And I'm sure if I don't satisfy you, you'll definitely let us know. So Marika, if I could turn it over to you to begin to walk through the incredible compilation of documents that you've done, which is going to make our life a lot easier as far as finding it. Although let me stress, there is a lot of homework for everyone to do. So Marika, I will let you begin walking through and try not to scare everybody.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Michael. Hopefully most of you have already seen or looked at documents that you can find here on the agenda. Of course, we don't have time for a very in-depth review at this point in time. We'll definitely get there. But we did want to touch upon all of these so you at least know what is in there and why these are important.

So the first document on the list is obviously the Council instructions to the scoping team. Quite a bit of thought and discussion went into what the scoping team is expected to do and what it is expected to consider. So please make sure to have a look at that and read through it. This is basically your guide for the questions you're expected to answer and provide recommendations to the Council on, as well as the expectations with regards to how you're expected to work and the timing of the effort.

One of the things that our staff support team was asked to do as part of these instructions—and I saw Sarah already referring to it as well in the chat, and I think Michael always made reference to it as well, is the index of relevant resources. So what we basically tried to do is pull together all the documents that we were able to get hold of or have knowledge of that basically touch upon the concept of accuracy over the years. So it's already a pretty lengthy document basically dating back to 2003.

What we've done for each of those documents is basically provide you with the year it was developed, a link to the actual text, an indication by who actually developed the document. We tried also

to highlight what are the main relevant sections or pages. Not all documents are relevant in the full document, but certain sections or pages, and we provided some comments on the status or relevant information that might be helpful.

So we would encourage you to have a look through the list and basically review the documents that we've indicated that are important to review, and especially those sections we've highlighted.

Several of you have already done homework on this by flagging certain documents that were missing from the list or information that should be added. So again, if there's something that you think is worthwhile adding here for the work that the group is going to undertake, please feel free to add it. You all should have comment abilities. So again, this is really intended to be a resource of information that the group can review and look back at as you go through the different assignments that the Council has provided the group with.

Following that, you have your index of resources. What we also did to help the group kickstart its conversations and really trying to help bring information together in one place is that for each of the four assignments that are identified in the instructions that were provided by the Council, we've created a background briefing.

Again, this is our best effort in bringing relevant information together. If there's something we've missed or information that you think is relevant, feel free to point that out. Again, all of these are Google docs for which you should have comment abilities so we're able to see if there are further suggestions.

But basically what we've done for each of those is start off with the assignment that you can also find in instructions from the Council, and then we basically try to break these down because most of the assignments have several aspects to them. So for each of the assignments, we've kind of broken it down in smaller pieces and tried to list the information. again, most of that derived from the index document, of information that's relevant as the group considers that specific part of the assignment.

So again, we've done our best to put together what we thought or seemed to be the most relevant as part of that conversation, but if we missed anything, please feel free to point that out. And this is also going to be part of the homework assignment for next week's meeting. We hope all of you can go through these background documents, look at the information that is in there.

What we've also done is for each of the assignment breakdowns, we've tried to identify specific questions to help to get input from the group that is really focused on making sure we have all the information that is necessary for you to think about how are we going to approach these assignments and translate that into a concrete work plan and approach. Because that's really what the group is expected to focus on in your first couple of meetings, to really think through how are we going to tackle these assignments, what do we need to be able to do so and how are we going to structure our approach.

So again, the ask for you is really to look at these questions that we've highlighted in tables in orange, and again, in advance of next week's meeting, please provide your answers to these because this'll really help facilitate the conversation, and again,

work towards development of a workplan and a detailed approach for how to tackle these.

So as said, we've done that for each assignment. As you've looked at the assignments, you'll see that for one and two, there's quite some information that is available. Three and four, there's less so. So the bulk of work and review for now will probably be on assignments one and two. Three and four are to a certain degree dependent on your work on assignment one and two, but still, even for those who try to identify some questions that we think are helpful to at least get the groups to start thinking about how to approach these and what may be necessary in order to be able to complete those assignments.

So I don't know, Michael, if you want me to go into any further detail at this stage. I think the plan is that for the next calls, we are going to do a detailed run through of these background briefings and the input that's provided on those, but I think maybe at this stage, it may be sufficient for pointing the group in the right direction and highlight again how important it is to review this information and ensuring that everyone is on the same page when it comes to what we have available and potentially as well, what is still missing or needed.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Marika. I think that was perfect, and right on time. Sophie who is also part of the registry group has joined late as a result of a conflict. Sophie, would you like to perhaps give a brief introduction? Beth and Mark had done a good job of articulating

SOPHIE HEY:
Sure. No problem. Thanks for that, Michael. Apologies for joining late, everyone. If this is going to be the time going forward for all these calls, then I will be missing the first half hour.

I'm Sophie, I'm based in London and I work with .brand registries and verified TLD registries. This is my first work on WHOIS accuracy in a formal group. I've been following the EPDP though. And I apologize for the Australian accent. That's it.

MICHAEL PALAGE:
Thank you, Sophie. So we have 18 minutes left, and what I'd like to do, according to our agenda, is being to discuss next steps and our future work, including what is the cadence that we will be meeting and our approach.

One of the things that I did want to discuss and bring to everyone's attention was we do not have anyone from Latin America, from South America participating. So I guess my thoughts there is if you know anyone—perhaps Alan, I believe ALAC still has an available slot open—if you can think about reaching out, I really do—if the multi-stakeholder model is going to work, we really need to focus on making sure that we have all viewpoints, and geographic diversity I think is important.

That being said, if we are unable to get some—and we do have light representative, I believe we only have one representative from the Asia Pacific region and one from Africa.

So one of the things that I would like to discuss or put out there for consideration for the group is, what can we do to perhaps address that shortcoming in the composition of the group. And there are two ideas that I would like to offer and put out there for consideration.

First is the potential use of alternates. I know alternates were used in other PDPs, especially the EPDP 1, 2 and 2A. So, is there anyone that would be opposed to the use of alternates? So we would limit who could participate on any of the plenary calls, but the use of those alternatives, as Melina had discussed with the GAC, helps with a burden or load sharing. So, is there any objections to the use of alternates that people could think of?

Okay, hearing no objections. That's good. One of the other ideas I wanted to float is something that has been done in connection with the SSAD ODP, I believe. And Marika, you can correct me if I'm wrong here. But there was an e-mail set up that would allow third parties to contribute thoughts or comments. It's what I would affectionately refer to as drive-by participation, the ability for someone to comment—if there was a certain topic, next week we're going to be discussing assignment one, somebody really feels passionate about it, there's the ability for them to comment.

And the reason that I think, personally, that this is important, is because this is a scoping team, there is not likely going to be a public comment period in connection with our work. So my thought

here is to have a dedicated e-mail set up. ICANN Org would be responsible for reviewing it, making sure no one was getting any spam. These third parties would not have the ability to direct directly to our mailing list.

So this is my thought of trying to address some of the deficiencies we have in the group's current makeup and how we could go above and beyond to commit to that multi-stakeholder model. So this is an idea that I had thought, I had shared some of these with our ICANN Org colleauges, and I'm putting that out there to the group. Good idea, bad idea? Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Michael. I guess I'm having trouble wrapping my head around what you just described. I think in general, it's a good idea to have inclusiveness and opportunities for broader community to participate. I'm not sure I quite follow or understand your proposal though, and perhaps I just need to see something in writing or have a chance to digest or absorb what you said. So I guess I'm open to the idea, but I'm not sure I quite understand or follow your proposal.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay, so what I will do in the interest of time is articulate in a written document or in an e-mail what I am proposing, and we could discuss this at a future meeting. So again, this is kind of what I would call encouraging everyone to throw spaghetti on the wall. We're trying to think outside the box here. So I will try to

articulate my thoughts in a more succinct manner via e-mail to the list.

Lori, were you also confused?

LORI SCHULMAN: A little, but I have another comment and an idea, and I don't know how well this would play or if it would work, but if we're throwing spaghetti, I've got a pot right here. So my organization has a global membership. We have a very large Latin American contingency. I've set up a small group to help support the work that I'm personally doing as the IPC representative, and I certainly can put a call out to Latin American members to make sure we have that participation. But how would I ever flag that to this group would be one of my questions.

And then the other is I agree about the global representation, absolutely, and I'm particularly thinking about Latin America because we know there's a trend with privacy law implementation, particularly in Brazil, Columbia and I think Chile. So I think there is a trend in the whole region to implement privacy regulations. Many of these regulations do mirror GDPR but some don't exactly.

So if I were to somehow figure out to get broad Latin American input, how would I indicate that to this group without breaking a rule? We're not going to have five representatives from INTA.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I think Lori, the question is, if we go with the alternate approach, if you were to designate someone from South America—take for

example today for some reason Scott did not participate on behalf of the IPC. So this would be a perfect example if he was to say "I'm not going to participate, let me designate an alternate from a Latin American IPC rep to participate." That to me would be an example of what we would be looking at.

That would be part one of my proposal, the use of alternates as had been done before in the past. And again, Marc, let me take a second stab at this with regards to the e-mail.

Marika, perhaps you could jump in here. I know we were having some discussions of how this was used on the SSAD, a dedicated e-mail to solicit input. I hate to put you on the spot, but could you articulate that?

MARIKA KONINGS: No problem at all. I posted the link in the chat. If people go there and basically scroll to the bottom of the page, I think we can see what we would have in mind. So basically, set up on the scoping team's Wiki page an opportunity or a link to the e-mail address that interested third parties or those that have something to share can send their suggestions to.

It would be a list that would be publicly archived. Staff would be on that list so we would directly receive any messages or are also able in that way to flag to the group if there's anything of relevance that comes in and that the group should be paying attention to.

It would also allow for example if at some point there are specific questions that the group is looking for broader input on to kind of promote that, either through a blog or through one of the

newsletters, or through your respective groups. And again, it's a way to lower the barriers for participation, because committing to participating in a group like this does take a lot of time and commitment. Certain people may only be interested in very specific parts of this work and that might be a way that allows for—I think Michael used the term drive-by participation as a way of allowing a channel—and of course, we need to see if—I have no idea if that would trigger one e-mail a month or 100 a week. It of course depends a little bit on how much visibility or promotion the group gives to it. But again, it's another channel that the group can provide for those that are interested in this topic and feel that they have something to contribute but are either not members of this effort or don't have the resources or time available to dedicate to fully participating in the effort.

So I think that's the idea, and I think we're thinking of setting it up in a fairly similar format as has been done for the SSAD ODP.

MICHAEL PALAGE: And Marc, hopefully Marika explained that. I think she did a much more articulate job. So hopefully that provided a bit of clarification, although I will still follow up with a specific e-mail with recommendations, not only on the use of this dedicated e-mail but also the alternates.

Sarah, please go ahead.

SARH WYLD: Thank you. Just on this same topic, I do absolutely of course support diversity of inputs here. I think getting input from a variety

of sources would be very valuable for our work. But I think also, we have to be very clear about what we want and what we are looking for.

One thing that we have found with comparing it to just the public comment process on PDPs' initial report as an example to compare it to, a lot of the responses that come in there are not actionable or not narrow enough to fit into what we're trying to accomplish or what kind of input and information we are looking for.

So I think in order for us to really gather useful actionable input from the worldwide community, probably better suited than an e-mail list would be a survey with targeted questions. And this is something that we touched on a little bit when we had our small team meeting with Michael just to get to know each other, that there's ways of asking questions that are effective and ways that are not effective. And not even asking a question is not effective at all, it is just going to get all kinds of random input.

So I think we have to figure out exactly what we want to accomplish and then put out questions and do surveys instead. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Sarah. Mindful of time, we have six minutes left. Sarah, I do genuinely like the idea of surveys, and surveys are something that I believe is considered in part three of our work assignment. So that's something that I think is definitely worth exploring more in the future.

The one thing that I want to touch on right now real quick is the topic of our regular cadence going forward. My goal here is to try to keep these to one plenary call a week going forward. And instead of having two plenary calls, actually make use of, if you will, SCRUM teams. I want to take a more agile approach to the scoping work as opposed to what I would call the traditional waterfall approach that tends to drive a lot of ICANN processes.

This is something I want to attempt. If it does not succeed or fails epically, we will go back to the waterfall, but I do want to try some other ideas here. So part of that will be one plenary call a week and then the use of some SCRUM teams working in an agile environment that would be able to break off.

So that's something that I am considering. If the group is like, "No, Mike, we just need to have our two plenary calls if we're going to meet our deadline," that's one of the topics I think we would like to discuss in advance of our next meeting.

The other topic that I do want to raise real quickly is it is my goal to keep these plenary calls to 60 minutes. I know the previous ones generally tended to be 90 minutes twice a week. The only caveat to that is for the first two or three meetings, I would potentially be looking at a 90-minute slot just so that we could come up with the initial scoping and give basically a project plan to Berry so that he can hold us accountable to that.

So this is what I am thinking. Right now, my proposal would be to meet next Tuesday for 90 minutes and see if we could have the next two meetings be 90 minutes on Tuesday. That's what I'm thinking. Thoughts, comments? Beth?

BETH BACON: Thanks, Mike. I just want to say I appreciate all of the advance thought and work that you and staff have put into this. I think that's going to really make our work go more smoothly. I will say that I think because this is different than a PDP—it's a scoping team— we're a much smaller group than some of the larger PDPs we've had to tackle, where we have used those breakout groups and special working groups.

And I will say that in my experience, there's a little bit of communication lost there and it's just a little broken up. So I would love it if we could see if we could have nice conversation, good dialog, and come to agreement with the larger group, since we are smaller and it might be more manageable. If that proves not workable, then maybe we would break off.

My only concern is that people will have interest in assignment one and three or two and four. And then you're up to three one-hour meetings a week. That's my only concern. While it tries to be manageable, there's not a lot of us to go around. So we might end up with a lot more meetings than just one, if that makes sense.

MICHAEL PALAGE: No, Beth. That totally makes sense. Part of this is we're, again, trying to think outside the box and try some things differently. I am not one to admit—if something is not working, to recalculate. So let's see how our first two 90-minute calls go over the next two weeks, see if we could get that done. I, again, would like to try to

… Maybe that works and maybe we don't need the scrums. I don't know. We'll play it by ear.

But I just wanted to float some of the ideas that we've been having with some of the subgroups as well as with ICANN Org about how we can improve and increase participation in the multistakeholder model and prevent burnout because burnout is real and I am very sensitive to that.

So if I can, if there's any other hands … Sophie, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

SOPHIE HEY: Yeah. Thanks, Mike. I was just wondering if we could potentially consider doing a Doodle to work out the next couple of meeting times. I think Lori, in the chat, said [inaudible] the last half hour for the 90-minute calls. I said earlier that I'll have to miss the first half hour. Is it possible we can at least find a different time, if not next week but the week after, so that those of us with regular appointments at this time can share the pain? Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yep. And to that, the one other thing that I forgot to mention is one of the things I'm going to try to do is follow a practice that ALAC does and look at perhaps rotating a periodic meeting to be sensitive to our colleague or colleagues from the Asia Pacific region. That's something that I think is important.

I know that that may present a little bit of inconvenience for some. But having talked to a number of my colleagues from the Asia

Pacific region that have basically spent getting up at really odd hours of the morning to participate in other groups, I think we need to be respectful of that. So that's to be determined. Obviously, I don't want to impact participation. It's one of the things that we'll work with it as we go. Nothing's written in stone. I want us to be fluid, dynamic, and agile in how we produce our work.

So with that, we are now at the top of the hour. I think we have gotten through all of our discussions. Sophie, we will send out a Doodle poll regarding future meetings. But for now, I would like to keep next Tuesday and propose a 90-minute block and then we will do that. So I will work with Marika and staff to send out that Doodle. Okay?

Any final thoughts or comments before we wrap up our first meeting? Silence is acceptance so thank you, everyone. Look forward to working with you over the course of the next year and delivering this on time. Have a great day. Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Stay well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]