
ICANN Transcription

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team

Thursday, 25 November 2021 at 14:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/3gC7Cg>

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

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team Call taking place on Thursday, 25th of November, 2021 at 14:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom Room only. If you're on the telephone, could you please let yourselves be known now.

Hearing no one, we've received apologies from Melina Stroungi, Susan Kawaguchi, Roger Carney, Sophie Hey, Marc Anderson, Beth Bacon, Lori Schulman, Stephanie Perrin, Olga Cavalli, Manju Chen, and Becky Burr. And none received from the alternates.

Statements of interest must be kept up-to-date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now. If you need assistance updating your statements of interest, please email the GNSO Secretariat.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

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

All documentation and information can be found on the wiki space. Recordings will be posted on the public wiki space shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. Thank you and over to our chair, Michael Palage. Please begin.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Nathalie. Hello, everyone. As I had indicated via the mailing list earlier this week, and as evident by the number of apologies that Nathalie read through, we will not be undertaking any substantive work. I encourage all working group members to continue to work offline so that we can continue to meet our deadlines.

The reason I decided to hold this meeting was to reinforce the importance of cadence and having the group as a whole stay on time so that we can meet our deliverables as we have conveyed then to the GNSO Council.

As you may recall, several weeks ago, it was the intention for there to be no call. However, I believe if you look at where we're at right now, we are I think falling behind in our deliverables

regarding assignments number one and number two. So again, that's one of the reasons I wanted to do this.

The remainder of this call will just be purely administrative identifying where I think we as a group are I believe falling behind. And to perhaps clarify some of the upcoming work items and deliverables that will be required.

So the first deliverable in which we've had some slippage, today was supposed to be the close of all questions that were supposed to be submitted to ICANN org for clarification. I wanted to particularly thank ALAC, the registrars, and the registries which have submitted a number of questions. We still are lacking any—I believe we're still lacking any questions from the Non-Contracting Party House, again, with the exception of ALAC. So I would urge all of our members there to please follow up. It will be the intention to close the initial round of questioning to ICANN org at the conclusion of next week's meeting. So that again is homework item number one.

Homework item number two deals with what we were previously referring to aspirational definition. During last week's call, there was a lot of concern, I believe particularly from the registries and the registrars, regarding how that term aspirational may in fact be sidetracking or diverting us from following the path set forth by the Council with our assignments one through four.

After consulting with our ICANN org colleagues earlier this week, Marika circulated to the list a proposed new table. So this table is part of, if you will, I believe it's assignment number two—current

assignment number two which we are now referring to as a gap analysis.

So I believe this actually fits in line with some of the questions that the registries have supplemented to the list that talk about the current working definition, aka legal construct, and what it is that ICANN compliance follows.

So I think and Volker and Sarah ... I promised I wouldn't do anything substantive, so I won't go there. If you want to go there, I will respond. But hopefully, the revised template that we collectively put forward I think is more in line with trying to do that gap analysis. And depending upon then what happens in assignments three, maybe four, we can get to some of those tasks. I know there are some stakeholders that want to be focusing on three and four but I do believe it is important to work to stay methodical, go through our work sequentially.

So with that, I believe the original deadline for that assignment was also the second. What we have done is we have pushed that out. We have pushed that out a week to I believe the ... Yes, we've pushed that out. Now if in fact we are able to get through the questions next week quicker, anyone that has provided a gap analysis, we will start that work there.

So that is where we are at. I think we can still make our original deliverables, which was completing assignments one and two by the end of January. I think that is still possible. We will continue to meet on Thursday. I believe the only meeting which we will probably be canceling is the meeting on the 30th of December and that is because all of ICANN org is in a—I don't want to call it a

shut down. That may send the wrong words—a light working schedule. Only critical employees are working during that period of time.

And unlike today where we were able to sit there and accommodate most ICANN org staff or employees that are not celebrating the Thanksgiving holiday—except Berry. Thank you for joining voluntarily. No one twisted your arm. For that, we do not want inconvenience our ICANN org colleagues. So I can tell you right now we probably will not be having a regular scheduled call on the 30th although we still will ... It is still my intention to have everyone working during that period of time asynchronously via the Listserv, so that we can meet our deliverables

So with that, I will pause. I believe that is the end of my administrative update. If there are any other administrative issues that those joining today would like to raise, I have no problem answering those or we can ... I see someone with their hand raised and that would be ... Why can't I?

ALAN GREENBERG: It would be Alan.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Why can I not see your hands? There we go. Okay, Alan. Yes, please. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe you're not scrolled to the top. Two points, number one on the gap analysis. I found these questions partly not addressing the problem and partly overlapping with things. For instance, number two and number four both talk about documenting whether the current goals are being met or how do we document the needs.

I just didn't find it very satisfying and be able to really express what our position was. So I'm just noting that. We will answer them but I almost would hope for a number five. Is there anything else you believe has to be said which isn't quite addressed by the questions? So I'll just note that I don't think the questions were well phrased to elicit the information that we're either looking for or trying to give, number one.

Number two, I've been having problems with the mailing list, not receiving some mails. And I understand from staff that I'm not the only one. I wonder if we can have an update on that. I'll also note the mailing list archive was locked, although I hope its fixed now. But you couldn't get into it unless you had your mailing list password and such. So thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So I don't know if our ICANN org colleagues are on today could speak to that technical issue. Marika, Berry?

BERRY COBB: So the mailing list, the archive mailing list, there is an issue that's still being worked. But I think it was late last week. Several of the active Mailman list were inadvertently tagged as private and ICANN org IT colleagues are working to correct that issue. But it's being done on a per list basis. We don't have an ETA on when those are going to be fully rectified but the more important lists, we're flagging to try to correct or undo the privacy setting in an urgent manner.

As for not receiving emails from the list, I'm not aware of any issues but we'll take a look and see if there are.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Sure. And so what happens is, Alan, again, since a lot of the I would say ICANN org colleagues in IT department are probably celebrating the extended Thanksgiving holiday weekend, I will make it a point to document this. And on the Tuesday call that Olga and I have with ICANN org, I will try to have an update for you and the rest of the list by end of Tuesday if that's acceptable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I'm not quite sure why this is an onerous thing. It's one parameter to change in Mailman but I won't comment on that. The mailing list problem, I missed a number of mails. For instance, I only saw Volker's mail to you about the ICANN questions because I saw your reply. And I only saw his message when I finally made my way into the archive. I reported it through At-Large staff and I was told that IT is working on it, had already been working on it. So apparently it wasn't just me but a known

problem. So I look forward to being told that that won't happen again.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. And now I want to get to your ... I began addressing your questions in reverse order. To the first point that you raised about the level of the questions, terminology and the format of things has been something that we have struggled with. I saw Sarah's comment in the chat about whether question three potentially addresses your concerns about the gap and what you feel might be missing. Could you perhaps elaborate on why you think number three specifically does not address your concerns of what you feel is missing?

Is it possible, Berry, to blow that up a little?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I'm not prepared to go into great detail. I was supposed to be drafting some ... I was putting together some draft answers for discussion by the At-Large policy group and I just had a fair amount of trouble addressing them and my answers ended up being somewhat redundant. As I said, two and four seem to overlap.

The goals are not purely ... Because we're not talking about and not allowed to talk about purposes of why we are collecting this information, you have to end up talking about goals in a somewhat convoluted way. I just found that they were not the easiest thing to answer, even though I know overall what we're looking for. But they didn't very well fit into those questions. No, I'm not prepared

to do a detailed analysis at this point. We'll squeeze our answers in and if someone rules them out of scope or not appropriate, so be it.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Well, put it this way. Alan, as I think I've made very clear from the beginning, this is a scoping working group. We are not setting policy. So to me, the fact that our job is to gather facts, provide that to the council for them to make a determination on whether to go forward, I think we need to focus on facts.

I understand that there are some that want to be focusing on assignments three and four. I do believe that it is important though that we try to move sequentially through the work plan that has been given to us by council. I do not want to deviate from that unless there is a rather compelling reason. And to date, I have not seen that, so that is why Olga and I ... Well, I would say, myself, Olga and the rest of the ICANN org team in mapping out what we are proposing, we think it's consistent with that guidance from council.

Anyone else?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

My hand is up.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. Oh, now I see. I'm sorry. Volker, yes. Now I was able to do this. All right Volker, you have the floor.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Thank you, Mike, even though I think that this meeting should have been canceled because of the holidays and the resulting low numbers of attendance. How many members do we have here now? Five plus ICANN staff, plus you as the chair. That's not quite a lot and I don't think we even have quorum here.

But that aside, I think we are basically capable of delivering our deliverables by the end of the time, even though I think that slavish adherence to the timeline will not serve us well. But we will need to stop wasting time on discussing the other issues that we will have more time to address afterwards. So if we are just focusing on one and two, I think we will be able to complete this work in time.

If we don't do that, if we don't manage that, then the sky is the limit for when we will ever complete it. That was the same issue that we had in the EPDP, where basically the same issues were reiterate again and again. And if we do this here then we will take just as long as we did in the EPDP and I hope we don't.

With regard to Alan's comments, it's concerning that messages are missing but maybe it's just mine that are disappearing. I hope not. I hope it's fixed soon because otherwise we will not be able to communicate meaningfully during the times that we are off or that we are supposed to do the work through the mailing list.

With regard to these questions of purpose, I think we can talk about purposes. We can talk about those purposes that have been defined by the EPDP and the previous phases that have

been defined and take those as basis. And if we want to add to those, then that is not part of one and two, that's part of three and four.

So for now, let's focus on the purposes as defined in the EPDP for this data set that we're discussing. If we do that, then we can achieve our timeline. And I would like to conclude by wishing all our American colleagues that still managed attend this call, happy Thanksgiving.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Thank you, Volker. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. So maybe I'm a little confused. I read questions one and three as directly addressing purposes. I read question one as basically ... The answer to that is, what's listed in the phase one list of purposes augmented by the addition that was made in phase two. I'll come back and make a comment about that in just a second. But the quick answer to one is, copy what's in the phase one specification of purposes and copy what's in the phase two addendum to that.

Question three basically asks, and are there additional purposes that should be included? And so that runs counter to the point that you just made, Michael about that's not part of this but I don't know how to read question three differently.

Now I'll come back to the comment I want to add on question one. As I said, the straightforward answer is copy what's in those

documents. Having looked at those documents again with this question in mind and particularly in light of, will the accuracy requirements that are prospectively being set in the forthcoming PDP, going to meet those purposes? There is a lot of question about what those purposes actually mean in practice.

That is, given a given scenario—you can pick whatever scenario you like, a security practitioner or an intellectual property attorney trying to track down who's in charge of an infringing site or a potentially infringing site, etc.—how do those map to the listed set of purposes?

And there is a lack of direct connection. I mean, that specificity that somehow is going to have to come to the surface, obviously it's not going to be done in the scoping process here. But I wanted to flag that in just listing those purposes and taking those wholesale from those documents and then trying to match up. And then when you get to the question of, will these accuracy requirements that are being set be sufficient to meet the purpose which is inherent in question two of this exercise, then you're going to run into trouble as to whether or not the specific scenarios map correctly into the listed purposes.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So what I want to do here is ... Again, this was an administrative update and I want to avoid ... I want to give as much time back to everyone as possible. Here is my main question to everyone on the list to make sure we can meet our deliverables. Is the current template, do you feel, sufficient enough for you to fill in?

I have heard Alan's concerns. Steve, I think you stated that you think you could fill that out. You see them being ... You made a statement. Sarah, in the chat, I think does not agree with all of them. But can you fill this out? And Volker and Sarah, do you see any problems with the registrars being able to complete this gap analysis? That is the most important administrative thing I would like to take away. Is this sufficient enough for you and your stakeholder groups to do the assignment on time? Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Good morning, this is Sarah. Yes, I am sure that we will be able to respond to these questions. It's not exactly how I would have laid it out myself but that's okay. And I do think that these will get us the information that we need. We're already started drafting our responses and we'll definitely be able to share it before the deadline. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, thanks Michael. I just wanted to note, I think that the comments that Sarah put in in the chat seem to be helpful. And at least, we're just chatting behind the scenes. I think we had the same understanding here and it may be helpful for those maybe listening to this recording in filling out this template that, indeed, they are unique purposes for processing the data and those are

the capital P purposes. But there's also an objective or goal that you're trying to achieve by processing that data.

And I think that's what we're trying to establish here with these questions. And are there any of those goals that are currently not being achieved? And that may result in needing additional purposes at some point, if it's agreed that that is indeed currently missing. And that may require for the policy work. And again, that's where you would come to conclusions in phase three or four.

But that is I think the conversation that we're trying to facilitate by asking here this input to really better understand what people think are the current goals. What is accuracy trying to achieve and what is it currently not achieving that should be considered or that's important? And hence, this question on what problems and needs are currently not addressed? So I'm hoping that is helpful and I think Sarah hit the nail on the head the way you framed that in the chat.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So I think we are at the end. As I said, we will be convening. Hopefully, we will have the entire group back with us next Thursday to do a review of those questions that we'll be submitting to ICANN org.

But before I do conclude today's meeting, I do want to go back to Alan. Has this follow-up discussion by myself, Sarah, Steve and Marika ...? Has that given you additional confidence or guidance in how to work with ALAC in filling out this gap analysis? If not, let

me know and I will follow up with you offline to figure out how we close that because having been a regular participant of the ALAC policy calls, I do want to make sure that you are in a position to work with ALAC to get the necessary feedback. Was this helpful or should we schedule a call later in the day?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can schedule any calls you want. As I said, when I drafted the responses, I felt that they were not optimally set-up and that there was some overlap. We will handle it. I'm not demanding it be changed. I'm just noting that a somewhat different process might have resulted with better results. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Well, as we've heard, what we try to do is find a middle ground. Obviously, Sarah, as she noted would have perhaps went about this a different way yourself. Trying to find that middle ground that minimizes the pain or shares the pain across all stakeholders is perhaps the true definition of consensus.

So with that, unless there are any other last-minute comments, we will conclude today's call. Please continue to do the work via the mailing list. And yes, we will be working to make sure that that mailing list issue is resolved so that statement can in fact be possible. For those again celebrating the Thanksgiving holiday weekend, enjoy the time with your family and friends. And with that, the meeting is concluded. Have a good day.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining today's call. Have an excellent and pleasant good mornings, afternoons and evenings. Take care, everybody. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]