EN

ICANN Transcription

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team

Thursday, 21 July 2022 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/aIFJD

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. Welcome to the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team taking place on Thursday, the 21st of July 2022 at 14:00 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 yourself now? Hearing no one, we have listed apologies from Kenneth Merrill, Melina Stroungi, Laureen Kapin, Beth Bacon, and Lori Schulman. We do have alternates stepping in as Susan Chalmers, Alan Woods, and Chris Lewis-Evans.
	Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any update to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. Seeing or hearing no one, if you do need assistance, please e-mail 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 panelists for today's call. As a reminder, when using chat feature, please change the dropdown menu to everyone in order for all to see your chat, also so that it's captured on the recording. Observers will have view-only to the chat access. Alternates not replacing a member, please rename your lines adding three Zs at the beginning of your name, and at the end of parenthesis your affiliation, which means you're automatically pushed to the end of the queue. To rename in Zoom, hover over your name and click Rename. Alternates should not engage in chat apart from private chat or use any other Zoom Room functionality such as raising hands, agreeing, or disagreeing.

All documentation 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 to 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. Hello, everyone. Can everyone hear me fine? Hello? Brian, you have the floor.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Oh no, sorry. I was trying to say yes, I can hear you fine.

MICHAEL PALAGE:	Okay, good. Sorry about that. Silence is acceptance. Okay. So just a quick update. So one of the things that we have discussed earlier this week—ICANN Org, myself, and Olga—is trying to come up with an orderly closure of our work in connection with Assignments 1 and 2. What I'm going to do now is share what we think is a path forward. So looking at what is the rule of diminishing returns, I think we have gotten to a point where there has not been a lot of substantive change or really not much change at all in connection with the document since ICANN74.

So what we are going to propose is at the end of today, we're going to go through the agenda, and if there are no further changes or edits, today will actually be a pens down for the current write-up regarding Assignments 1 and 2. However, recognizing that there are some stakeholder groups that have been advocating or may have concerns with that, we will give all interested stakeholder groups the ability to submit a statement—I don't want to call it a minority statement—but allow them to submit a statement up until August 8. And then what is being proposed is those statements would be included as an annex to the report. So, all stakeholder groups would have until the 8th to submit those statements. If none are submitted, then we are done, and the report will be submitted to Council immediately in advance of the August 15th deadline. If there are any statements submitted by any of the groups, we would have one last plenary call on August 11th to review those statements. But again, the goal is to have this submitted to GNSO Council no later than August 11th. That is the proposal. Comments, suggestions? Marika, you have the floor.

MARIKA KONINGS:	Thanks, Michael. I just wanted to add that that deadline would allow the group to submit the write-up for Assignments 1 and 2 to the Council in time for the August meeting, which we may also allow them, the Council, to already indicate whether or not they have any concerns about the group proceeding, I think specifically on the registrar proposal, which is currently in the report as a recommendation. As we know in the last meeting, we've tentatively carved out some time during ICANN75 to potentially work on that. So this timeline would allow for that kind of sequencing of having the Council have a look at the write-up, considering that specific recommendation and basically indicating if they would have any concerns with the group moving forward on that specific item in taking advantage, potentially, of face-to-face time in Kuala Lumpur.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Excellent. Perhaps on that, if we could have a quick show of hands among those that are online right now. How many intend to be attending Kuala Lumpur in person? That may help. So quick show of hands. Marc, Stephanie, Sophie. Okay. All right. So we have a couple. We have a number that will be attending. As I said, I will send this out and it will be included in the write-up notes after this call to the entire working group list. Okay. Thank you, everybody, for that. If we could put our hands down.

I think what I'd like to do now is really focus on wrapping up these last couple of loose ends. As you can see on the agenda there, I believe we're going to start off with the registrar survey. Next up, we'll be turning to our GAC members on further follow-up or clarification on the reliability of data. Then I believe the stress |

testing. Again, Scott, I did not get a chance to read your comments this morning. I don't know. If they are not part of the stress testing, then we will take that as, if you will, part of this. So that is the cue for how we are going to try to just knock out these remaining items. So, Marika, I'm going to turn it over to you, if you want to pull up the doc and walk through. I believe Sarah had made some changes. If you could and—

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Michael. So what you see on the screen is the latest version of the write-up. As you may recall, we discussed during the last meeting some potential additions to the registrar survey, specifically the areas or questions it would focus on. So staff went ahead and made a couple of updates to reflect that. I think those updates are specifically in this section, the expected insights. So we added language here to indicate that this would also focus on how registrars currently implement accuracy requirements, as well as language to reflect that the survey would also be intended to ask questions around what registrars may be doing that goes beyond the minimum of requirements to get some more insights into that.

We also added in the possible survey questions. So we indicated here that this is a compilation of questions that were, on one hand, developed by the Scoping Team, as well as individual Scoping Team members, but that is part of implementation. Further work would be undertaken to see if or where there might be overlap in these questions and where groupings might need to happen. But also, of course, some consideration will need to be given by the Scoping Team on how long the survey can be to make sure it's

still attractive for registrars to respond to. It was to capture at least the breadth of questions that we've received so far. Of course, it's part of the description of what the survey is intended. The insight is intended to gather. There's, of course, as well a room there to make sure that the questions that ultimately go into the survey are responsive to that.

I know that Sarah made a number of suggested edits, I think from staff perspective. Sarah, of course, you can speak to this as well. I think these are clarifying editorial ones. At least, I didn't spot anything that seemed to maybe require a conversation, but of course, the group thinks differently. I think this is the moment to do so.

I did note, Sarah, that you raised one question here. It is important to indicate what service will be used. Maybe it wouldn't hurt if we do know. I think this is a bit of an open question. From our side, we have used Google Forms in the past. We also have a survey tool, it's called Clicktools. I think it's probably a conversation we want to have with the group as well on what may work best. I know there are some advantages that some tools may have over another, if there are your specific preferences. Or if we have access to those tools, I think it's definitely something we're willing to consider as well. Again, I think we will be hesitant to put it in stone here, because depending on what the group wants to do or the form it takes, maybe that one tool may work better than the other. I know that is noting as well that Google may not be accessible. So again, that may also be a reason why a certain tool is used over another. Although I think in the past, we've always been able to find workarounds where people can maybe,

separately through a form, submit their responses and stuff and enter them or something like that. But I said that I think we have options there. It will just be a question to see what tool fits the purpose at best and factoring in what may be possible limitations or restrictions that one has over the other.

So that I think is it from the registrar survey side. I don't know if people have had a chance to look at this. But I think, as Michael indicated, we're hoping to place a deadline for review so there's still of course an opportunity to look at this and flag if there's anything in here that you believe either is not responsive to what the group discussed last week or changes that are proposed that you're not able or willing to live with.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Marika, for that summary. Any questions, comments? I'm sorry, Marika. I just had to step away there for a minute to answer a phone call. Were you able to address some of the changes that Sarah had made, I think, in the lead up or not? I'm sorry if I missed that.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. I just noticed that Sarah made a number of edits. Sarah is of course more than welcome to speak to those. But at least from my perspective, these seem to be more kind of editorial changes, just to clarify some of the language. I don't think there were any major items. But, Sarah, I think you're probably in a better position to indicate if you think there is something that the group should maybe have a closer look at or discuss. I don't know here you

made a suggestion to stay instead of disclose a process because it may include more activities. And again, I think from the staff perspective, it seems to make sense. Of course, if others disagree, the group can discuss that. I think the others want more editorial changes.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Marika. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. I think, Marika, that you're completely right in thinking that these are hopefully clarifying and do not change the meaning of what we are doing here. I just thought there was a couple of places where the wording could be a little bit different and hopefully helpful to first-time readers. So you are absolutely right in how you characterize that. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. If we can go back to the agenda, I believe we should now be moving on to our GAC colleagues. Let's see. We have Chris. Who else do we have on? Chris, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Hi, Michael, and hi, everyone. Unfortunately, you have Chris and Chris today. Yeah, just holidays and everything else and other work commitments meant that no one else is available, unfortunately. So I have not been following this as closely as Melina and Kenneth have. I haven't been very helpful in this. But

I've had a bit of a catch-up and we had a good conversation earlier in the week about this within the GAC. One of the things that I think might be helpful for the whole group that we discussed was within the current Registrar Agreement, it refers to reliable and accurate in reference to the WHOIS data. So it would be interesting to hear from some of our colleagues on that side how they currently interpreted that, how they deal with that within their Registrar Agreement, and whether that would help us in that. So I suppose before we get into the whole what does the GAC think it'd be interesting here on that side?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So you would like to hear from the group on that? I just want to make sure I try to facilitate this dialogue on what you're looking for, Chris.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: As part of the current Registrar Agreement, I believe that it refers to reliable and accurate data. So I suppose it's more for the registrars, and maybe the registries as well, to comment on that.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So here's what I'm going to do. We have, I think, had these discussions previously. So just in the interest of time—and I appreciate that you're filling in here and thank you for attending. Sarah, I'm glad you raised your hand. I was actually going to call on you or Roger. So, Sarah, perhaps you could start off this discussion. So you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. I don't understand why this is a question in the first place. What does reliable mean? I think it means that it's consistent over time. It continues to be something over time, right? Registration data must be accurate and reliable. That means that it must be accurate, which we have spent a lot of time discussing what accurate means. And reliable means it needs to continue to be accurate, which is why we have the ongoing WHOIS data reminder policy. Is that what the GAC team is looking for? Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So if I could—and now I'm going to call you—again, allow me to try to synthesize several months of discussions. Again, I'll let Steve speak to this in more specificity. I think there have been some concerns, Sarah, by those within the group that reliability means that there is a way that the data that is collected is accurate and will work in contacting that person. So I think that is what that means.

Again, we were somewhat restricted and we walked the very tight rope line, given the restrictions in the charter, which prevented us from revisiting the EPDP Phase 1 work. I think that is what I am hearing from Chris, and I believe this is what Steve and I believe the IPC has also previously articulated. So I'm not going to advocate. I'm just trying to tee this up. So, Steve, did I get that right or not?

STEVE CROCKER: Are you referring to me?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Reliable does have the connotation that not only was it accurate when you collected it and checked it, but that when you go to use it, it actually does the job you have in mind. The nuance there is important, I suspect. I don't know. To really cover that correctly, if you're going to measure it, say, if you want to see what conformance is, you're going to have to have a much more subtle and persistent measurement process because you're going to want to measure how accurate it was when you collected it. And then later, when people go to use it, you're going to need a separate measurement and reporting system to find out whether it's become unusable in the interim. That opens up a fairly big challenge for the kinds of things we're doing here.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Again, just trying to facilitate this conversation. Scott Austin, would you be able to speak to this? I believe the IPC has previously talked about this. I think you also talked about this in one of the previous calls about being able to contact the individual. Could you speak to this?

SCOTT AUSTIN:

Thanks, Michael. Lori is not on the call, but had supported what I'd submitted on the other matter, the stress testing on behalf of IPC. But as far as reliable, I think it should be taken in context, which I think is what Steve was saying. For us being rights holders, it is dealing with our ability to rely on the data that's there to be able to contact the registrant of record in order to notify them if in fact they are engaged in some domain name abuse or cybersquatting that affects the rights holder. So that is another form of reliance. I think we've stated before that one of the things we would like to be able to rely on is that the person who submits the data is who in the WHOIS they say they are or they say they is. So I think that's reliability. The specific section in the agreement I think is susceptible to interpretation that would permit that analysis. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. So I'm going to turn to Stephanie. Stephanie, you've been posting some stuff in the chat. Could you perhaps articulate? You say that accurate and reliable are not synonymous? I put it this way, I'm not going to disagree, but could you perhaps articulate a little more clearly on that point? Then what I'm going to do is I'm going to go back to Chris and Chris to see if this has helped. You have the floor, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you. I think we run into difficulties because people are assuming that reliable and accurate are synonymous, and they're not. Reliable does imply functionality and something being continuing to work. We have to remember that the functionality

that the use of the term accurate in the Registration Agreements means that someone is contactable. We have to bear in mind that—I'm always using the iceberg analogy—there's a lot of stuff under the water that the contracted parties may have about the registered name holder that is not part of this other system that ICANN dabbles in, namely, the fact that they might be offering other services to the RNH and the fact that they have credit card numbers that continue to work. So for the purposes of ICANN's usage of the customer data, we're talking about reliability. Can they be contacted? Not whether the minute details are up to date all the time. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, if I could, let me try to synthesize this, and then again, hopefully this dialogue, Chris, has given you something to build on and to engage further. I think what we're hearing is that there are some people that would like a response. However, right now there is no obligation on a registrant to respond to an inquiry. That being said, the fact that an e-mail is being sent and there is no response, things could have changed. Does the non-response to an e-mail then constitute that the underlying data is accurate and up to date? What I think is interesting here is—Sarah and Roger, hopefully you can appreciate this as well—but earlier this week during the transfers call, I think there was a discussion about problems with registrants going in, they want to change registrars, transfer domain name around the time of renewal. They go in and they say, "Hey, my data is not accurate." They go to try to update it, and then that they then miss out on their window to transfer the domain name.

Again, I'm just trying to look at this issue from both sides. I understand that there may not be a requirement. There is no requirement for a registrant to respond to an inquiry from an intellectual property owner that has concerns about that. That being said, I do think, if you just send an e-mail, say, "Hey, is everything good?" but nobody responds, does that still mean that it's accurate and reliable if there is no continual operational verification of either the original e-mail or telephone that was provided by the registrant? That is what I see and what I'm hearing. So what I'm going to do, Alan, I'm going to let you speak, and then again, Chris, you're going to be next in the queue. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just two points. Number one, we know there's no obligation to reverify or recheck addresses. So from a point of view of reliability, we know that is not going to be used. We also know from the responses we've had from Contractual Compliance that even if a registrar gets a bounce message trying to use a particular address, they're under no obligation to follow up and do anything about it. So we may well have situations where the address is no longer working but a registrar does not have an obligation to follow up on it.

Lastly, I may be wrong, but I don't believe there is any requirement to use the contact information in the registration to do the WHOIS reminder thing. In other words, the registrar has contact information from me, the customer. They also have contact information in the WHOIS record that I have put there. I don't think there is a requirement to use the latter address for the

WHOIS reminder. I may be wrong, but I think that they have the option of using the customer contact information, which may be very different from that in the WHOIS record as that effort sending that reminder. So I think on a number of levels, if the concept of reliable means we have some level of competence that it is still working perhaps many years later, that I don't think we have that right now under the current RAA. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Alan. Chris, before going to you, Sarah, I'm just trying to read through your chat, multitasking here. Could you perhaps speak to what you just posted in the group? I really want to have that on the recording, particularly for those that tend to listen to this, like myself at times. Sometimes people miss out on the richness of the discussion in the chat, too. Can you speak to what you just posted?

SARAH WYLD: Sure. Thank you. Hi. I think Alan is asking to whom must be WDRP notice be presented. So to find that information, because I also could not remember, I went back to the policy, and there's a section called how and to whom the notice may be presented. It tells us that the notice may be presented to the registrant directly or through the administrative contact for the registration.

So, the admin contact—no, Scott. Good question. My understanding is that the administrative contact is a contact set that is stored on the domain registration record, which is not necessarily related to the account holder, although it could be the

same party. And that contact set is no longer going to be required once the—well, it's no longer required now, certainly will be deprecated once the Phase 1 IRT is going to go live. So the admin contact is going away, the WDRP notice will be presented to the domain owner.

I'm still just kind of shocked at the idea that some third party not getting an answer to their e-mail could suggest that the data is inaccurate. If someone does think that domain registration data is inaccurate and they think that the registrar is not noticing that, they can submit a complaint. That's a thing. There was also some interesting discussion in the chat, Michael, that you might want to make sure it gets verbalized about controller and processor, which, honestly, I was not following that super clearly myself because I wasn't sure how that came up in the first place, but it might be worth checking out. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Stephanie can always have the floor regarding issues regarding processor and controller. Obviously, the lack of agreement between them and the contracting parties has been a point of concern, I think, voiced by many in the community. Stephanie, do you want to speak to that?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. Sorry for putting Sarah on the spot there. But Becky had raised—I had made some comments about the under-the-water data that the contracted parties have as data controllers responsible for their richer relationship with RNH. Becky wondered

whether, in fact, that would be a backend processor that held the credit card data. That may be true. As we all know, the web relationships and the contracting and the credit card management, that's all a huge ecosystem. One of the beauties of GDPR, as far as I'm concerned, is the richness that that new data protection law brings in about the controller/processor arrangements. Because of this very disaggregated ecosystem that's running, we might have 10 different processors managing your commercial activities on a web. So whether or not the contracted parties themselves manage the financial end and the credit cards is irrelevant because they have a data processor agreement or arrangement in place with whoever the heck is doing it. As we are operating to try to bring ourselves up to GDPR standards for data protection, I think that these are relationships that we should be keeping in mind as we look at things. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Stephanie. Alan, do you have any objections with me going to Chris, or is there something that you want to add that you think is relevant before that? Or is that an old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a new hand. I want to talk. But please go to Chris first.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Chris, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Thanks. Just answering one of Sarah's questions in the chat, does that answer it for the GAC? I think you went most of the way there, Sarah, maybe not all the way. You said you have processes for verifying accuracy. But what I didn't understand, but it might just me being a bit slow and rusty, is whether you also have processes for verifying reliability, and then how they differ. What we've said is you've got that experience of those and I think that the ask of the GAC was what we understood as reliability of the data. I think, realistically, you guys have contractual obligations to do that already, so have lots of experience for the GAC themselves or the small team within the GAC. Really, for us, the reliable of that is whether it will work and whether that contact method will get through. I don't think it needs to have a response, as you say, and I'm terrible for this as well. I saw in your chat, Sarah, of not responding to people even though they e-mail me. That doesn't mean it's not reliable. That's the person maybe that's not reliable, not the e-mail that's not reliable. But then accuracy is more about whether the contact is directly linked to them or whether that's something else. So I think there is a nuance here. Like I said, I'd be interested in how you do your verification of that different nuance between the two if there is one.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, Chris, I'm going to go to Alan, and before wrapping up, I'll come back and try to synthesize everything that we've heard. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think Sara's reference to the RAA is good. The way I read it, if the registrar may contact the registrant, that could be interpreted as contacting their customer, which is not necessarily the address in the e-mail. There are a number of reasons, including the lack of obligation to address, to follow up on bounces and things like that, which clearly are a bounce. We know the message isn't getting through. It's not just being ignored by the recipient, as Chris implied could happen.

I think there's a number of reasons to question, whether the current processes as specified in the RAA give us a high level of comfort of reliability. That doesn't mean it's bad, it just means we're not taking active action to ensure that it is reliable on an ongoing basis. That's the current RAA. We can't change that. We have later phases in this PDP which may suggest that we make other changes.

One last comment on the whole issue of credit cards and stuff like that. That's a red herring. Registrars may have credit cards, they may not. I regularly use PayPal. When I say I want to use PayPal, I can point to an account completely different from the name I've given the organization I'm buying something for. And if I don't trust them to hold my credit card information or use it reliably, I may use Pay Pal exactly for that isolation. So there are plenty of times in life where you don't want to be well understood. In that case, that's completely legitimate. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: To wrap up this point here, Chris, hopefully this has helped give you and your GAC colleagues the feedback that you need.

Perhaps you can go back to Kenneth, Melina, Velimira, engage with them. If in fact you still have issues, concerns, this would be best submitted via those, so supplementary statements that will be included in the annex. You will have, as I had stated previously, up until August 8. So that's over two weeks for you to interact with your public sector working group members and respond. Unless you have any further objections, I will propose to move on to item C. Is that okay, Chris?

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Yes. That's fine.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Perfect. Thank you. All right. So next, there was the proposal of stress testing that was discussed, was floated. There was some e-mail exchange. There was a response by Brian. Becky and I then responded in response to that. I think what we have here now, I believe this is what Scott Austin wrote. So, Scott, I will give you the floor to walk through this addition that you've done here. You have the floor.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Thank you, Michael. One final point on reliability. I noted in the RAA, at least the version I'm looking at, there is also a Section 3.3.4 that talks about if the WHOIS service implemented by registrars does not in a reasonable time provide reasonably robust, reliable, and convenient access to accurate up to date data. So, reliability is also reference to the access to the accurate

data. I just wanted to add that point to the prior discussion, but we can come back to that.

As far as what I submitted on the stress testing, I spoke with Lori this morning and she has confirmed that the IPC supports what's here. We've talked about it because I wasn't part of the original discussion when stress testing was brought up. I've tried to on a generalized basis because that's sort of where we're at now and give some thoughts on the application of stress testing, which is, as I understand it anywhere, at least from my experience has been more in the context of things like economics and investing and, in other words, taking different scenarios and altering those scenarios to determine how it would affect certain outcomes with regard to investments or with regard to interest rates, things like that. But in this particular case, I think the broad understanding of it, which is what I put there, running simulations to identify hidden vulnerabilities, and the focus here has been the processes and procedures that are being used to determine whether the verification or validation which are the processes specifically referenced in the RAA, although those terms are not defined in the definition section of the document. I continue to support the need for perhaps definitions because there are ambiguities.

At any rate, the point is that that's what we're looking at here is those processes. If there are ways in which some kind of simulation can be done, and the suggestion has been that there would be domain names, I know there has been pushback and concerns raised by ICANN, whether this would be fraudulent or whether they'd be things that would violate the agreements themselves. I've tried to raise, which make some suggestions

anyway, because that was what Marika asked me to do and the group asked for us to do, that would mitigate—that's the term that was given in the document—the downsides that were expressed. Some of those downsides were—they do not like this—ICANN is going to choose a specific registration provider or several, and that provider gets business from this test, suggesting that someone would be singled out and get a benefit from it. My thoughts on that would be that they could use a blind pool of registrars or another process that it would be random and that would not be based on any particular aspects of that registrar for them being singled out whether it's to give them business or impose a burden on them. The other would be that the names of the registrar selected or used, or even those volunteering would be kept confidential. Simple reference says it's done in other context, that they would not be expressly named. The other one is perhaps a bit over the top. But there was a comment about the fact that they would get business because the concern—at least that's what I read from the downside section—buying a domain name with purposely—no, that was the one before that. The chosen provider gets more scrutiny. That's a downside that I think is dealt with with confidentiality. But there was another space where it was as if they were getting more money because of the fact that they were chosen and their domains were being purchased and not in other registrars. So the idea being that perhaps a credit could be given if someone was deeply concerned about the amount of domain names purchased. I have no idea what the sample size would be and what that would require. But I can't imagine that it would be such a vast number, a vast volume

of domain names for the testing that it would be a sizable income as a result.

At any rate, what I've also tried to address there was the concern raised on buying a domain name with purposely incorrect information violates the Registration Agreement. I mean, the idea here is that the parties to that agreement are both participants in this and that there would be some recognition given that this is for research purposes and it's not an attempt to undermine or to use some unsuspecting individual or entity's information for this purchase, but it would be entirely hypothetical. And because it's on that basis, I would assume that there would be some consent given to the fact that this is for testing with a goal to improve the process. If that isn't acceptable, then I don't know how you would be able to do any kind of testing, quite frankly. But that's the suggestion that's there. And it's given in a spirit to try and improve the system, not to perform any of the downside or to expand upon any of the downside aspects that are stated. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Scott. Alan, I believe ALAC had also expressed some support. Is there anything that you think ALAC has a different perspective, support? You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I understand the position that ICANN Org and others have taken, saying to deliberately violate the intent of the agreement by providing false data and certifying that it's true is

problematic, and indeed it is. I'd like to hope that we could be innovative and find a way to get around that.

In industry, we regularly do stress testing. You hire hackers to break into your system. I know that's a different situation. I'm not saying it's similar, but we regularly understand that systems may not be perfect, and therefore, we try to find ways to make them better. I think it's rather unfortunate if we cannot find an innovative way, either with slightly different contractual terms to cover this case or some other way to finesse it. That would allow us to do this kind of thing because I think we'd end up with a better system for it. As Scott said, we're trying to improve the system. We're not trying to just point out people who were violating it or doing something wrong. I understand the issue, but I find it rather unfortunate if we simply shut down the discussion at that point without trying to find a way around it so that we can do the testing which I think would be beneficial to the system. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Alan. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I want to thank the IPC team for providing that suggestion. I appreciate the ideas for how to get around the financial aspect of the concerns. Maybe we could just scroll up to have the idea back on screen. I had thought that the idea was to do like mystery shopping, where the registrar does not know that the specific registration is a test, and that allows results that should show the registrar's true behavior. So like thinking about

penetration testing, as Alan refers to. My understanding is that the system or person being tested cannot know about the test in order to ensure that it's fully neutral. So instead, now the proposal is that the research is undertaken with the consent of the parties to each Registration Agreement.

So I do see that this could resolve the issue of signing a Registration Agreement with fake data, but it means that the registrar knows it's a test. So if the registrar is aware of the test, they could manipulate the results. Some members of this group already we know do not trust the registrar to adhere to their contractual obligations to verify and validate data. So if there's already that sort of expectation, why would they trust the registrar not to cheat on the test?

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

CHRISTOPHER LEWIS-EVANS: Thank you very much. I think you mentioned penetration testing there. Many companies do this. And you're right, it's a little bit wrong to say, "Well, we're going to test you, so here's the answer. We're going to ask you the question on this date." But the same that happens with audits and everything else is that you can give someone a scope and the mechanism by which the test will be done and outline the parameters and how that will carry out and get agreements or consent from the parties involved, and leave as you may be tested between these dates and not tell them the exact time or the exact format that will come in.

All these things are manageable and I think a workable. There's many analogies in different business sectors that do this. There's some good proposals here by the IPC. I'm not saying it's an audit, I'm just saying that there are mechanisms by which you can produce safety or safeguards that cover the misinterpretation of putting false data in. Then once you have done the pen test, you can say, "These were the ones who did this," and provide that detail for cleanup to happen. So I think there are ways to get around this. It's not policy type decisions. It's more around technical discussions, and I do think it's worth investigating further.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Chris. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think you can say, "I'm going to do some testing to make sure you're verifying information at 3:00 tomorrow afternoon, and I'll be doing it from this account." That I do believe would defeat the purpose. But I think that we could find innovative ways around it. And maybe it's as simple as terms in the RAA saying ICANN may award changes, may on occasion do random verifications to ensure that accuracy is being followed. If there's a desire to do it, I think we can find a way to make it happen. Simply saying that "Strictly under today's rules and processes, it's not possible" is probably true, but that shouldn't stop us from investigating further how to do it. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Scott, you have the floor.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Thank you. I can only echo what Chris and Alan have said, Chris specifically, in terms of the business community and how they implement stress testing in a variety of areas, including penetration testing. And that there wouldn't be an announcement, as Alan said, "It'll be in Friday at 3:00, and there'll be X number, and then it'll be over." I think it'd be an ongoing process over a particular period of time. But again, there are experts and advisors and vendors that could provide those kinds of details to ensure that it is a valid test, that it isn't given away, so to speak, so people can psych it out, for lack of a better term, or game it, and therefore, create a result that is either meaningless or severely skewed. But I believe that, as my colleagues have said, that can be left to the details. I think the overall idea still has merit and should be followed up on. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Scott. Marc, you have the floor.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Michael. First, thanks, Scott, for presenting this and for writing a new idea for us to consider. I'm not sure I fully understand what you're suggesting, Scott. So I'm wondering if you could sort of provide a little bit more of an example as to what like a stress test event would be. So for example, I'm wondering, are we talking about having somebody created domain registration and you'll leave fields purposefully blank that should be required,

or put like a street address and the phone number fields, for example, and see if that is caught. Or are you thinking, as the stress test, somebody would put in syntactically valid information what could possibly an actual address and phone number but doesn't map to an actual person and report that as inaccurate or, in some way, measure the steps that the ICANN and the registrar go through to address that inaccuracy complaint?

I understand in a general sense what stress testing means, but I guess in a practical sense, I'm not sure how you envision it being applied here to registration data and how that would map to an understanding or some kind of metrics for us as far as the state of registration data accuracy. So I guess at a high level, I understand what a stress test is here. But when you get down to how it would be applied and how we would get useful, measurable data, I guess I'm missing some of the details.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Alan and Scott, perhaps you could fill in some of the—

SCOTT AUSTIN: I'm ready to respond to his specific question, but I'll let Alan go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Go ahead, Alan. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just very briefly, clearly some of the things that Marc mentioned would be caught by syntactic checks at input. Those don't violate any rules because they're going to get rejected. Hopefully, in most cases, if you put something that doesn't even look like a phone number, that will likely be rejected with the syntax. Those aren't the checks that we're talking about, although one obviously could make sure that registrars are using reasonable levels of syntactic checks. It's the ones that don't have to be done for several days that are the problematic ones, the ones that do require you to click all the way through and pay the money before the verification is done. So certainly, there are some kinds of checks we could do that would likely be effective for really bad formatting of contact information. Certainly they weren't the ones I was thinking about. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Scott, you have the floor.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Marc, those are excellent questions and ones I expected, especially going through this and trying to come up with something that was meaningful. To address stress testing, I thought about many of those same elements, but without, obviously, your expertise and those of other registrars and registries who are present on this team to articulate areas within the validation/verification processes. And I don't want to, in responding your question, misspeak and then allow that to balloon or snowball into "Oh, well, yeah. Obviously, then you don't know what you're talking about." Because there are those, and that's

why I defer to Alan. He has spent many, many years carefully reviewing many of these items much, much more time than I have.

So I defer to those comments. But by the same token, I did try to put some meat on the bones as a possible element or a possible path. And in my second paragraph under the upsides, I said, "Were there any past instances?" Because one of the areas in stress testing, at least in this more traditional context with regard to investing and banking issues where they're trying to figure out what change in the economy could make them go bankrupt or become one of those too big to fail examples, there are specific instances they look at what has happened in the past. They look at historical context. The only thing that I could reach on and grab onto there were the ones that I've suggested and they bear further analysis to determine if there is any kind of correlation, causation, let alone a correlation related to certain events that have happened in the past that may have affected accuracy. Again, my brief projection there was maybe when COVID first hit, maybe around the effective date in May of 2018 when GDPR went into effect, there was a rise in complaints for inaccurate data. Maybe some other policies that went into effect changed the way that things could be done and impacted the ability to accurately verify and validate registration data accurately. That's one example that I thought might provide some date or data points to look at to see if that could be used to make or to determine changes that occur that could be the source of some stress testing, if that same scenario could be run or if those kinds of things that occurred at that period of time. I have no idea what those are. Obviously, time does not permit and that's not my area of expertise, but just trying to develop some analogs or some things that have happened that

have affected the Internet as a system and the registration process as a system. Perhaps there are other events that may be even more glaring, and that the registrars and registries, because they deal with this on a daily basis, could have said, "This had a tremendous impact on our ability to do these things. If it happens again, we need to have in place some things that would adequately provide—stop gaps would provide measures to ensure that accuracy is not affected." That's where I think that we seek in good faith interests of the registrars and registries and the contracting party group to tell us if there are specific ways in which that can be done.

Again, not to identify wrongdoing or negligence or anything along those lines. The point is, if there's ways that the process could be improved, again, even confidentially, without regard to naming names or pointing fingers at specific registrars or registries, that's not the point. The point is to try and obtain the most reliable and accurate information as possible so that registrants, if they are doing something that is bridging the rights of people's reputation, their trademarks, their business that's been around for years and years and years, there's a means of contacting and say, "Why are you doing this? Stop doing this." Thanks. I hope that shed some light.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thanks, Scott. Stephanie, you have the floor.

EN

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry, I was having trouble unmuting. I'm just raising my hand to discuss something that I typed in the chat. I do think that as we discuss stress testing, we have put our finger on a very key element that deserves to be in the record and that is, in my view, ICANN appears to be carving itself out and I should say here my usual caveat. I'm not the lawyer. But my observation is that ICANN has carved out a fairly limited role for itself as a data controller. I think that that may well be appropriate given its role as, basically, a stand in for a regulator. I know Göran hates it whenever I say this, but this is a function that might be managed by a government in other circumstances, possibly under rules forged at the ITU. Instead, we have a multistakeholder organization doing it, and there are pretty strict limits as to what ICANN can do in its current role as it is carved out. The fact that they might have gone over that role in the past is irrelevant now that we are attempting to comply with GDPR rules.

So I don't believe that they could do the kind of stress testing that was requested—and I realized we've moved on from that original point, I'm just trying to get it on the record—because of their limited role as data controllers. So I think we are back at on audit. As Steve has typed into the chat that we're spending too much time on this, that if ICANN cannot do it in itself, in other words, hire a data processor or an outside research firm to do this, then they could impose the rule on the connected parties. I'm not actually sure that they can do that in their limited role as controller either. I think if you're going to start increasing the burden on the contracted parties, you're going to have to look at the role of ICANN as data controller again because this is a burden. And clearly, the purpose is for the benefit of third parties seeking

access to data, data that is not available any longer on the WHOIS replacement. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Stephanie. What I'm going to try to do is synthesize what I've heard and potentially provide a path to the group coming to closure on this point. Before doing that, just a quick observation. Better late than never, but it really would have been helpful to perhaps have some … This really good idea perhaps surfaced a couple of months ago, but as I said, better late than never. I think it's important that we properly document this in our report in connection with Assignments 1 and 2.

So there's two paths that I see this potentially happening. One is that over the course of the next two weeks, we're not going to have—I'm not proposing any plenary meetings until the 11th. But over the course of the next couple of weeks, perhaps the group can reach consensus via the list that what has been proposed by ALAC and the IPC is some type of enhanced audit or audit functionality that could be included.

Again, I've heard the word stress test audit. Again, just my own individual personal neutral capacity, I tend to align myself with the comments of Stephanie, and I do view this more in an audit capacity as opposed to stress testing. That being said, as I had noted in my e-mail exchange with Becky on the list, I do find this very analogous to some of the testing for some companies that I have worked with where they send out test spams to try to trick their employees to click as part of an overall security and stability educational program. As Alan said, if there was a desire by the

EN

parties to come together, I think there could be a way of pulling that off.

Again, however, I need to go back to my comments at the top of the call about the point of diminishing returns. I don't see us spending another couple of weeks or another couple of months trying to micromanage this particular audit/stress test and producing something. What I am going to propose to the group is, as I said, let's use the next two weeks via the mailing list to try to achieve potential consensus on this point so that when we meet on the 11th, if there is consensus, we can make changes to Assignments 1 and 2. If there is not consensus, those groups that are articulating their points on this particular topic, they would be able to submit this as part of their—I don't want to call minority statements—but as part of their statements that would be included in the annex as I had detailed at the beginning. Now, Marika is going to correct me from a process standpoint or make a wonderful suggestion on how to perhaps do this more efficiently. So, Marika, I await your guidance and instruction.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Michael. Definitely not correcting anything you said. Just maybe a slight nuance to your first version of a proposal. Just to flag the group at an earlier stage. I think that proposal is still here in this document as well, a bit further up, did discuss as well the option of registrar audits and actually had engagement with that as well with ICANN Org. Originally, based on those conversations, I think the group felt that maybe there wasn't that much value in proceeding with that versus moving forward with the registrar survey because I think there was a sense that there might be

overlap in some of the questions that would be asked and potentially also some limitations in what could be asked versus what could be asked in the survey even though, of course, there's the voluntary required nature.

So one potential option could be as well, if there is interest from the group to further explore this idea of an audit, that potentially includes this aspects of stress testing, noting that some concerns have been expressed on whether that is even legally possible and whether an option would be too similar to what was done for the registrar survey proposal to basically include that, that is something that the group would like to further explore. That some thought has been put into that in the form of what is here in this document. Part of what you see here is part of the registrar audit original conversation, part of the stress test, and maybe then as a part of an implementation conversation that the Scoping Team would meet with ICANN Org, assuming it would be my colleagues that would be involved in conducting such an audit. And I think they indicated previously that they would be more than willing to engage with the group on this to maybe discuss practically what could be done in this regard.

That, of course, may not answer all the questions or may not take exactly the form as what is being suggested here, but that may provide an avenue for further exploring this idea of a registrar audit and maybe better understanding what is possible and what may not be possible as a possible path forward. Again, I think that, of course, is only viable if there is support from the group to further explore this idea of an audit. And if there isn't, I think you already

indicated that another path could be through individual statements highlighting what groups believe should happen.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Marika. That's why you earn the name Oracle because you are the repository for everything that we've done. So thank you for that historical link. If I could just check with you, just from a process standpoint, I think if in fact there is consensus within the group to include this audit using—as I said, at that previous placeholder or getting that reflected into the final documentation, if that could be achieved via the mailing list over the next two weeks, and then when we meet on the 11th for our final plenary call, if there is consensus, then adding that to the final write-up will not be a problem. If, however, there is not consensus, those groups that hopefully have been articulating would then be able to just include that into their individual stakeholder statements that will be included as part of the annex. I think that, to me, is the most efficient use of our time to make sure we land this plane in advance of that August 15th target deadline. That's what I'm thinking. And perhaps maybe this becomes a topic for discussion in KL. I don't know. But that's my current thinking. Perhaps this makes sense from ICANN Org's perspective from a timing—or do you see any particular issues or process, concerns that I may be missing?

MARIKA KONINGS: No process concerns, but what I can maybe offer, I think, from the staff side, we will be happy to maybe include in the draft write-up in big brackets a recommendation that models what it currently

says on the registrar survey or also have a similar annex that refers to the conversation that the group has had on the audit idea and see if that could be a starter language. Maybe it's easier for the group react to that, instead of maybe asking the group to come up with something which may be more challenging in the timeframe that is available. So if that is something that the group thinks may help in moving forward with conversation, that is something we can definitely include. As I said, we would basically model that on how the registrar survey recommendation looks. Basically, saying that's an idea that the group thinks is worth further exploring. Already, some thought has gone into it that you can find in the annex. But the next step would be for the Scoping Team to basically sit down with ICANN Org to better understand what can be achieved through an audit.

Probably also, I think, some questions were raised in the chat as well on what is the data—how is that expected to help the group forward in its consideration of Assignments 3 and 4. Basically, there is some interest in exploring, but further work is needed to really be able to understand if and how it can be done and how it may help the group move forward in its work. So if that's helpful, we can definitely do that. If not, we're also happy to wait for others to suggest language.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I want to sit there and say I think I speak for many of the stakeholders and participants in this group. I have historically found the recommendations of ICANN Org in synthesizing discussions to be helpful. So my inclination would be to trust ICANN Org to synthesize what they had heard and put that

forward in bracketed text for consideration. Again, that's me individually, but I want to hear from the group. Marc, you have the floor. Marc, are you on mute?

MARC ANDERSON: I am on mute. I will restart. Thank you, Michael. Indirectly related to what you just asked, going back, as we seem to be circling back to sort of a different take on the audit idea, I just scrolled through the spreadsheet, the deep dive proposal on audits, and I'm having trouble remembering why we didn't recommend audit as a possible path forward in the first place. It doesn't seem to be captured on the table. My recollection was that we were concerned about the timing. That it would take a little while for us in working with ICANN Org to put together the terms and scopes and goals of an audit. And the other considerations, note that ICANN could typically spin an audit up within two months but it doesn't say how long it would take to get the results. My recollection is that the actual completion of the audit and compiling of the results would be in excess of six months. I'm not an Oracle so I'm wondering if my recollection is correct in that we didn't go down the audit path because we're concerned about the timing involved. If somebody could help me out with that one, I'd appreciate it.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Marika, you have the floor.

MARIKA KONINGS:	Thanks. I also need to dig a bit in my memory because I think that was the conversation we had on the group meeting some time ago. I think the one aspect was understood that it would take some time to develop, and then of course get responses and analyze those. I think part of the concern was also—and that is something that Compliance also made clear—that the only auditing at this point they could do without having that additional clarification from the EDPB would focus on aspects that would not require access to registration data. So maybe partly, there was also a sense that maybe this proposal needed to be reconsidered once there would be a better sense of whether or not that would be possible, as that might result in further data.
	I think a third aspect, as I previously mentioned, I think there was also a sense that based on what ICANN Org originally shared, what they would audit, that we would not include access to registration, that data was, I think, fairly similar to some of the questions that were foreseen in the registrar surveys. I think there was also a sense of potential overlap. But of course, at that stage, this idea of the stress testing did not come up or at least I don't recall that being discussed. So that may now give a different assessment on whether or not it's worth further pursuing that idea and if that could be a potential add-on or approach that could be taken in the context of an audit.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Thanks. So this actually did jog my mind. Marc, I think one of the things than when we were previously talking about this was what the data. I remember at the time, we were talking about the balancing test, and this is when we were thinking within the

context of actually auditing, if you will, through their actual domain name registrations by registrants, not by testing authorities. So if you may recall during our discussions, I think I had floated the idea about should ICANN perhaps sample domain names from the DAAR reporting? Because sampling domain names that were alleged to be involved in abuse of activity would probably increase ICANN's legitimate interests. But then there was concern by Owen and others that that may potentially bias.

If I recall, just with this discussion that was just going on here today, I think that's where we started to go down the path, and then we reached that dead end. I think what is interesting, and perhaps different and new, is instead of actually sampling domain name registrations that may or may not involve actual PII of registrants, as part of this stress test slash audit, whatever you want to call it, would be ICANN or a third party contractor injecting domain name registrations, and then doing the testing that way. That is, again, my recollection. But I will go back through some of the stuff and try to check that as well.

So if I can go back to the broader agenda here real quick because I think we're almost done. Outstanding issues. Confirm the deadlines for review next steps. So to me, as I said, what I am going to recommend is for ICANN Org to draft that language, put it in brackets. It is not included. It's just that bracketed text for now until we meet on the 11th. I would really encourage all of the participants to use the mailing list for asynchronous discussion of this topic. Concurrent with that discussion on the proposed bracketed text when it is made available, I would also encourage all groups to have their individual stakeholder statements ready

and submit it by the 8th. Again, we really want to wrap this up on August 11th. I enjoy these weekly calls but I really think it's time for us to wrap this up, and Berry to be able to report to Council that we have reached our deliverables on Assignment 1 and 2.

Unless there are no further questions, Steve, I think you would ask for a couple of minutes at the end of today's meeting. So unless I see any other hands, you can have the remaining six minutes— oh, Marika, you have the floor.

MARIKA KONINGS: I'm very sorry. Apologies, Steve. I just wanted to quickly flag. I'm assuming that people will also go through the rest of the write-up. I think nothing further substantial has changed apart from the updates to the registrar audit that we discussed earlier today. Of course, if there are any kind of grammar, editorial edits, those are always welcome. Because if we can make the language clear for all those reading this, that's always appreciated. Please do use the comment function. Don't make changes directly to the text. Of course, if anyone still encounters any cannot live with items, you're encouraged to flag those as well. But as I said, those should have already come up previously as nothing has changed. Hopefully, we can avoid kind of redoing conversations that we've already had on some of the topics. With that, I'll stop.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Steve, do you need verbal or do you need screen sharing capability?

STEVE CROCKER: I need screen sharing.

MICHAEL PALAGE: There we go.

STEVE CROCKER: Not yet. Host disabled participants.

TERRI AGNEW: There you go. I just had to find your name.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Terri.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. As I said, this is going to be very brief, and as a consequence, it's going to be a fast run. You can all see this, I hope. Yes? GNSO accuracy.

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, we can see it.

STEVE CROCKER: You can see it? Okay. What I'm going to do is do a super brief overview from 100,000 foot level, and then dive into the parts that I want us to pay attention to. We have a scheme for documenting in fine grained detail, very granular detail, several attributes related to each of the possible data elements that might be

collected. One column is whether or not that data element is necessarily collected or as optional or is not. Another is the validation, which is the focus I want to come back to. And another is the sensitivity level, private or public or more private, etc.

We have two sets of rules. One derived from listening to the discussions that have taken place in this group. Let me be very clear that this is not authoritative. This represents my best understanding. So it's entirely possible that it's wrong and that is one of the main purposes that I wanted to bring this up. The other is a similar set of rules derived from reading the ICANN Temp Spec in conjunction with the RAA. And what we have here is a side by side comparison. I'll do the vertical first and then I'll come back.

There's a grouping of the different kinds of data elements. Here's the DNS records and registration details and payment and transactions. Then all the details about the account holder, all the details about the registrant, and similarly, for admin tech, and possibly, a billing contact. Then, as I said, side by side comparison. Just focusing on the validation, we use the compact notation V0 to mean no validation, V1 syntactic, V2 operational, and V3 identity level. And if there's a range, then it means that the rule is any validation within that range. So this is from a policy point of view saying that the registrar can choose what it wants to do as long as it's at least at the syntactic level, and it could be much more in this particular one that I'm pointing out here. That's the basic structure. As you see, the colors match the values that's redundant there. So if there's a change in color, it means there's also a different value there. Here, we have phone extension. We'll

just take whatever is given. As what this says, there's a way of representing that either e-mail or phone is required and a bunch of things. As I said, I'm being very, very fast about this because we're limited on time.

What I have done is lay side by side two sets of rules. One derived from listening to this group and the other derived from spending a lot of time in the Temp Spec and GNSO EPDP Phase 2 and Phase 2A working groups and so forth. What we have here is the ability to do a point by point comparison. For example—let me choose one that will be more interesting here. If we come down to the registrant, this says, for example—it's hard to highlight just what I want—that the street address must be collected and that it must be validated to the operational or identity level, and that that is more specific, that is tighter than and hence consistent with what we think the Temp Spec says, which is that it has to be collected and only has to be checked at the syntactic level.

Let me repeat again. Take full responsibility for all of the markings that are here. They could be completely wrong. So an obvious step is, are these correct or not? If they are correct, then the question is what's the relationship between these two? So there's two separate questions there. That's what I want to say. All of this comes out of an interactive system where it's easy to generate these things and make changes to them. At the very top, not too obvious, but a way of recording when this was done and who did it and what the provenance of this is. And at the moment, this is us reflecting what we think we've heard does not and not intended yet to represent any official output from this group or any other

group and certainly not from ICANN Org yet. That's the quick run through. Any reactions?

MICHAEL PALAGE: I see no hands. If anyone has any questions or comments to Steve's proposal, I would encourage them to submit them via their mailing list. Again, make use of the asynchronous means of communication. Sarah, you have the last word.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. I just want to clarify, what is being proposed here? Is there a proposal? Because this is a very interesting, very detailed spreadsheet. I do look forward to meeting with Steve offline to go through in detail. I think I have some feedback. There's some areas that look a bit weird to me but I need to think about it. But what has been proposed about this sheet for this team? Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: It's related to the comment you made about things looking weird. The tools that we have and the approach that we have dives down to a level of detail that will tend to bring to the surface ambiguities and discrepancies and help focus discussions on, "Well, is that what we meant and is that what we intend?" and to sort that out, and also to provide useful input to higher level policy discussions about, "Well, does that serve the various purposes that are intended?" So this is a more detailed representation of what we think we're saying. As they say, it's intended to clear away a lot of

the brush and provide very precise and easy to understand once one gets past the granularity of this.

SARAH WYLD: I'm just going to jump in. Sorry. I know we're basically out of time, but I still don't understand what is being proposed here. Yes, it's an interesting part. Yes, I want to get into it with you. Michael said that there is a proposal. What is the proposal? Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: The proposal is exactly two things. One is reviewing the specification on the accuracy side as to whether or not that correctly represents what the consensus of this group is. So that's the first task. And then potentially, whether or not that's intended to be consistent with or different from the Temp Spec or anything else, and if so, what the rationale for that would be. It might be okay.

SARAH WYLD: Okay. I mean, that doesn't sound like the work of this group.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, the first part is certainly the work of this group and the second part is just a question of aligning what the output of this group is in comparison with all the other moving parts in the GNSO process. It's fine to say to just focus on the first question. Mr. Austin?

SCOTT AUSTIN:	Thanks, Steve. Quite a bit of work here, and certainly, I agree with Sarah. I would very much like to have a discussion to work out what some of the meaning is in the details. But just the overall scope in terms of the comparison between GNSO Accuracy and ICANN Temp Spec, could you refresh my recollection on why those two were chosen and to be juxtaposed?
STEVE CROCKER:	Well, I chose those because they were easy to choose. We have the ability to compare any pair or in fact more than two. I figured that the Temp Spec is sort of a baseline at the moment. But that's just a question of where you want to focus your attention. In principle, there's a set of rules for the Temp Spec, a set of rules for, say, a GAC Minority Report which says, "No, we'd like it to be this." I would not all be surprised if you said, "Gee, the Intellectual Property Community wishes the following." So we have the ability to compare not only what is the consensus of some group but also what our proposals or desires, and to line these up with each other and see how they compare.
MICHAEL PALAGE:	All right. With that, we are now five minutes into overtime. Again, anyone that has specific questions or comments, please, if you want, reach out to Steve directly on the list. With that, I will bring this week's plenary call to an end. Thank you, everyone. We're almost done so let's just keep together and let's bring this in for a landing on August 11th. Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]