
ICANN Transcription

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team

Thursday, 19 May 2022 at 14:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/Tg51Cw>

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 19th May 2020 at 14:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no rollcall. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the telephone, if you could identify yourself now? And as a sidenote, Becky is on the telephone only and she is driving and on listen-only mode mostly. So, anyone in addition to Becky at this time?

Hearing no one, we do have apologies from Olga Cavalli, Stephanie Perrin, and Marc Anderson. The alternate for the RySG group will be Alan Woods. Joining us about 30 minutes late will be Lori Schulman. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. If anyone has any updates to share, please raise your hand or speak up now.

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

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

All members will be promoted to panelists for today's call. As a reminder, when using chat features, please select "everyone" in order for all to see the chat. Observers will have view only to the chat access. Alternates not replacing a member are required to rename their lines by adding three Z's to the beginning of your name and, at the end in parentheses, the word "alternate," which means you are automatically pushed to the end of the queue.

Alternates must not engage in chat apart from private chat or use any other Zoom room functionality such as raising hands, agreeing, or disagreeing. 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 though, to take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process, you are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it back over to our Chair, Michael Palage. Please begin.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Terri. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. I'm just going to start off as usual with a quick administrative update. We have posted for ICANN74 a tentative agenda for the work that we will be doing. Again, it is a very, as you can see, slim placeholder for the work. I do want to remind anyone who intends to be participating in-person, there are sign-up requirements in advance of the meeting. There will be no on-site sign-up, so please be mindful of that.

Also, I have been informed that there will be the need to sign up in advance for sessions. So, those that are going to be in attendance, please make sure that you sign up so that you will have a seat at the table during our first face-to-face discussions. Is there anything else that I have missed there, Marika or Terri, from ICANN Org in relation to ICANN74? I will take silence as no. I think I've ... Go ahead, Marika.

TERRI AGNEW: Marika, maybe you've ... Anyway, yep, no further adjustments. You carried it all, thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay, sorry about that. So, what we need to do is let's just dive into our work. The second item is the scenarios for the EDPB. Yes, that will be greatly appreciated. Thank you, Terri, for enhancing that. So, how would we propose to kick this off? Obviously, we have something from Volker and then we have Becky, who is partially participating remotely—we don't want to interfere with her driving—and some of the others. Do we just want to walk ...? How would the group like to do this? Would you like to literally walk through this document? What is the proposal here for the best way?

MARIKA KONINGS: You have some hands up, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Sorry, I was not paying attention to that. I was multitasking while reading, sorry. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There was a comment from Amy, and I don't know if she's on the call or if someone else can speak on her behalf. It essentially changes the overall area of discussion and potentially invalidates or changes some of the comments that were made earlier, certainly by Becky and others. And I wonder if we can get clarification. I did add a comment on it.

Specifically, the document starts off saying the ICANN Board charged ICANN Org with coming up with scenarios to ask the European Data Protection Board. A number of us commented that some of the scenarios don't seem to need permission.

And Amy said, "Well, the scenarios are really just things to investigate that might be useful," and that seems to change the complete direction of what this document is for and what the Board asked. So, I'd like some clarity because there is no point in us going ahead with this if we're working in two different directions simultaneously. So, I'd like a little bit of clarity of just what this document is for before we start looking at or critiquing the comments. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. And I know Sarah Wyld is also agreeing with you in the chat, Alan. So, perhaps the ... Let's go to ... What we will do is we will give the floor to Amy. Brian, I'm noting your hand up. Amy, you have the floor.

AMY BIVINS: Sure, yeah. This is Amy from ICANN Org. Thanks for having me here today. So, I put a comment in the compilation document with all the feedback thus far. But just to take a step back and explain the scenarios that were provided to the team, ICANN was instructed to go and think about scenarios and steps that ICANN Org could take at this point in furtherance of registration data accuracy. So, we had to take a step back and look at what ICANN could actually do under the current agreements and policies.

And as noted in the communication that was sent, ICANN is somewhat limited in the data that it can require the registrars to provide. So, the scenarios were provided in the context of looking at what ICANN can do under the current policies and agreements. If the group wants ICANN to ask about other scenarios that aren't permitted under the current agreements and policies, we're certainly open to doing that, too. But we wanted to start with what we believe we can do under the current agreements.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, Alan, okay. Steve, I acknowledge your hand being up. Alan, does that help address your concern or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really, because if you look at the first sentence of this document it seems to have been driven by the Board's request to consider things we could ask about whether we could do in the future. So, as I said in my response to Amy, what is being described may be useful

things to do, but they don't seem to be in response to the specific request the Board was making.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, perhaps, if we could without interfering with Becky's motor-operational skills, Becky, since this was basically a request by the ICANN Board to ICANN Org, could you perhaps shed some light on this potential perceived disconnect? Is that possible, or do we have another Board member who is ...? Who else do we have? I don't see any other Board ... So, Becky, can you get off of mute? If not ... Okay. Steve, do you want to sit there and ...? You have the floor.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much, Michael. I want to respond to and expand on both of Alan and Amy's comments. The ultimate consumer of the data is not the registrars and not ICANN Org. It is the people making the request for the data. And so, the gold standard of whether or not we're meeting the needs of those people is to ask them what it is they want and what it is that they need.

So, a question of asking Org to come up with scenarios should be interpreted, in my view, as a proxy for asking, what do the ultimate consumers of that data want? And Org should be, if they're going to try to put together scenarios, focused on that. Looking at the contract is ... It's understandable why that's a focus but that is, at most, secondary. It may limit what can be done but it doesn't describe what should be done or what's needed. And so, I think it's important to distinguish the kinds of questions that are being asked.

So, I'm very much in line with Alan about going a bit further. The critical question is, what do the ultimate consumers of that data need and are those needs being met? That seems, to me, the controlling question. And running off to the data controllers is a subordinate matter just to see if you can stay within the legal frameworks that are required when it's not the source of primary information. Primary information is to ask what it is that these people need who are going to use the data. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Steve. Amy, is that an old hand or a new hand?

AMY BIVINS: Oh, sorry, it's an old hand. I'll take it down.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay, just want to make sure. Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD: Thank you. Hi. Alan, thank you for raising that question. Amy, thank you for the clarification. I just want to confirm that I was not suggesting that ICANN should act beyond their remit or beyond the current contracts. No. No, we're good to stick within those boundaries. I guess, for me, the document confused me because I had understood it to mean ... It starts by saying ICANN prepare a number of scenarios, and then there are number of scenarios.

So, I thought all of them would be send to the EDPB. But good to hear that that's not the case and the intent was, indeed, only to send

scenarios that do involve the processing of personal data. I do not have suggestions for other such scenarios to include. It seems to me that number two would be all that we really need to look into in this context. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Beth, you have the floor.

BETH BACON: Yeah. No, Sarah said it all for me. I think that's good clarification, and why don't we just turn to looking at those two that were provided that ICANN is thinking about sending? So, we could narrow our focus and not talk about the extraneous items.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, as Marika or Terri are highlighting—I don't know who is driving, but as our ICANN Org colleague is highlighting—there are basically four scenarios. And just for purposes of those that may be driving or are listening, I'm going to read through them briefly for everyone's benefit.

So, scenario one is analyze publicly available registration data for some tactical and operational accuracy. Scenario two, analyze a sample of full registration data provided by registrars to ICANN Org. Scenario three, proactive contractual compliance audit of registrar compliance with registration validation and verification requirement. Scenario four, registrar registration data accuracy survey is voluntary.

So, those are the four scenarios that have been proposed. I guess what I would like to do is, before diving into those, is there anyone on the list that thinks that ICANN Org or the ICANN Board missed an additional scenario based upon the work that we have been undertaking for the last several months? It would be helpful in that we could gain some potential insight from the European Data Protection Board. Alan, I see your hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I did put two scenarios there, one of which is ... One is comparable to one of the other ones and one is brand new.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, thank you. The scenario ... All right, hold on. I'm trying to get ... So, if this the two additional scenarios? Okay. So, the two other recommendations or suggestions you have made is restarting the ARS with the same sampling methodology as before but requiring registrars to provide the full set of contact information.

And then, the second is a complete or partial retrieval of contact information on a registrar by registrar basis. It's essentially an accuracy audit with an analysis similar to what was used in the ARS. So, those are the two additional. Are there any ...? And before we as a group begin to walk through those, I want to make sure that we have a comprehensive list of all scenarios. So, is there anyone else that is thinking of an additional scenario where information from the European Data Protection Board would be helpful to us as a group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Michael, it's Alan.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes, Alan. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I didn't claim that this was an exhaustive list. I can probably come up with other ones. These were two that came up at the time I put them in. There are certainly variations of these that one could look at, somewhat different verifications in light of Steve's comment. One could look at a stronger definition of accuracy other than the ones that are in the current RAA and test against that. So, there are certainly other variations that could be done. But in terms of the Data Protection Board, what access we would need to be able to do those other tests, they're both comparable to these two. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you and duly noted. Sarah, I see you have your hand up.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you. These, to me, really seem to be just more detail for scenario two, analyzing a sample of full registration data provided by registrars to ICANN. So, in both of these, if that analysis is done by something like the ARS, or restarting it, or if it's done by ... Well, the first one is restarting ARS. The second one is something similar to ARS. In both cases, it's ICANN processing registration data that has been provided to them. So, probably really good clarity for us

to have for our own purposes but I'm not sure that that changes what ICANN Org would be sending to the EDPB. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, let me follow up on that, Sarah, and try to reconcile, I think, what Alan has said and what you're saying. So, one of the scenarios that we had talked about within the group was, instead of doing a random survey of all of the available registration data, we talked about just doing a subset based upon, perhaps, domain names that were subject to DAAR reporting. And the reason we had talked about that was that there would be a clear ... That would probably be ICANN's maximum legitimate interest under Article 6, that there has been an alleged illegal activity associated with the domain name, and that would be the basis of doing it.

And I guess my question here is, if we do not provide the specificity of a sample of registration data, if we just leave it as written, as whole, I could see the European Data Protection Board saying, based upon some of the discussions I have had with data privacy folks, is ICANN trying to survey all 200-plus-million names on a random basis would probably not suffice under Article 6. However, if you provide a more narrow scoping, that would probably be potentially viewed more favorably.

So, I guess what I'm hearing and what I think Alan is trying to articulate is it would be in our best interest ... I think that more specificity on the sampling, as opposed to just something being open-ended, is what we would be looking to do. That's what I'm hearing as I'm trying to sit there and thread the needle here. Alan, I

saw you put your hand back up but Beth was first in the queue. So, Beth, you have the floor.

BETH BACON:

Yeah. Thanks, folks. So, I just want, maybe, an overarching comment here on our engagement with regards to parsing, and adding, and tweaking these. I'm very supportive of ICANN taking whatever action they feel they need to take in order to start/restart/meet their clients' needs. I think that we need to be ... And while those can contribute to bettering accuracy or the measurement of current accuracy requirements, I'm concerned about us getting too in the weeds about saying exactly what ICANN needs to do and what ICANN Compliance needs to ask of the European Data Protection Board.

Because Compliance knows what it needs to do to meet its needs and the community doesn't necessarily direct ICANN Compliance, whether it's their methods or their analysis, and we certainly don't tell ICANN what they feel their legitimate interests are. That's an evaluation for ICANN Org to make itself. So, I am very happy to say, yes, we appreciate your energy and effort here. Appreciate you sending these questions. We think these are appropriate and should help you.

But I just want us to be careful about how much we add, we edit, we tell ICANN what they need to do, because these are questions from ICANN. These aren't necessarily questions from the community. This is ICANN Org asking for guidance for their internal compliance work. So, I just wanted to kind of throw that over the ... That net over the top. But this is, again, me not ... I'm not saying

we're not supportive of asking these questions. I think it's just we need to be careful how much we stick our fingers in the pie. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, let me ask you this. Becky, I'm going to ask you a follow-up question, so hopefully you can come off of mute. I guess my question here, Beth, is, I still think we're struggling with what the exact role of ICANN is. Is it a controller? Is it a co-controller? We don't know. And it itself has not really provided great clarity, and the lack of a data processing agreement between ICANN and contracting parties, I think, adds to that potential confusion.

So if, in fact, ICANN Org ... Well, again, this is the ICANN Board asking ICANN Org to send this to the European Data Protection Board. Should the community, other people that obviously have a say, including registrars and, I would even potentially say, registrants have a say, in how that data is being processed? To me, it would be incredibly short-sighted to miss the opportunity to ask questions of the European Data Protection Board based upon work and subject matter that we have been deliberating for the last eight months. Again, that's just my perspective, and I see Thomas with his hand up.

BETH BACON:

I'm sorry, Michael. Might I respond, since you just responded to me?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Yes, please.

BETH BACON: If it's okay with Alan and Thomas?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks, guys. I appreciate it. So, I think ... To be clear again, I think I said three times I am not saying we don't send questions. I'm saying that we have to appreciate our roles and responsibilities as parties. And whether ICANN has said or not said ... There have been various comments and discussions. There is a lot of work going on on these types of issues that is overlapping and certainly have impact on one another.

I'm not saying we don't ask questions. I'm saying thank you, ICANN, for asking these questions, but if ICANN is asking these questions to establish their role, to understand their abilities and scope, that is, again, an ICANN internal risk evaluation and legal evaluation. We can say, and have said many times, as a community, "This is what we think your role is. This is what we think we need to process data properly," and those efforts are ongoing elsewhere.

So I think, yes, ask the questions. These are fine questions. I wanted to make the point that we should be careful about how much we direct and how much we say "this is what Compliance's job is," which Compliance is a very ... They have a remit that is outlined in the contract. We sometimes go, "hey, Compliance, we think you're

overstepping.” That has happened before and I think that’s appropriate.

I think we, yes, support ICANN’s energy to send these questions, but I want us to be careful about, again, are we telling ICANN Compliance what to do or are we asking for information? I think that these are good questions to ask. I think it will be helpful. Yeah, as Sarah says, “Support without directing.” I think that’s the bullet point there. So, I just wanted to say I’m not saying don’t send the questions. I think they will contribute positively.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So thanks, Beth. That was helpful. If I could ask a follow-up question? So, what happens if we, the Accuracy Scoping Team, come up, we agree ... Or there is a set of questions that we say, “Hey, we would like these asked.” So, let’s just suppose we have a set of questions that we would like asked. We forward them to ICANN Org as part of their engagements with the European Data Protection Board.

And again, we’re not going to be pre-supposing what their obligations are but we have questions we forward onto ICANN Org and ICANN Org chooses not to include them. I guess my question for us as a group is, if we have questions and we ask ... if we ask ICANN Org to ask them to the European Data Protection Board and they say, “No, we’re not going to include them,” is this something that we, as the Accuracy Scope ...? Do we send our own communication in to the European Data Protection Board to seek clarity? I guess that’s my question.

I am all for working with ICANN Org to reach consensus on the questions that are asked. But if there is a disconnect and we want questions asked that ICANN Org is not asking, what do we do at that juncture, I guess? And I'll let you get back in the queue. Alan and then Thomas.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I no longer remember why I put my hand up but I have a whole bunch of things to say. With regard to your last question, Michael, let's deal with that if it happens. If we propose something and ICANN simply says, "No, we're not going to ask that question," or mangles it such that it's a completely different question, we'll deal with that when it happens. That's a confrontation between us, the GNSO, and ICANN Org that I think we'll have to deal with if and when it happens. It's a scenario I don't think we need to plan for right now.

In terms of Beth's comments, number one, ARS was not a Compliance issue, so we are not looking at this necessarily as Compliance. My second suggestion that I put into the Google Doc was, in fact, something that could be considered Compliance. It is ICANN could audit registrars not on the process but on the results. That's something that could be a Compliance issue, should Compliance choose to. But in general, to say that if ICANN Compliance wanted to ask some questions they should have, I think it is negated by the facts. ICANN Compliance has said multiple times that they are not necessarily doing exactly what they did before GDPR because GDPR has not allowed them to do what they did before. That is, get the data and make decisions based on what the data actually says.

Four years into this process, ICANN Org has not chosen to go the Data Protection Board and said, “Please, sir, are we allowed to get the data like we used to so we can do our compliance?” They have chosen not to. It’s up to us to ask that question if necessary because, clearly, ICANN Org is not going to do it at the behest of Compliance so that they could take action similar to what they did before. So, to say it’s Compliance and, therefore, we shouldn’t stick our noses in it, I think is wrong. And number two, some of the things we’re talking about are not Compliance. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, Thomas, you have the floor.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Michael. Hi, everybody. I seem to have some network issues here so I hope that I’m coming through and you can discern what I’m saying. A couple of points. We’re still dealing about the same data that has been collected by registrars and then processed to make the domain name registrations possible. Now, we’re looking at a very small subset of what is actually done with that data. But you might remember that, when we discussed ... I think that those were still the pre-Strawberry days, when ICANN sent questions to the European Data Protection Board.

The European Data Protection Board basically got back to ICANN—and I am paraphrasing—saying, “Well, do your homework, and if you have something to present then we can talk.” And it looks to me like we are in more or less the same situation. We have the operational design assessment, which, I don’t remember what page

it was, states that the legal framework depends on what role ICANN wants to assume.

So, even [inaudible] that was meant to specify the processes, business processes but also data flows and stuff like that, it is unclear what role ICANN wants to play. And I am afraid that, if the Org goes to the European Data Protection Board asking for advice on what they can and what they can't do, they are going to get the same response, namely, "Do your homework. Write up what you think you are, what the processes are, who is responsible for what, and then we might opine on it."

But I think it is not unlikely that the European Data Protection Board will just say that they are not legal counsel for ICANN. So, whilst I appreciate getting clarity on these important points, I think it is also important that you go to the European Data Protection Board well-prepared and that you're not stressing their patience with things that should be done by ICANN or ICANN's legal counsel first, because these are basically questions for ICANN to answer and I think that those on this call that have cautioned us not to guide ICANN in any shape or form are spot on because that might ultimately be held against us, namely that the community has directed ICANN to do certain things and that, therefore, ICANN has another reason to shy away from its role as a controller.

So, again, I am all for cooperation. I am all for getting clarity. I am all for advancing this project. But I think that we should be cautious in giving directions and, maybe, rather open advice on what procedure should be done so that we get the answers from the EDPB that we're hoping for. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thomas, thank you. I always appreciate your insight and contributions. If I could ... And I think you accurately summed up the previous communication by the European Data Protection Board in saying, "Go do your homework." Would it be ...? Here's my question to you. As part of the last guidance of "do your homework," do you believe having a data privacy agreement between ICANN and contracting parties is a prerequisite to that homework assignment before any type of analysis or opinion will be able to be given by the European Data Protection Board in your professional view?

THOMAS RICKERT: This is a rough one to answer, but I think that the first thing that would need to be done, and I'm not sure we've done, is that, prior to commencing the processing ... I mean, certainly, this has been done pre-GDPR but it has ceased to be done. Before you start such processing, it would be to do a data protection impact assessment. And if I were the European Data Protection Board, I would ask ICANN, "Have you done those?" That's a legal obligation for somebody processing data to do if there is a potential risk for the data subject. And so, I think that the ...

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thomas, I think we just lost for you the last point.

THOMAS RICKERT: The situation in ... Would then probably have to function ... I'm sorry for that.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yeah. Thomas, you did break up. You broke up for about 30 seconds. The last thing I was able to hear was your question of whether ICANN itself has ever done a data privacy impact assessment, and I'm looking to see if Stephanie Perrin is on the phone because, unfortunately, she is not on the call, but I'm sure she would probably be echoing that because I think she has been asking for that for at least the last, probably, ten years that I have known her.

THOMAS RICKERT: Exactly, but that's a factual basis which would also be important for the Data Protection Board to see in order to opine on the processing and whether it's okay or not, because I don't think they have these facts at hand because they might not know the industry [inaudible]. But that's to say that I think more homework needs to be done before the questions are [inaudible].

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Thomas. I guess the question to Amy and Brian, to Thomas's question there, is, do we have any clarification on whether ICANN has undertaken a data privacy impact assessment? That, I think, would be a good question to ask and would be helpful. Amy, do you have an answer to that?

AMY BIVINS: Hi, sure. Yeah. It is noted in this communication that we sent to the team a while back. We are planning to do a data protection impact

assessment on at least one of these scenarios. So, that's in progress right now and we will be asking questions based on that assessment.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Could you share which scenario?

AMY BIVINS: It's scenario two, the one that clearly involves the processing of the thick registration data.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, there is potentially going to be a data privacy impact assessment based upon scenario two. That would be helpful. And again, I'll put this out to the group. But given the discussions that Sarah and Alan had raised about the broad breadth of scenario two, there, encompassing a bunch of different things, can you ...? Could you, perhaps, consult with ...?

Are you going to be consulting with the community about the specificity of scenario two before a data privacy impact assessment is undertaken? Because let's just suppose you go with we want to restart the ARS as opposed to we only want to look at complaints associated with DAAR. Obviously, those are two distinct, different scenarios and would probably have a different data privacy impact assessment associated with each. Can you give any insight on when the specifics of scenario two could potentially be shared with this group or the broader ICANN community before undertaking that data privacy impact assessment?

AMY BIVINS: Sure. So, I think at this point we ... In sending this request for input to this team, that's what we were specifically asking for, was your input on these scenarios, including scenario two. We specifically flagged a need to ... If ICANN is going to be analyzing a sample of full registration data, we need to have some sort of link to Compliance. So, we are hoping to get some feedback from this team about which scenarios or which specific links to Compliance you might find helpful to be studied. So I guess, in our view, we are trying to seek feedback from the community right now. That's sort of what this discussion is intended to be.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Well, thanks, Amy. I would say a number of people on this group would, I think, look forward to contributing to helping ICANN Org get the specificity that will hopefully get some guidance. Thomas, is that an old hand? I will assume it's an old hand. Alan, old hand or new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is hands go up in the order they were raised, so that is definitely a new hand.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep, thank you. A couple of points. The point you last raised and Amy responded to is exactly why I did put those two scenarios. I believe those two things are very different. One is a sample based on [inaudible], or perhaps based on DAAR. The other one is really a registrar audit, which could, in theory, request all of the data for a domain sponsored by a registrar. Those are two very different things. And the terms that would ultimately have to go into the RAA to allow those are quite different, and that's why I did differentiate, and there are probably sub-genres within those.

So, I think it's important to get the specifics. It's not micro-managing. We're looking at different types of things with very different privacy impacts. So, I think that is really important. With regard to what Thomas said, I completely agree. I am assuming that, if we are going to go to the Data Protection Board, we are going to do it in a more rational manner that is likely to get an answer, and that will require data impact assessment.

It will require providing them with a very specified scenario saying, "Based on our position of controllership, based on our data processing agreements," which they actually are going to have to be sent, "this is the process we plan to carry out. This is the processing we want to do. Do you consider this reasonable or not?" So, we are going to have to do a lot of homework. It's not going to be a one-paragraph scenario that Greenberg wrote into a Google Doc that we're presenting to them.

But because the impact on privacy may be very different depending on exactly what we do, we are going to have to be somewhat specific as to what we're looking at. Based on the answers, we may be able to extrapolate to other things, but I think we have to be very

specific and we have to articulate why we believe this is a reasonable thing for us to do under GDPR and get verification that it is, as opposed to asking open-ended questions. Thank you.

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

BETH BACON: So, I feel like we have veered gently off the assignment a little bit. I just want to reiterate, yes, let's focus on these, on the scenarios that ICANN has asked for input on. My comment was let's not get too specific simply because, and I think to Alan's last point, if ICANN needs to ask these questions based upon what ICANN believes their risks and roles are, we can't necessarily dictate that. If we say, "Ask these questions, ask these questions," or, "ask in this way," ICANN needs to ask the questions they feel need to be answered. I think that it would be good if we could just roll back to the actual assignment.

And I do think that a DPIA would be delightful. That would be great, to have that done, and to see that, and to see the thinking that goes into it. I think that's a different assignment. If ICANN wants us to contribute to a data protection impact assessment, that's a different request than, "Hey, we're going to send some scenarios and questions to the European Data Protection Board. Please provide input on these provided scenarios."

I have full faith and confidence in ICANN, and Amy, and your team, that when you send these things you will provide all sorts of supporting documentation information, because you know what

you're doing. So, I don't know that that's, again, something that we need to micromanage ICANN staff doing. I think that you're going to do that. I think our assignment here, as I understand, is the request of, do these scenarios seem like they would bear fruit? Should we submit them in a comprehensive way to the European Data Protection Board? So, I just wanted us to go back and focus on our original conversation.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

I think that's fair, Beth. And again, focusing on the scenarios, I think where ... So, I agree. It is not in our intention, nor do we have the capabilities or skillsets to try to micromanage the interactions between ICANN Org and the European Data Protection Board. I don't think we want to do that. But what I have heard is that Amy is asking this group for some input, and specifically with scenario two, which they have acknowledged is potentially going to be the subject of the Data Privacy Impact Assessment. There is a large range of sub-scenarios under scenario two.

As I said, is it old-school ARS where we're just randomly picking from 200-plus-million records? Or are we doing something much more narrowly focused based upon reports to DAAR and where a legitimate interest balancing test would be substantially heightened? So, I do think it would be important from what I have heard today and within, I would say, the group for the group to provide that level of specificity to ICANN as they engage in their deliberations. Again, that's kind of what I think I'm hearing. But again, let's get back to the scenario, if you will. You want to follow-up, Beth, or you want to ...?

BETH BACON: Yeah, I just had another question, if you'll indulge me, from what you were saying. So, if ICANN wants to ask this question and they're asking this accuracy team for input there and saying, "Does this seem like a good scenario? Does this seem reasonable?" if we as a team decide that we would like to offer more specificity, I think we can do that with regard to the accuracy of registration data and those requirements that are caught under this group.

I don't know how we as a group could qualify ourselves as representative of the entire community to ask questions about DAAR and other items. And I'm just asking because it's a scope thing here and I wouldn't want us to say ... ICANN says, "Well, we sent this and we asked the community, but really they asked the Accuracy Scoping Team. So, I just wanted to flag that, also. I don't have any concerns talking about a little more specificity and what we think we'll get out of this scenario, asking the scenario's question. But I do think we should make sure that we are being true to our scope as a group, as well.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Fair. And if Marc Anderson was on the call today, I'm sure he would be reciting line and verse regarding our original charter. That being said, I do think one of the things that we have talked about, particularly with ICANN Compliance, was, when they get reports of abuse and inaccuracy, I think we had discussed that. So, the fact that some people have looked at the accuracy of the information associated with domain names that have been identified by ICANN Org as involved in abusive behavior, I think that's a fair ... My

opinion, I think that's probably within our scope of what is accurate data and asking that question.

And the reason I say that, Beth, is just look at some of the work that is taking place within the Registries Stakeholder Group right now where they want to begin to distinguish between maliciously registered domain names versus compromised domain names. To me, getting accuracy data from DAAR will help provide a level of detail on, okay, these were maliciously registered versus these were compromised.

Because if they were compromised, the data should be accurate. We should be able to get in touch with that person and quickly follow up with closing that security loophole. If, in fact, it was maliciously registered, unless that bad person is really stupid, they're probably not going to be providing real data to let people track down. So, again, I think that's probably within our accuracy scope and would be consistent with, even, some of the follow-up work that the Registries Stakeholder Group is doing in DNS abuse.

So, anyhow. I think ... I just want to be mindful of time. We've spent 45 minutes on this. So my question to the group here is, in light of Amy, I think, clearly acknowledging that this group is ... We want to provide some further clarity. Beth, to your point about whether this group may have sat there any sought appropriate input from its respective stakeholder groups, perhaps we pause on this analysis today and go back ...

If each group can go back, with regard to scenario two, and provide some further level of detail, acknowledge that ICANN is intending to do a data privacy impact assessment on this, hopefully that will

motivate some others. So, perhaps hitting pause and allowing everyone to go back to their respective groups would be in the best interest, instead of trying to wordsmith or do that. That would be my proposal, is that ... Good idea? Bad idea? No, Mike. Let's continue to plough forward. Alan, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. It would also be useful to use to know what the status is and what direction we're taking with regard to controllership agreements. That can change the whole picture. And we know there are supposed to be negotiations going on as a result of the P1 implementation. I have heard nothing as to what the status is or, are we in fact going to be classed as controllers in any sense or not? It would really be useful if we were being asked to be specific to understand a little bit more of the overall picture, and I feel like I'm completely in the dark on that one.

MICHAEL PALAGE: A question to Brian or Amy. Is that something that you could perhaps get a response from ICANN Org on the status of those negotiations to report back to the group? Because I do think, based upon some of the comments of what Thomas was saying earlier, having that background homework would be, I think particularly relevant in any data privacy impact assessment if we are going to be getting ... Or if we're looking for actionable guidance. So, maybe that ... I think Alan has raised a good question and it would be great to get some feedback or an update on that. Brian, you have the floor.

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Yeah, no. I just want to jump in quickly. Thanks for everybody's comments thus far about the scenario work. Rest assured that we're listening, we're trying to get feedback. That was the purpose of this exercise. So, I appreciate all the insights. And to Alan's question, I don't think we have much more to update this group with in regards to the status of the negotiations and such from what we provided a while back. But I'll take a note to take this back and see if there is anything else to update the group with.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Brian. Volker, you have the floor.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. I mean, a lot of the discussions over the last minute seem a bit tangential to the question of accuracy. I think certain issues such as controllership and the question of who is the controller of the data is interesting when it comes to the question of analyzing the accuracy. But for the question of accuracy in and of itself, I think it's irrelevant, as is the question of whether a domain name is maliciously registered or compromised. I think that might have an indication on the accuracy of the data that will be on file for that domain name, but it does not give us a picture of the status of accuracy, and I think that is what we should be focusing on in the first place, not the tangential issues. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So let me ask you this question, Volker. If you don't have access to data, how can you make a determination of whether it's accurate or not?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Like I said, it's interesting for the question of analyzing whether the data is accurate or not but it's not relevant for the question of the accuracy of the data itself. I think that it does not inform ... Who the controller is in the circumstance does not inform on the level of accuracy that we have. It just has an implication of, how can we investigate that accuracy? But I think those two questions should be separated and looked at separately, as well.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Brian, is that an old hand?

BRIAN GUTTERMAN: Old hand, apologies.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Alan, old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: ... Hand. Volker is absolutely correct, these are two completely different issues. And somewhat unrelated, we need to eventually come to a decision as to, what do we mean by accuracy? What should we be trying to put into the contracts, if anything different from what is there today? But if we are going to look at what actions

can ICANN take to audit, or to verify, or to understand the current situation, whatever the definition of accuracy is we're using, then the controllership-type things are relevant in asking the question to the Data Protection Board. They're two completely separate issues but that doesn't alter the fact that they are linked together in certain specific ways. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, with that, I think we're going to hit pause here. This was, I think, an excellent, in-depth, constructive discussion on something that is very important and timely. Again, thank you to Brian, and Amy, and for all the individual members that contributed to this discussion. I would really encourage every member to go back to their respective stakeholder groups.

Please update them on what has transpired today and specifically regarding the focus on scenario two and a potential data privacy impact assessment. I think that would be incredibly helpful and that is how we could best collaborate and help ICANN Org in getting, hopefully, the specificity that they're looking for from the European Data Protection Board. So, with that, if I could have the agenda? Unless, before I wrap up, any last words on this task before we transition? Okay? No objections. Marika, you have the floor.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, thanks, Michael. So, maybe just asking the group, because I think the original deadline for input that was provided for [inaudible] on 3rd of May, but I think there is potentially flexibility to give everyone some more time if that's helpful. But at the same time, of

course, it would be helpful to have kind of an end-point by which everything thinks they will have had a chance to review, because that will also be helpful for Amy and others that are working on this. So, I think the question is the 23rd May. So, a reasonable deadline. Or, is some more time needed? And, if so, what would that additional time be?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

I would argue that some of the new data points, the potential authoring of the data privacy, if that was referenced before, I think Amy really did an excellent job of crystallizing some of the actions that will be taking place in connection with scenario two. I think it's another week. Let me hit pause here and I guess I'll pose this to Amy, Brian, and Becky. This concept of engagement with the European Data Protection Board was originally introduced to the group during ICANN73, the virtual meeting. Is there an internal deadline that ICANN Org has where they are committed to sending something?

And I guess the other thing is, based upon Thomas's ... And this gives me pause here. Thomas acknowledge that you would probably want to do a data privacy impact assessment as part of your homework before making this submission. So, if the data privacy impact assessment has not yet been undertaken, does that potentially impact ...? I'm just, again, quoting. Oh, Becky is no longer in the car and is in her office, which is good. So, Becky, can you please give us some insight on timing and sequencing? It would be greatly appreciated. Becky, we can't hear you. Am I the only one that cannot hear Becky?

ALAN GREENBERG: Cannot hear her.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay, good, I'm not alone.

TERRI AGNEW: Becky, you're unmuted on the Zoom side. Check your computer mute side. We're still not able to hear you, Becky.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. Dialing in. We will wait. Okay. Connecting to audio. Still connecting. Okay. While we're waiting for ... Oh, Becky?

BECKY BURR: I'm here.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Excellent. You have the floor.

BECKY BURR: I'm sorry. This happened to me when you asked me the earlier question. It was showing that I wasn't muted on my device but, for some reason, I couldn't get in. So, I'm in on the phone. Apologies. in terms of timing, I have had a recent conversation about timing. The questions are being drafted and, obviously, the discussion and input on these scenarios is an important part of that. And so, my

goal is to have these submitted as soon as possible. I believe there is some prep work that needs to get done to pave the way to make sure that they are received in the most effective manner, and that may involve some conversations with folks at the Commission. I'm not entirely sure. That's sort of a [inaudible] question that I would put to her, and I will ask her about that and get a specific sense of timing.

I'm sort of curious. Is Thomas on the call in terms of the DPIA? Because it seems to me that the asking the questions is really part of the DPIA in a sense. But to the extent that it makes sense to go to the European Data Protection Board with a DPIA in hand, I think that's a reasonably good suggestion and I think that can be done pretty quickly. We'd have to assume a scenario, right?

And again, I'm just speaking for myself and not on behalf of the Board on this, but my view is that this group should have a view on which of those scenarios, if any, will provide reliable information about the nature and volume of inaccuracy in the dataset and we shouldn't be pursuing options that don't give us that. And so, people in this group need to be able to say, "Yes, if the analysis takes place in the following way, I'm not going to stand up and say, 'No, you can't rely on that for the following reasons.'" And if we can't get there, we shouldn't bother.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Becky, that was helpful. Thomas, can you perhaps respond? I see you have responded in the chat that you're here. Can you ...? Hopefully, connectivity issues will allow you to respond. We don't hear you, Thomas. Okay. While we are waiting for

Thomas to speak, Alan, I see your hand up. You have the floor. Beth, you're next in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. With regard to what Becky just said, which I agree with, by the way, we still have the question to ask of, what definition of accuracy do we want to use for such a study? Is it the one in the RAA, which is basically what ARS did? Or is it some new level of accuracy that we believe is really needed? And I'm trying to channel Steve, here, who unfortunately left the call a little while ago. That's still one of the things on our to-do list of trying to look at, is the current definition sufficient or do we want something more? What are the implications of wanting something more? So, the study might do one, or the other, or both. Thank you. Or a study.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Beth, you have the floor.

BETH BACON: Yeah, thank you. Thanks, Becky, so much for that. I think it's really helpful. And I just wanted to quickly go back. I think, from what I'm hearing from Becky, if we look at scenario two and it's presented in the way that we all expect with the DPIA and all the good supporting information that we trust that ICANN will do, I think that that might be ... I mean, I think that the response or the input that we could get could be broad enough to, maybe, cover or provide some understanding for any of those edge or sub-scenarios that we were, maybe, discussing before.

If that question is worded in a way that ... And you do a DPIA, that information provided there can then inform other scenarios. It doesn't necessarily mean you have to send every scenario. And I'm just thinking of ways that this could be done more easily, and streamlined, and quickly by ICANN. But I just wanted to share that thought and see if folks thought I was bananas.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I don't think anyone thinks you're bananas there, Beth. And I also just want to note for the record Thomas is having network issues and he is on the road, as well, but he states that he is happy with what Becky said. So, Becky, do you have any insight on if the DPIA has been started or is in draft form? Since that seems to be something that would be part of the homework assignment sent to the European Data Protection Board.

BECKY BURR: I don't know the answer to that question but I will check. As I said, I think if we picked the scenario that we wanted, or the scenarios that we wanted, the DPIA flows quite easily from that.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Perfect. Becky, thank you for joining. Well, you were always with us, but thank you for connecting the audio and giving this important insight. It really is really helpful, so greatly appreciated there. So, let's move on. We took a little longer than 15 minutes but I think it was a good investment of our time. So, let's begin to go to the write-up assignment for one and two, if we can pull that up. And thank you for enlarging that.

So, we could skip my comments. These were just thoughts. I want to focus on the individual working group members, if we could. I'm mindful of time. All right. So, one of the things that we have here in B12. I think there was some discussion by others that a particular reference somehow provided an over-weighting or bias. So, I guess the alternative, Sarah, maybe you could speak to this, or Beth, is just strike that and say, in the context of assessing the measures and enforcements ... And go right to there. I believe that is what you are proposing, Sarah. Beth, have I misspoken on that? Sarah, you have the floor.

SARAH WYLD:

Thank you. Yes, Michael, you are correct. We are suggesting removing the words "of particular relevance" and beginning this sentence with "in the context of." Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. So, is there any objection to that from the broader group? Okay. So, seeing none, we could strike that. Since we're on this section, here, one of the comments I did make ... And since we're here, I do want to talk about this, is one of the issues that we had talked about with regard to registry operators is how ICANN Compliance will do registration authority checks in connection with some community TLDs and whether we, somehow ...

If what we are doing here is trying to factually document when ICANN Org is, in fact, enforcing or taking an action and asking questions about the accuracy, that ... I think that's missing. And while that may not apply to all gTLDs, the fact that it does apply to

some is something that I feel should be documented and noted. That would be my proposal to the group; good idea, bad idea? Beth?

BETH BACON:

I'm sorry. It's a lot of me today. I really apologize. Our edits here noted ... I think that we were trying to keep it consistent with the previous introduction of this is the world of things that we considered but without pulling out particular or highlighting particular things. And I do think, to your point, we did discuss that.

But I do remember that, yes, we did discuss it. Yes, that was information provided. It's already provided in the other briefing documentation and other information. We also have a sentence in the current definition up in there ... Sorry, is it below that? I think it's after this. I can't remember the layout. Of the current description of current requirements that highlights that. So, I don't know that I would support putting it in here as a flagged item, simply because it's already in the agreed definition or description.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

To follow along ... Okay, I'm just reading the chat. Comments, suggestions from the rest of the group? Do we propose striking that and just leaving it there? Okay. We shall strike it, then. Let's now go down to Beth's comments here. Beth, we have not heard you speak enough, so I'm going to ask you to take the floor and perhaps kick off this discussion. I'm sure Alan will be next in the queue. You have the floor, Beth.

BETH BACON:

Yeah, sure. Thanks. This is, I guess, just a little bit on what we were just noting. To mirror what we have in the other informational section, we provide the links. We provide the whole suite of information and then to pull out and highlight certain items I think is ... It adds weight where maybe ... I mean, it's important but it's not necessarily that we discussed these particular items more, or differently, or thought they were more or less important.

So, I do think that being able to ... Just viewing the information in full is a better representation of what we discussed and allows the reader to then go look at that and not just read what we highlight here, because it's not ... I mean, it's not as if we said these are the only important points. All of that information from Compliance is really helpful and I think, as a suite, it's better represented. So, we just proposed to take out the bullets and make sure that we cite to the full Compliance contribution.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, here's my ... Well, Alan, you had comments, so I'll let you speak before I provide my thoughts on that. You have the floor, Alan, if you would like.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. I agree and disagree. I agree that we should be presenting the full document so someone can look at it in its full context. That being said, it is not sufficient to just have an obscure pointer to it, which we know most people will not follow. It's important to have the salient gist of it presented in the text, and then they can follow up and look at the full text if they want to see all of

the nuances. But to just have a pointer is burying it in clear sight, and that just doesn't do the same thing. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, Beth, I find that kind of compelling, as well. I think most people are not ... I just look at internally, within our group, when we had the background document, how long it took people to get through all of the appendixes, and background documents, and stuff like that. Given, I would say, the attention span of most people within ICANN, I think the more succinct and on-point we can keep this document the better we will be doing.

Again, that's not sitting there saying that we don't include the pointer to the full document is someone wants to deep-dive, but I find Alan's point there—if you will, the pro and the con of both sides—being compelling and would probably lean toward leaving in the bullet points. Marika, I see you have your hand raised so I will let you speak to this before turning it back to the group for discussion.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, thanks, Michael. Maybe a compromise as a solution is to leave the bullets as they are but maybe include the Compliance responses as an annex, and in that way the full responses are more easily accessible than just the link. But indeed, there is also kind of a summary version that those that want to have a quick read or a snapshot of what is in there are also able to see. And of course, with encouragement that those interested in seeing the full responses, that they need to look at the annex where we would then

kind of copy-paste what is, I think, currently posted on the Wiki. So, that may be a way of satisfying both points of view.

MICHAEL PALAGE: All right. Sophie, I see you have your hand up. You have not yet spoken. Please, you have the floor.

SOPHIE HEY: Okay, sure. No problems. Looking at this, I think it's important that, if there is going to be an end-line summary here, we need to make sure that it's language that isn't too in any particular details and it's quite high-level. Something that sticks out to me is the reference to a V1 in the second bullet point, right before "as follows," and I think there might be a couple of ...

And then V2 further down. I don't think we have any other references to that in the document and it just seems a bit strange to have it there. So, if we're not just copying and pasting from the Compliance document and we are, indeed, doing a summary, I think it would make sense to strike that just so it's a bit easier to read for people. Thanks.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay. So, here's what I am going to propose on this block of text. I'm just going through here. I'm looking to see whether we have any BC or IPC folks on and I do not believe that we do. So, what I would propose here is ... Well, before I make any proposal, let me go back to ... Let me do a couple of iterations, here. So, let's start with Sophie's more strategic striking of the V1 reference. Alan, do you

think that striking that specific V1 or V2 reference would be okay?
Marika, do you want to speak to this?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yeah, I need to check back and agree with Sophie that there may be confusion, because I think that the V1 and V2 might have come from the original question that was asked. I think there were a number of levels that we identified that aligned with, I want to say, an SSAC document? So, indeed, calling that out here without reference ... And I think this was kind of copy-paste. It may be confusing.

So, just kind of removing that reference that I'm highlighting here, and then mentioned there, might be sufficient to avoid that confusion, at least. So, if that resolves that point ... I think that's where the reference came from, because it was in the original question. But out of context, it may indeed not make much sense to have that in there.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. What I have just heard from your explanation as well as Sophie's, I think potentially, striking that, we need to just do that verification. But that may be something we do want to strike after we've done further verification. Assuming that we potentially strike that, I go back to Beth. Do you still believe that you or the Registries Stakeholder Group would be opposed to the inclusion of the bullets as they currently appear? Is that still a concern, even if we strike the V1 and V2 language that Sophie referenced?

BETH BACON: Thanks, Michael. Are we going to also link to the full document still?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes. Put it this way: linking to the full document, yes. I 100% ... Yep, there we go.

BETH BACON: Can I make a smaller question, and ask if we put that up at the top so that people can have the option of taking a look at the full document, and then we can have these highlighted bullets? I think that's kind of a logical flow. But yeah, cool.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Put it this way, I see no objection to that. Alan, I see you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note that Marika suggested annexing the full document, not linking to it, but I have no problem with pointing to that annex at the beginning.

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, yes, I will let Marika wordsmith that, something along the lines of "included is annex X, a full write-up." So, we will trust Marika to move that to the top and make a reference to the annex. Again, we will wait to see that wordsmithing by her to see if it's acceptable. Hopefully, we will be able to get some participation next week from our BC and our IPC representatives on this, as well. Do we have

anybody from NCUC? I don't see Stephanie. Yeah, we're a little light on representation, so I think we have something that will be a consensus compromise but I do want to wait until we at least share this with the fuller group.

With that, Marika, if you want to continue to move down to, I believe, the current description? And this is something where there was a lot of back and forth on this. Manju is not on. We also do not have Melina, who I believe also made some comments. Real quick, if I could, would either ...? What is it? Who do we have on from the GAC? We have Kenneth and then we have Lorraine as an alternate right now. Kenneth, would you be able, or do you feel comfortable, to speak on some of the points that Melina has raised in this document? Or, would you like to go back and confer and we can discuss this at a later date? You have the floor, Kenneth.

KENNETH MERRILL:

Sure. Yeah, I mean I'm happy to speak to some of these. Let's see, here. Where should we start? Can you scroll up? Actually, no, sorry. Let me just pull it up. I note that there was, right off the top of my head, a question about use of the word "willfully," and we sort of looked back into that. It does seem that that is in the RAA, so I think we would want to ... Given that we want that to reflect accurately the text, there. So, I think we would include that. Let's see. I don't know if folks have comments there, so I'll stop there and continue to look at ...

MICHAEL PALAGE: So, to the group, regarding this ... And again, Kenneth, I'm sorry for putting you on the spot here. But does anyone have any questions regarding that, I guess, reference to "willful?" I know this is a little .. We jumped down a little sequentially in the document, but I think that appears to be important in the broader scope of the working description of the term. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No, I don't have a comment on that particularly. But given the very light attendance of some of the critical groups within this area, it may be better to defer this discussion until next week and then give us back ten minutes. I don't have a lot of confidence that decisions we make at this point are going to be able to be supported by the whole group, given the number of people who are absent.

MICHAEL PALAGE: I concur. I think that is an excellent suggestion, Alan. I think we had a really good discussion on the original document here. I think we have made some progress on getting through our draft report. I do think it's time to hit pause. So, Marika, you will have the last word for the day.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Michael. Before pausing, if I can maybe just ask everyone to look at the document we see now up on the screen and respond to some of the suggestions made. I think there are a number of suggestions where we have some agreeing, others not agreeing. It would be great if others could weigh in, especially if you have suggestions for how to find a middle-ground position. And I

just wanted to flag, as well, the other document that we circulated earlier this week.

We also had on the agenda ... I don't think many have yet had a chance to review this. We also shared a link to the write-up for section C.2.2, which basically documents the group's conversation on the proposals and has included some specific recommendations for your consideration. So, please also have a look at that and any comments, suggestions, questions you may have, please put them in the form of comments. We will hope, then, to review them in a similar way as we're now going through the other documents. So, that's all.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

All right. Excellent. Thank you, Marika, and thank you, everyone for, I think, a really good, substantive call today. Very happy. With that, Terri, you can stop the recording and I will look forward to speaking with everyone next week. Stay safe.

TERRI AGNEW:

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]