
ICANN Transcription

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team

Thursday, 21 October 2021 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/Kg2HCg>

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 October 2021 at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room. If you're only on the telephone, could you please identify yourself now? Hearing no one, we do have listed apologies from Susan Kawaguchi.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates 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.

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 all to see the chat. Observers will have view-only to the chat access.

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 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 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. I'm going to be doing this without video. I'm doing this today from a hotel room so I want to conserve bandwidth. Just a quick roll call here. I don't believe we have any BC reps on today's call. I see SSAC. We have one IPC. Scott, do you know if Lori is going to be joining today?

SCOTT AUSTIN: I am not sure. We spoke at length yesterday and went through a number of items that were put into the Google Doc. I believe she's going to be with us but I am not sure yet.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. I also have not seen any GAC reps. Alan, ALAC in the house. As always, thank you again. Do we have anyone from NCUC? Stephanie?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Manju's here, NCSG.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Oh, Manju. Thank you very much. My apologies for not seeing you sooner. Jeff and Steve, so we have ALAC. Okay. I just wanted to do that real quick to see what we have. So let's start in with the agenda. If you can blow that up. GAC has now arrived. That is good. Thank you, Melina. Thank you. Yes, my eyesight appreciates the expansion of the text.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Michael, Lori is here too.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Excellent. Thank you. And just as a reminder for everybody, we are starting at the top of the hour so that would be helpful. I appreciate that sometimes you may not be able to join all the time. So with no further waste of time, let's jump into the agenda. As always, we have some administrative issues that I just want to tick through real quick.

First is the issue of the e-mail. I know we've had some discussions on that. What I am going to propose, I have not seen any further objections on the e-mail list. We've had some verbal discussions but we are going to stand up that e-mail address similar to what ICANN did with the SSAD. What is it, the ODP? And we will try it for a month. So we will see how it works. If it works, we'll keep it. If it does not work, we'll sunset it. So that I guess would be administrative issue number one.

Administrative issue number two is the potential use of—what is it, the alternates? My question to Berry or ICANN Org—is that something that we can just do? I don't view that as being

inconsistent with our charter. Is there anything in ICANN Org's perspective that we need to do to move forward with that or can we just have people start designating alternates? Again, I'm just looking at today from the BC group. I don't believe we have any— has Tobias joined? No. So I definitely want to make sure that individual stakeholder groups have either their primary or alternate. So, question there on what we need to do to implement that. Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

The instruction on the charter for the group doesn't foresee alternates but it does provide some leeway for the group to kind of consider if additional expertise or knowledge is necessary. I think under that category, you might also consider whether alternates are helpful to make sure indeed that there's sufficient participation. I think it is probably worth notifying the Council of that. So maybe that can be in the form of an update. I'm trying to remember if we actually have a Council liaison to this group. I don't think we actually have. But I think as it's not specifically foreseen, while in other setups it has been. But I said there is some flexibility within the instructions to expand our membership. I think it's worth sending a notice to the Council flagging that you've indicated that groups, if they want to, can appoint alternates that it would work in a similar way as how does this work in other setups. So an alternate would only participate if the primary member is not available to attend. It's not additional members that are added to the group. And basically, it's checking if there's any concern about doing that.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay, excellent. So what I will do—thank you—I will prepare that communication. I will send it to the list within the next 24 hours. And if there are no issues, I will then forward that to Council. So thank you for that advice. I believe that is the most prudent course of action to go forward.

Next, I believe that is it as far as the administrative issues. I believe the last thing that we need to discuss here is the proposed agenda for ICANN72. As we have discussed, we are going to be meeting next week. There is a session planned, we have intended that as kind of a hybrid format. So the intention there is to have this group undertake some of its substantive work. We still need to work on moving forward with getting a high-level overview of our work plan. Recognizing that, though, we still do want to provide the ability for some participants to the ICANN72 model to perhaps interject and give their thoughts.

So with that in mind, what you see on the screen and what has been circulated by our colleagues from ICANN Org is a proposed agenda. That would be the welcome introduction, a high-level overview of the work plan of this particular group. And then, if you will, an open microphone period to take action.

So I guess my question to the group right here is that—well, actually, I have two questions. Question number one—if I can have a quick show of hands—does everyone intend on being able to participate in that meeting as part of ICANN72? Show of hands. That's good. Excellent. Lots of hands, which is always good to know.

I guess the second question is does anyone have any particular issues with that proposed hybrid format, or are there other suggestions from the group on how we could make more efficient use of that time? No hands. That's good. So let's, I guess, move forward.

I believe what we want to do now is—oh, there is one other thing I forgot to mention. This question goes out to our friends, our colleagues at ICANN Org. I've had a couple of off channel communications from some of the members on how they could go about working with Google Doc. Some of them are not familiar. So my question to ICANN Org is has ICANN prepared any instructional videos or FAQs or any documents that we might be able to make available? That's question one. Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, I will need to check on that. I don't think we have any ICANN Org prepared documents, but I'm sure that there are plenty of Google training materials on this. So we're happy to have a look and find a link to the basic instructions. I mean, in all honesty, it works very much as you would use a word processing tool. And the way that we've set up, the way you can participate, collaborate in the documents is through the form of comments or red lines. Again, that functionality works pretty similar to how it's done in a Word document. It does mean as commenters that you cannot accept your changes or accept those of others. That is something that staff does as a way as well of making sure that we keep document control and version control in mind. But of course, we're always here as well to help if someone has any questions or

any concerns. Feel free to drop us an e-mail and we'll do our best to answer the question.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

That would be helpful. Then I think in addition to, if you will, just the functionality of using Google Docs, I have had some other questions from people about, if you will, the protocols and keeping track of everything. So maybe we could perhaps do that as far as best practices and how to go about making the comments. Because I think some of the discussions I've had with ICANN Org is the need to document that. It's kind of hard sometimes to memorialize what's being said, and then sometimes trying to synthesize some of the discussions on the e-mail list. So having people make those contributions in the Google Docs and have that be reflected I think is the most important thing. So perhaps some one on one on how best to do that would also be helpful. I can work with you, Marika, on getting that out in advance of our meeting next week. Steve, I see your hand. You have the floor.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much for these. Marika, maybe one very simple basic thing is finding the document in the first place, finding the URL to connect to turns out to be a little bit hard to find. Perhaps it could be matter of standard practice that in all of the invitations in which there's all these details about how to connect to the Zoom Room, there could also be included as standard practice a pointer to the documents or to the wiki page.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So if you can, Marika or Terri, can you just pull up the wiki page right now and see what we have available right there? Just if we can see that to Steve's point.

MARIKA KONINGS: I think we currently don't have the Google folder link posted on the wiki yet. I can add that. I've just posted it as well in the chat. I think if everyone bookmarks that specific place because that's where all documents are going to be saved. So it's a dedicated folder for the Accuracy Scoping Team. If you've clicked the link, you'll see there's now one folder that has all the assignment background briefings, and two other documents in there, one of which is the questions for ICANN Org, the input form, and the index of relevant resources.

STEVE CROCKER: Have you ever done a survey of how many people do and don't use bookmarks?

MARIKA KONINGS: No, but I've said we can make sure as well that the link is readily available. Typically, as well, when we send out either action items or reminders, we always include the link to the document that people are expected to either have reviewed or have provided input on. What we'll do as well and what we already started as a practice for those that were on the EPDP as well is that as soon as the document is no longer in use, we'll create an archive folder so that that information and as well input provided remains available but it's at least hopefully clear to the group that that's in

an archive folder so no longer open for input. What we typically do as well, especially if there are multiple documents that are open for review and input, we do put a big heading on a document if it's no longer in use, again, to avoid that people maybe work on older versions. We're learning as we go as well so we're hoping that we've already made some improvements from when we started using Google Docs to where we are now. But of course, if there are suggestions for how we can make this easier for everyone, we'll of course happily take those suggestions.

Maybe one less note as well, one thing that we definitely heard as well from those that participated in the EPDP to try to limit the number of different versions. So what we started doing as well, especially if it's kind of the same text that's under review, to have that in one document where we basically just move older versions down into the document so we don't every time have to circulate a new link, but it basically stays in the same place. People have kind of the archived version in that same document but can still work from that same link, basically.

STEVE CROCKER: All right, thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Lori, you're next in the queue. And then I do want to get us back on to some of our substantive discussion here today. Lori, you have the floor.

LORI SCHULMAN: I just want to go to the technical too, Marika. I'm not sure what the issue is but Scott will attest to this. Yesterday I did try to get to the Google Drive directly from the e-mail. I absolutely could not get in. It took me seven minutes to figure out it was impossible. But Scott then sent me a link that worked perfectly. So I don't understand why one link would work and one link would not, but I just wanted to alert you to that that some of the links inside the e-mails weren't even functioning.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, Scott, what I'm going to do is I will work with ICANN or ICANN Org colleagues. I will send out an e-mail and we will work to empower the individual volunteers to this workgroup to be able to contribute. That's our promise to you to make your contributions to empower that and make that happen. Again, let's get back to the agenda. What I'd like to do is we started on assignment number two last week. So, Terri, if you can pull up the document to see what comments we have in Document 2.

The other topic I do want to discuss today where there was I think some substantive discussions on the mailing list this week was with regard to the proposed definition of accuracy that our Registrar colleagues submitted, and then there was some back and forth. So I would like to get through assignment number two. I would then like to revert to that discussion and then get to three and four. The reason I am going to delay three and four is that that those are assignments that I believe most people are in agreement are largely gated until the completion of one and two. Marika, you have the floor. Would you like to walk us through some of the comments that have been submitted in Google Doc?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes. Thanks, Michael. Just flag to people where we're at and what the new information is. So we're indeed at background briefing assignment number two. And as a reminder, this is about measurement of accuracy. We broke down that question in two parts. So the first part is the scoping team is expected to provide recommendations for how accuracy levels can be determined and measured. So what we did is collected information on how accuracy has been measured in previous studies and reports and documented that.

The first question that is asked here is what information, if any, is missing to support the team's deliberations on recommendations for how accuracy levels can be determined and measured? I think we already looked last week at the Registrar Stakeholder Group input on this question but we now also have input from the IPC on this question.

There's also a second question related to this specific part which asks about the approach that should be taken by the team to develop these recommendations. Again, I think we did already briefly look at the Registrar Stakeholder Group input on this question but we now also have input from the IPC team. Probably I should pause there before we go into part two, I guess.

MICHAEL PALAGE: If I could ask you a question, Marika. So when the Registrars provided their definition on the e-mail list, I believe Sarah provided that to the group, where would you like that to show up in this

document, another document? I'm just trying to figure out. I believe one of the questions from Steve was where should he be responding in a Google Doc to some of the dialogue with that proposed definition. In your opinion, where would you like to see that memorialized or evolve?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah. I can just quickly flick through that. That's actually background briefing number one. Because if you may recall, the question there in part two of the document is asking about is there an agreed definition of registration data accuracy? And if not, what should the working definition be? So there we already have input from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and what we can do is add the definition that was provided on the mailing list. I think we also have input here from Steve already that was noted and discussed as well during the last meeting. However, these background briefings are really to document initial input, work that needs to be undertaken, steps that need to be considered to help inform the development of the work plan. I think we may need to think about or discuss if we start moving into the actual deliberations on topics, whether it makes sense to also do that here or whether that should move over to a separate document where we then document again specifically on this question the different positions of the different groups. And from a staff side, we can of course pull the information that has already been shared on the mailing list as a starting point and have others add to it. So I think the question is do people prefer to continue working here or we leave these background briefings as the input for the work plan and start off separately clean slate on once we've identified what indeed the

specific work items are, start those in a separate document, which then can also be used, of course, to document the working group's conversations on this topic in the report that will ultimately be used to document the conversation as well as any recommendations coming out of this effort.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Thank you. As I said, I want to get through assignment number two, and then we could come back to assignment one with the definition, if that's okay. So, getting back to assignment number two on the continued use of the ARS, as was noted in the background documentation, I believe that this is a project that ICANN Org has put on hold. Yes? Marika, would you want to highlight what your—

MARIKA KONINGS: I just want to flag the ARS is the second part of this assignment. So if you want to take all together, I can just flag/highlight as well what is there.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I'm sorry that I'm jumping ahead. So let's go back to part one. So what information is missing? As the Registrars who said they don't believe there is. So perhaps what I will do here is, Scott, I will let the IPC make their comment, and then I will allow the Registrars to reply to that and let anyone else comment. So let's kick that off, Scott or Lori, whoever would like to take that issue first.

LORI SCHULMAN: I'm fine with doing it. No one's read the answer. We just found this question a little confusing about what data is missing. In a nutshell, our understanding was—and perhaps we're not clear—is how do we restart ARS in a GDPR compliant world? I didn't understand this exercise to be sort of reopening a whole issue of accuracy as much as understanding that there were processes that ICANN have suspended. And the reason that they were suspended is there's been some questions about whether or not this is GDPR compliant. Part of it is my own lack of technical understanding, where was the ARS run as some sort of scraping report where public WHOIS records were scraped? Or were the contracted parties submitting information directly that ICANN? So I think how information flowed through the ARS is extremely important to understand. And to the extent that—yeah, Sarah put in the chat—I thought it was scraping public WHOIS. I do, too, but it would be great to have that confirmed, and understanding that scraping now can't happen because of the redacted nature of WHOIS. So with that being said, how do we still get this report to function? And to simply say, well, it doesn't function because you can't scrape anymore I think defeats the whole purpose of the exercise. How do we make it function?

MICHAEL PALAGE: I believe, actually, this was the university, I believe the research group up in Chicago, if I recall. That was the draft document that never made it to final. Marika, if you want to sit there and speak to this, I know I've read that document. I don't have that off the top of my head. Sarah, go ahead. Sarah, you're in the queue. Go.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you very much. Good morning. I just have a thought that has come to me. As Lori asked, how can we restart the ARS? This is early morning, first thinking. But I wonder maybe there would be value in resuming some kind of review of publicly available registration data, which would help us to determine that much of that data is redacted as required under Data Protection Law. But it would also see that some of the data is not redacted because those domain owners have chosen to publish that data. And for those data that are not redacted, it could review the syntactical accuracy of those data. Understanding of course at the operational accuracy, which is the other important piece of it, is already assessed and confirmed—verified one could say—by the registrar. That’s my thought there. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Alan, please go. You have the floor. Marika, you’re next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. My recollection is the web space web or wiki. I don’t remember which on the ARS does go into some detail about how it runs and how it was collected. That being said, in a former life running the RDS Review Team, I spent a fair amount of time with ICANN and a briefing with ICANN Compliance and the ARS people and got more insight into it that isn’t in the public documents of some of the problems and issues associated with the ARS as it was implemented. I think it may well benefit this group to spend some time getting an actual briefing and having an opportunity to ask questions on both how the ARS functions and issues that were found with it that if we’re going to design a new

one or come up with a replacement that we may want to be thinking about. Things like the time delay that it took to actually process the data became a problem in its own right, and that isn't obvious from the documentation. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, Marc, I'm going to go Marika then, Marc, you're next. But if I could interject there, Alan, what concerns me is you said there was a lot of important information that was not in the documents. So my concern here, as part of our group here from an information gathering perspective, is would you be able to perhaps reach out to those people within ICANN Org that you had those deliberations to perhaps put a document together so that we can look at that? Because if you've undertaken this work and know there are some gaps in the publicly available documents, I would like to make sure that we're filling those holes in so that we don't—

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, I didn't say there was a lot of gaps. I said there was some information that might be useful to us.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: The documents on the web, I think—and again, it's been three years since I looked at them—so my recollection is, though, that

there was this fair amount of things. But that being said, a briefing probably is worthwhile from the people who ran the ARS and I really don't have any contacts, I'm not even sure which of those people are still with ICANN or still in that function. But I'm sure ICANN Org can find someone who understood how it worked.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So what happens here is we have Brian who raised his hand. Brian, is this something you could shed light on? Or is this something you could follow up and provide clarity?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Michael, and thanks, Alan. I just wanted to clarify. I'm more than happy to relay this. If the group wants to maybe identify specific things that might be missing from the existing background documentation, it's my role to relay questions, again, to the Org and to find the right people if the group believes that a further briefing would be good. We believe we'd be happy to set that up. So I just wanted to reconfirm that. So Alan doesn't have to search through old e-mails or something like that. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, Brian, that's something that—if you could undertake that, if you could communicate with Alan, and then when you find the answers or I don't want to say holes or gaps, whatever Alan was referring to, if you could just share that to the list, that would be great.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Yeah, sure. I'll do that. Just a reminder about the Google Doc that we've set up for questions to be relayed to the Org just so we stay organized there if we could use that, but I'll also be taking that as an action for myself.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, Alan, we're trying to use the Docs and make this as efficient as possible. So if you could perhaps synthesize those questions or comments in the Google Docs to facilitate that, that would be helpful. Marika, you still have your hand up. Questions?

MARIKA KONINGS: I just wanted to reiterate again that there is a lot of information that we've already gathered. I just put in the link that I think is also in the index of resources to the ARS that provides further information on how ARS is done and what it uses, what it's based on, and which phase it's in. The ICANN Org briefing as well as the Compliance report and the blog by Jamie Hedlund I think also described in further detail what the challenges currently are with ARS. So I think it would be really helpful if everyone reviews that information. And then based on that, as Brian noted, identifies what the specific questions are because that makes it a lot easier for us to kind of identify where to direct those questions and what is the best way of getting those addressed.

One thing we can double check—and maybe Alan recalls that—if that briefing that was done for the RDS Review Team, if that was part of a public session or session that was recorded, we can also go and dig that out. So we don't need to repeat something that

was already done and people can listen to that. Again, if there's still follow up questions after that, we can of course address those. But I think it's really important to review the ICANN Org briefing and the Compliance materials to better understand what the current limitations are and why ARS is on hold. So I just wanted to flag that. That's it.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So thank you, Marika. Again, in the interest of time, I believe what our colleagues at ICANN Org are saying is I believe, Scott and Lori, some of the answers that I believe you are asking are likely contained in that background document. I will get to you in a second, Scott, after Marc. But perhaps as part of your homework, you could go and review that. And then if there are specific questions that you have, if those could be reflected in the separate Google Doc with questions to ICANN. Marc, you have the floor.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Michael. Oh boy, lots happened since I raised my hand. So hopefully I can respond coherently. I have recently reread the background document prepared by ICANN Org. It's one of our briefing materials. It's contained in the swinehart-to-fouquart-26feb21 pdf. I found that incredibly useful and very relevant to the topic we're talking about right now. There's a lot in there about ARS, the limitations of it, and sort of the thinking from ICANN Org behind why they stopped running it. I find that extremely helpful and extremely useful. Yes, Sarah's linking it in chat. That I think is extremely useful for our work right now.

That's today. I want to give a plus one to what Alan Greenberg said. I think there is a ton of useful information in that document. ICANN Org did a great job with it. But I find that a document just isn't always as useful as getting a briefing on the topic. I think it'd be well worth our time to get a briefing from ICANN Org on it and sort of get to hear from them in their own words. I think it's important to remember Registries and Registrars are all required to provide a WHOIS response for every domain that they have under management. Some of that data can be redacted under our current working policy. Not all contracted parties are redacting that data. ICANN sort of notes that as one of the challenges for ARS. I'm sort of quoting from page 16. "Any results may be biased towards contracted parties who do publish contact details in registration data or those who consent to publication." So I think if I could summarize, ARS could be run today, right? Every domain under management has a public RDDS or WHOIS response. It's not that there are any domains that don't have a WHOIS response, they all do. It's just some data is now redacted that maybe wasn't previously, and that I think in ICANN Org's mind, fairly so skews the results. So I think that's some of the considerations we have to take into account as part of our work.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thanks, Marc. So, Scott and Alan, you're up next in the queue. If I could hit pause here and let me interject on what I have here and this is what I'm proposing. I have no objections to bringing ICANN Org on to, as you say, Marc, perhaps given the interactive session. I'm not opposed to doing that. The only pre-qualification to that is I will want to make sure everyone has done their

homework and read the briefing documents. If we do get ICANN Org on for, say, an hour of our time, I don't want people trying to do their homework on the fly. I would really like a lot of that briefing and background work to be done. I think this is, again, why we set up that document to ask ICANN Org questions. So if we do have these questions, let's get them documented on the list and I really think that that is going to make the most efficient use of our time. As I stated previously, I want to keep this to one plenary call a week and the only way we can do that is by us doing our homework in advance. So that is my first comment.

The second comment—Scott, I will let you correct me if I'm wrong here—the concern that I think I am hearing from the IPC is can the ARS be done? The previous way where there was basically a statistical analysis geographic across TLDs that then resulted in pulling publicly available WHOIS information, the reason ICANN Org suspend that is that the current availability of that data is largely broken or inefficient. What I think I'm hearing from the IPC is great. The process for collecting that data has been put on hold. Is there some way of perhaps legally, under a GDPR compliant fashion, getting that data from the Registrars so that the ARS analysis can be undertaken? That is what I think I'm hearing. And then the other point that I think Sarah made is, while that is one question, I believe the Registrars are also asking, "Can there be other surveys that could be asked to perhaps get to the same outcome of what the ARS was?" That is what I have heard. So I am now going to Scott. Did I get that right or did I mischaracterize what I heard from the IPC?

SCOTT AUSTIN: Michael, can you hear me okay, first of all? I want to make sure that my microphone and everything's working.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Hearing you loud and clear, Scott.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Okay. Yeah, Michael. I think that covers a part of it. But as Lori and I were working through our responses yesterday to this for the IPC, there's just so much material and unlike I think other stakeholders who may work with these documents on a daily basis, in part because it's what they're contractually bound to or it's what they work with in terms of their data storage and review and analysis and protection expertise. In the IPC, we have work which really is more in the legal vein and less in the technical vein. So for us, it's a catch up to collect all of the documents and then try to digest them on a weekly basis.

This is also while as Lori has mentioned in the chat that ICANN72 is going on. So there's a lot of legal and technical and policy material to cover. So that's where we really appreciate that this gets scoped out for us. What are the primary things to look at and how much of that should go in? Otherwise, it's a futile exercise because we don't know what we should be asking because we don't have the materials that raised the question. I think what we've summarized in our response on part two really goes to the heart of the matter and goes to the matter of—because there's been other things about purpose.

My understanding is there had been some specific purposes outlined in ICANN documents done in the EDPA perhaps on level one and that there are answers to that. But we're just trying to grasp all of the material. It seems to me assignment two goes to the heart of the matter of accuracy because it really gets into the nuts and bolts, and let Steve Crocker and his dialogue with Volker Griemann on some e-mails was particularly enlightening and is very important because some of the language that is in the various sections of the specification that apply here is being read as characterized, in some cases a discretionary, and in other cases as obligatory.

I think we need to deal with that aspect as well. Because to me, this accuracy element is we're reviewing the accuracy of one of the most important databases in existence and trying to get a handle on what kind of data quality is there and what's capable, as Lori has put it in a GDPR compliant world. So that's what we're dealing with and trying to grasp, but I just don't want it to get moved along too quickly, and that's to basically say, "Yeah, that's handled. Let's move on to three."

MICHAEL PALAGE:

I appreciate, Scott, that there is what I would call an information imbalance. Obviously, the contracting parties, this is their day job. And obviously, the reason they participate is these contracts have an impact on their day-to-day business. So I recognize that there is, if you will, an imbalance for some people, some volunteers that do not work for contracting parties that have a longer runway to get up to speed. That's something where I as a chair will always try to make sure that there is that equilibrium. That being said, I

would say all these documents were originally out, I know myself it took me a lot of reading. So again, I'm trying to find that balance. All of your comments about ICANN72, I agree with. But again, I want to try to be focusing on some of the facts and if we could point to the documents and focus on that—like the substantive discussion that was going on on the definition.

With that, I see lots of hands. We have 45 minutes left and I would really like to get through this assignment number two and begin to have a substantive discussion on the definition that the Registrars put forward. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to go down the queue real quick. If you could keep your comments, we're to 60 seconds short on the point. Alan, you're in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. From Lori's original comment, what I heard is there's some lack of understanding of exactly what the ARS is, how it was done, and what the issues were with it. I appreciate that there are infinite number of documents out there. But if you look at these particular documents, they have several footnotes. The footnotes point to web pages which then have many hyperlinks in them. Not everyone has the stamina to go through those and actually understand it. And that's why I suggested a briefing maybe a way to get everyone level set so they understood we're all talking about the same thing. Point being made is now it's in your hands. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Marika, you're up next in the queue.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Michael. Just to make life easier for Scott and others, just to kind of highlight the index of relevant resources is basically the long list of all documents in ICANN's history that have touched upon accuracy and that seemed relevant for this conversation. That's a long list and documents are very long, but it does provide helpful context in relation to relevant information. Having said that, the background briefing documents are specifically tailored to pulling together the most relevant information to address those questions. If I can just scroll down to the second part of this question, which is specifically about ARS, that has grouped together here. We even took out the most relevant excerpts in relation to this topic of ARS. Hopefully, that makes it a little bit easier to find the most relevant information and get up to speed. There is, of course, still a list of documents here. But that hopefully point you in the right direction. As I said, we've tried to pull out what seems to be the essence of some of those documents.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you. Sarah, you're on the clock. 60 seconds.

SARAH WYLD: Good morning. Thank you. I want to go back to something I heard just a couple of moments ago. I think Scott said some of the language in the specification is being characterized as discretionary. And the specification referred to there is the WHOIS Accuracy Specification. I noticed that also in the e-mail thread

yesterday and it confused me. So thank you, Scott, for bringing that up. Though WHOIS Accuracy Specification is a mandatory obligation that registrars must adhere to and ICANN does enforce. So I'm not sure why it's being approached or characterized as optional or discretionary. The requirements that we outlined in our definition of accuracy, which is the current working definition that we pulled out of the RAA, because that's what the specification belongs to, that is indeed mandatory for registrars. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Thank you, Sarah. Steve, 60 seconds on the clock. Go.

STEVE CROCKER: Perfect. Thank you. Three things. I think I'm seeing a little bit of confusion or conflation between the data that's collected versus data that is disclosed. In terms of accuracy, the requirement is that the data that's collected has to be accurate. Whether or not that data is made available is a totally separate question. That then segues into the next comment. The ARS was designed at a time when all of the data was available. The obvious knee-jerk thing is, given the situation we're in, if you're going to design a system to check for accuracy, start from the facts that exist now. There has to be a method of getting out all the data that's collected, not just the data that's available.

The third thing directly responsive to what Sarah just said, I think there is actually an ambiguity that came out of the dialogue yesterday, Sarah. What's mandatory is a minimum level of validation but it seemed clear to me that there was also the

possibility that a registrar might choose to impose a higher level of validation at their discretion. And the question then from a policy point of view is: are they permitted to do that? I'll also add that I've had conversations with a well-known registrar in which they say they reserve the right to do a higher level of validation for various data elements under circumstances of their design. So I would think that the right specification, jumping ahead from the scoping to where it's going to go, is that the policy at the ICANN level is to set a minimum mandatory level. But I think it's a separate question whether or not to restrict registrars from doing more than that. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. Steve, that was time dilation for 60 seconds, but okay. What happened is just a quick time check here. We have 40 minutes left. I want to get through this issue because, Steve, I do want to have this broader discussion. Sarah, we are going to have this definition so hopefully we could come back to that. I really do want to wrap up this second assignment so we can get back to the definition of what is voluntary, discretionary, what's set forth contractually in the agreements. Scott, go ahead. 60 seconds, please. Go.

SCOTT AUSTIN:

Quickly, the thing that caught my attention, and I'll make this fast, look at footnote 9, which is down ways that talks about the problems even during the ARS phase, now without it. And thank you, Steve, for making that statement of the distinction between collection and display of data. I think that's extremely important.

But if we don't have ARS and data is being collected, what is being done to test for accuracy? Thank you, Sarah, for agreeing that the discretionary versus obligatory is an important question we need to discuss.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Sarah, you have the last word on this.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you so much. Just going back to what Steve said. And thank you, Scott, for your support there. Steve mentioned the possibility that the registrar might choose to impose a higher level of validation. I mean, sure, if that is their business decision, I'm not sure what that really has to do with this. But I don't know what Steve's referring to that's optional. So it might be useful to dedicate some agenda time to reviewing the accuracy specification together in detail. The policy does already set a minimum mandatory level of both validation, which is what we refer to in our definition as syntactical accuracy, and verification, which we refer to as operational accuracy. So if we're looking at how to determine whether there are current accuracy obligations, which there are, then I think that is probably a useful approach to it, is reviewing the existing specifications. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Marika, if we can scroll down to the bottom of the second question here, whether it needs to be revamped or revisited. And if you could go back real quick, I just want to read one. Sorry. Back to the second question. I usually would have multiple

screens in my office and I'm struggling with one so my apologies. So the second part of that or whether there are other ways in which accuracy levels can or should be measured.

I think what I'd like to do here is I would like everyone to go back and read some of that ARS documentation. I would like them to propose specific questions to ICANN Org in that separate Google Doc. After we have looked at that, I will work with our ICANN Org colleagues to arrange that briefing session. I would say we're done with assignment two right now.

What I would like to do to make most efficient use of our time is to go back to assignment one regarding the proposed definition. Because to Sarah's point, the contracting parties, their starting line or their starting point is the contract. So I want to turn over the floor right now. Sarah, Roger, or Volker, if someone from the Registrar Constituency could walk through their definition, explain the position, and then we'll begin to engage in that dialogue that was happening. I believe via e-mail, instead of asynchronous, we'll make it a little more real time. Sarah or anyone from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, you have the—Roger, I see your hand up.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Michael. Again, I maybe make a little clarity and I think everybody's said it on this call or several people have already said it on this call. This isn't a proposed definition. This is the working definition that Registrars use with ICANN. I don't think that there's anything proposed here. We're not suggesting this is what this group ends up with. We're just detailing what the working

definition is today. And maybe that provides a baseline of where we go from here. But just to make that clear, we're not proposing anything, we're not trying to say this is the end result. This is just what it is today via our contract. To Michael's point, I think everybody can read this, has read this probably. I don't need to get into too much detail here unless people want me to get into detail. But again, I just want to make sure that everybody's clear that we're not proposing anything. This is just the working definition between Registrars and ICANN as it is today.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Roger, yes, I acknowledge this. There is nothing proposed. We are literally starting with what is in the Registry Accreditation Agreement. That is what you're pointing to. What I would like to do is now that you have reiterated that statement rather succinctly, I believe Steve and Scott did have some questions on that. So I would like to drill down a little on that to see—and I see Alan. So what I'm going to do is I would like to drill down on that here, particularly for those people that may not have been keeping track of all the e-mails. So what I'm going to do, Alan Greenberg, you're on the clock. Go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that yes, this is the defined statement on the contracts today. In my opinion, it is not suitable for moving forward for a very specific reason. The specification says the registrar, at their discretion, can pick either the telephone number or the e-mail address to check the accuracy. In the world that this statement was written several years ago, both of these

fields were available. So if for instance, the registrar checked, validated the e-mail address, but not the phone number, you could try both of them and hopefully one of them would work. In the world we're in right now, you may not have access to both of them. You may request something but in the registrar's view, it will be sufficient to give you the e-mail address but not the phone number, for instance, whereas the phone number may be the thing that was validated. So allowing the registrar to check either one but not necessarily give you both of them takes away the guarantee of some level of validation of the information that's made available to you. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Steve, you are on the clock.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. I note that I have another call at the top of the hour, so I won't run over by very much at all. After the back and forth with Sarah and with Volker, the only issue that remained in my mind is that if you drill down what's on the screen, the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification Section F, the last paragraph of that seems to suggest a higher level of validation than simply making sure that there is a way to reach, that it's operable phone number or an operable e-mail address. If you could click on that WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification link, it should be live. Nope. That's fine, whatever. Then when it comes up, scroll down to Section F.

The Section F has little letter i, little ii, and if you look at the last paragraph there right above two. In either case, the registrar does not receive an affirmative response, registrar shall verify, and if the registrar does not receive an affirmative response from the account holder, registrar shall verify the applicable contact manually but it's not required to suspend any registration. That manual process can be read—at least I read it and perhaps incorrectly—as pushing for a higher level of validation than simply whether or not things are deliverable. Because when you do it manually, you get somebody on the other end. Then the question is, are you verifying their identity or simply that the mail got delivered or that the phone got answered? That's a very fine point perhaps but is where I got hung up in trying to distinguish as to whether or not this was operable or operational versus identity validation.

Then one final very small point, backup in the definition. From SAC058 that are referenced, there are three levels there. There is an implied fourth level that isn't mentioned, which is doing nothing, which is taking the input as given, that is not even doing syntactic validation, just for completeness. With that, with apologies, I do have another meeting that I'm chairing so I have to break off. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Steve. Okay. Sarah, you're next in the queue. Go, please.

SARAH WYLD:

Yes. Thank you. I'm super disappointed that Steve is not able to remain in this meeting because of course I wanted to respond to what he said. So my hope is that he'll be able to listen to the recording so that we can all get on the same page. Because we have a very different understanding of how this specification works or what the requirements are in real life.

Firstly, going back to what Alan said, Alan said that the current requirements are not suitable. And to that, I would really say why? What problem is there? That's what I think the job of the scoping team would be, is to determine if there is an issue. And I have to say very clearly, accuracy is not the same thing as access to the data. The relevant controller has the responsibility of determining accuracy. And as you can see right here on screen, there are processes that are mandatory for doing so. But the ability for some person on the Internet to look up the WHOIS data and look at the e-mail address is not the same as making sure that accuracy is the case. Those are very, very different things. That's part one.

Part two, to Steve and the higher level of validation. I think it's really important here that we need to not conflate the account holder and the registrant. I just want to point out that if the registered name holder does not respond in the appropriate time period, the domain gets suspended. But if the account holder does not respond, there is no need to suspend the domain. That's a difference in that paragraph. So it's important to keep that in mind.

Going back to what he said about manual here, manual verification could mean a higher level. In my experience, that has been taken to mean that instead of using an automated system to

send the verification e-mail to the domain owner, there might be, for example, somebody from the customer service team sends an e-mail directly that they then get a reply to or they actually call the person on their phone instead of using an automated system. I have never seen this interpreted to mean that the identity is validated, such as checking an ID card against the registration data. That's just not operationally what's going on here and I don't think it's the requirement. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Volker, you're on the clock. Go, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Thank you. Also disappointed that Steve had to leave because I think this would have been helpful for him as well. I was part of the Negotiation Team of the 2013 RAA. And the reason why we have that language is because we wanted it in there. ICANN have the opinion that failure to verify should lead to the automated deactivation of the domain name after 15 days. So if you forget to click on that link that we send you then your hospital website, your e-commerce website, your blog might go down and you might lose whatever you had operational for the time that it takes you to get it back online. Whereas with this option, we now can have for important customers that we know and trust, for corporate registrars that may want to have additional levels of securities a way to avoid that automatism of deactivation and basically the ability for certain registrars that want to do that to flag certain registrations as essential or critical domain names and thereby avoiding automated deactivation if they so choose. But it still does

not require a registrant to do anything. It's just an option to protect high value domain names or critical resources that you manage for a customer. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Volker. Stephanie, you're next in the queue. If I may, however, I just want to jump ahead here and perhaps this may answer your question. With regard to, I believe, some of the comments that have talked about the access to the data, I believe that the access was something that was largely and subsequently discussed through other EPDP Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 2A. I believe with regard to this scoping group, we are just more narrowly focused on the accuracy, if there is an element of access that would be defined for purposes of undertaking any survey. That may be your question. If not, I apologize. Stephanie, you have the floor.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thank you. What I was going to say was to comment further on what Sarah was saying about the review of the data by the registrar. There is syntactical verification and there is operational verification, which in my book means, does it actually work? Is the mail delivered? Is the e-mail delivered? Does the phone work? Any one of those three. What you're talking about if you get through to, for instance, an NGO and the name on the registration is not necessarily the one that is currently doing admin or operations, but you're still dealing with the holder of the domain name, for lack of a better term, any other further examination of this amounts to a qualitative review of the data. And that is

something that possibly we need to talk about as we figure out the scope of this because I think it's outside the scope of what ICANN needs to do to ensure the stability of the Internet. It may be something that registrars want to do for their own risk but it should not be called into this particular PDP on accuracy. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. Just a quick time check here. What I would like to do—as was reminded by our ICANN Org colleagues—I would like to touch on assignments three and four so that we can begin to discuss a broader work plan next week. I do want to devote the last 20 minutes. I'm going to allow Roger and Melina to speak on this issue. I think we had a good dialogue. I would like to see this either take place with specific questions to ICANN Org or perhaps in other documents, but I'm going to be wrapping this up after Roger and Melina speak, and we'll be going back to assignment three and four to run through those documents. Roger, you have the floor.

ROGER CARNEY:

Thanks, Michael. This is going to be quick. I just wanted to follow up. From what I'm hearing, I think what I'm hearing is everyone agrees that this is the current working definition. Everybody sees that this is in our contract. So everybody is on the same page where this baseline is. And just what Stephanie followed up with, I think what I'm hearing as well as that's fine that that's the baseline. The purpose of this team really is to see if that baseline is adequate. If not, what are those things and should we try to add those things? Is that what everyone's hearing? At least that's what

I seem to be hearing is this baseline seems correct to everyone. The goal here is to see if it's right or if we need to make modifications.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I believe, that is the working assumption that I am on also, as well as this is it. Is this working, though, in reality? Is there gaps that need to be dressed or additional clarity?

ROGER CARNEY: Great.

MICHAEL PALAGE: That is my understanding and from what I'm hearing. Melina, you have the last word on this.

MELINA ASIMINA STROUNGI: Thank you, Michael. Thanks also, Roger and Sarah, for providing us this definition, which serves as a very useful starting point. Precisely because this is about fact finding and gathering as much information as possible and reviewing what is currently the reality under new developments, I would personally assume that a lot of things has changed since 2013 that this definition was first drafted. So we have to definitely take into account other developments, recent practice. I don't recall whom. I think it was Alan who mentioned the phone number and the e-mail verification, for instance. Currently, we have two-factor authentication in a lot of instances. Even in the commission, for instance, we would use

two-factor authentication. So, verifying both the e-mail and address, for instance, could be useful.

It would be another element that could be also useful when considering the accuracy definition would be to go beyond syntactical and operational accuracy to basically ensuring that the data corresponds to the actual person behind that. Because contrary to what I thought that Stephanie said, but I'm not entirely sure, so apologies if I understood something wrong, but don't think it is outside ICANN's remit to not take into account the security of the Internet. If I remember correctly, in the comment I inserted last week, it was in ICANN Bylaws that there should be efforts to improve accuracy and taking into account legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust. So this is also in ICANN's Bylaws so I don't think they would fall outside the scope of what we try to do. So this is too early to obviously agree on a definition, but I think these elements would be very useful to take into account. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Melina. So what I would now like to do—Stephanie, I still see your hand. Is that an old hand? I will assume that's an old hand. Marika, can you please put back up on the screen assignment number three and assignment number four? Well, one at a time. So real quick, there has been some previous discussion on the list regarding the timing of assignment three and assignment four. We could leave that until the end. I do want to, however, walk through these documents to see what comments have been submitted. So, Marika, would you like to perhaps strive

to see what comments, if any, have been contributed on these documents?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Sure. If I can make one observation as well, because I think actually the previous conversation also really went I think to assignment one and two. As we said before, the conversations that we're having in relation to the background briefings is really to try and help inform the development of the work plan. And it seems that we already made some progress by potentially agreeing on what is the current, the working definition of accuracy. So when we talk about accuracy, everyone knows what that means in the current context. But as some have indicated, that might not be the definition that some would like to see tomorrow or the day after. So I think what the group may need to think about as well, what information is needed to indeed come to that conclusion or agreement that something else may be necessary and what does the group need to do to understand the landscape? Some have indicated there are issues, there are problems, but how can that be documented and investigated? So that indeed, if there is agreement that the definition of today is not necessarily what the definition of tomorrow should be, how the community can get there and what work needs to be undertaken to get there.

So basically, then looking at assignment number three and the instructions to the group, make clear that the expectation is that work first needs to be completed on assignment one and two before meaningful conversations can start on assignment number three. So assignment number three really focuses on the

effectiveness. So basically, based on the assessment that is done and the data that is expected to result from the consideration of two to undertake an analysis of the accuracy levels that are measured to assess whether the contractual data accuracy obligations are effective at assuring that registered name holders provide accurate and reliable contact information.

So here, we did the same thing as we did for the previous ones. We broke that down basically in two pieces. The first part is really about what is going to be done under assignment one and two. And then under the part two of that is really looking at the analysis of the accuracy levels measured to assess whether the contractual data accuracy obligations are effective. So the question we asked here is really what is needed to be able to undertake such an analysis in this context, what is meant with effective, and how are accurate and reliable to be interpreted? I think that also refers back to the working definitions that we just discussed now, how is that currently interpreted? And indeed, is that something that everyone believes is still what should be the interpretation of those requirements?

So we only got input here from the ALAC on this particular question. Actually, we also have an additional point that Michael added here on a proposed data point for future input and looking at whether a study might be necessary or not. And if so, if that's something that's already identified at this stage, what could be done to make sure that when the time comes and the specific need is identified that resources are available to undertake such a study? So I'll pause there.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Marika, for succinctly summarizing everything. To my point on the survey, I believe Sarah has commented that there could potentially be alternatives or additional surveys in addition to the old ARS formatted. So that's what I was trying to point out there.

So are there any questions or comments from the broader group on assignment number three? Okay. So I am going to take silence. We will move on to assignment number four.

MARIKA KONINGS: So assignment number four is really basically the conclusion of the group's work and focusing on impact and improvements. So basically, once the analysis on the three has been completed, the team is expected taking into account estimates of the benefits and costs to assess whether any changes are recommended to improve accuracy levels, and if so, recommend to the GNSO Council how and by whom these changes would need to be developed. For example here, if changes are recommended to existing contractual requirements then a PDP or contractual negotiations are necessary to actually develop and implement those changes. So again, here we tried to break the sound. It was less obvious than in the other parts. But of course on the findings on number three, that first of all need to be completed before this part of the assignment can be done.

And then two, it asked a question about take into account estimates of benefits and costs. The question here from the scoping team is when and how are estimates of benefits and costs expected to be developed? Again, we're asking these questions to

help inform the development of the work plan. We know that this work doesn't start after one and two are completed. But if there are any thoughts about what it takes to basically do this, it may help us in estimating a timeline for that. I think as Michael has indicated as well, if there are potentially aspects of that work that could be done in parallel with one and two, it could be considered by the group whether that's feasible and possible.

Then part three here asks about the assessment of whether any changes are to be recommended. And so we're asking here is there anything further apart from the outcome of assignment one and three, and the cost benefit analysis that would need to be taken into account for the scoping team to deliberate on this question. Again, if there's something there that the group can already identify, it would be helpful to know that now. So again, that can be factored in as a work plan is developed.

Then I think as well, already thinking about what are the options the team can consider for how and by whom these changes would need to be developed? Again, of course, it's linked to the response to the previous question. So again, there are of course a limited number of options that are on the table is already any work possible on detailing those and once the group gets to this stage, you already have your kind of list of options that could be considered for recommendations.

So I think that wraps it up here. We didn't get any input or comments yet. But I don't know if anyone has any reactions at this stage.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So if I could jump in here, Marika, and tee this up. Roger, I think you and I had an exchange on the list regarding the gating functionalities of assignment three and four, whether task one and two needs to be done as a prerequisite between three and four. While I agree that we cannot undertake substantive work in three and four until one and two is done, I do believe that there is some preparatory work that can be done regarding identifying potential surveys, requesting budget from ICANN to undertake those surveys. I guess my question to the group is, is there any opposition to perhaps undertaking some of that preparatory work? Not substantive discussion, but some of that preparatory work while we are still undertaking one or two. So that would be sort of teeing that up for the group. That would really be helpful because depending upon how that is answered will have a direct and material impact on our work plan. Alan, I see you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have no problem of starting two, three, and four now but with the understanding that as we work through one and two, the answers to three or four may change, and things that we determine are necessary or sufficient at this point in terms of perhaps a survey or study that needs to be done may change and we may have to do it over again. So I question whether indeed it's reasonable to do it. Yes, we can start but it may need to be replicated or changed because of what we determined as we complete one and two. So that's simply a consideration. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Roger, you're on the clock. Go.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Michael. Yeah, I agree with Alan. I think, obviously for us, it may be a stretch even to do anything on. It all depends on what comes out of three. I think that a lot of what three is trying to work towards I think we'll talk about. I don't know that we have to drill down when doing one and two. But I think a lot of those, I mean, even today we've talked about certain things that is in three and not in one in two. I think even two gets to be an issue of is it in the right spot? How do you talk about measuring accuracy when you don't even know what accuracy is? So I think that obviously there's going to be a little bit of overlap. And to Alan's point, I think there probably will be some rework that we have to go back and forth on, especially how do you measure accuracy while you're still trying to define accuracy? The obvious plane scenario comes in, how do you build it when you're flying it kind of thing. Obviously, four to me seems like it doesn't need to be touched until much later on. But to your point, Michael, I think we'll talk about three but I don't know what we can do with three specifically. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Excellent. Thank you, Roger. We now have seven minutes left. Is there any final closing thoughts or comments? Berry, you have the floor.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Michael. I think Roger's intervention, he'll know where I'm coming from. I believe our colleagues here that have lived in the EPDP land for the last several years will know where I'm coming from here. When Marika's referring to the work plan as this is not a PDP but it is still a group that is sponsored or chartered from the GNSO Council, and at some point, we owe them a thorough project plan and a target date of when we're going to conclude our work. And the reason why it was important for the group to review every background and briefing document across all four assignments is we need to identify the big things that we think we're going to need so that can be properly inputted into a project plan and we come up with some sort of target date when this work might reasonably conclude. That's not to presuppose any of the outcomes of this. But that's why it's very important here.

So the reason why I picked on Roger is our Transfer Working Group, we went through a very diligent upfront exercise to review through the charter questions and we were asking ourselves about how long do we think that it's going to take us to cover the assignments as defined by the instructions to the Council or in the transfer case, the charter, understanding can they be worked on in parallel or can they be worked on iteratively? And then eventually develop an output of a project plan and come up with the key milestone dates for which was sent back to the Council and thereby were committed to work on that.

So I would ask this group over the weekend and it looks like that this is going to be part of the topic for next week to really think about some of these key aspects that this group may want to or

thinks that must be included as part of the deliberations here. As part of PDP 3.0, there are no more open-ended groups. We need to come up to a reasonable date, commit to it, and work towards that diligently.

The last thing I'm going to say about this is this has been decided by the community to be an important topic to discuss. I'm not suggesting that we need to work at the pace of the prior EPDPs but there has to be some sense of urgency to the work that's being assigned for homework perspective, as well as the productivity in our plenary calls. Because, again, I don't want us to fall into the trap that maybe we could deliver this by December of next year. 1.5 hours per week across 52 weeks is under 80 hours of plenary call time, assuming that we stay at this current schedule and duration on a weekly basis. It turns out that that's not a lot of time. It doesn't account for ICANN meetings, it doesn't account for holidays and those kinds of things. But at the same time, I don't think that the Council will accept a project plan that's three years out either. So there's got to be an inventory of exactly what this group needs to deliberate on, what expects that its outcomes are going to be so that we can assign that reasonable date and then pass that to the Council. The final thing I'll say—and it's a broken record from me—this isn't the only piece of work going on in the GNSO and everyone knows that. But the Council is management of the PDPs and they need to have oversight so that they can plan at a greater skill of all of the other policy efforts that are either in flight or in the pipeline. So that's why it's very important that we do our due diligence up front so that we can get to that reasonable date. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Berry, for that public service announcement, important reminder. So I think with that, we will bring this today's meeting to a close. I'd like to thank everyone for the participation. And to Berry's last point there, I will work with him and the rest of our ICANN Org colleagues to have a proposed workflow plan in advance of next week's meeting so that we could actually begin to try to flesh out and have some specific time so that we can hopefully report back to Council by the end of the month. So thank you, everyone. Enjoy the rest of your day.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]