

Concept Proposal: Structured SG Assignments for Addressing Accuracy Scoping Team Recommendations and Way Forward

Background

During the [8 August 2024](#) council meeting, significant concerns were raised about the complexities surrounding the Accuracy Scoping Team and how to best move forward on this topic. Some councilors suggested forming a Council small team to discuss how to proceed given the limitations in collecting data, but other councilors do not support starting another small team at this time. Given the difference of opinion, Council Leadership proposes to first pose a set of threshold framing questions to each Stakeholder Group/Constituency (SG/C) (via their appointed Councilors). This proposal suggests that all SGs undertake the same guided exploration task, with a shared set of questions to focus their analysis. Each SG will then report back to the council within [3 to 6 months], providing a foundation for deciding on the next steps, including whether to form a small team to analyze the responses.

As part of our structured process, we will begin by addressing three regulatory questions. Initially, we will seek input from the ICANN staff to provide their insights and preliminary responses. Once we have this foundational understanding, we will follow up with threshold questions related to Accuracy for the Stakeholder Groups (SGs) to clarify and provide their input.

Proposal Outline

Objective

- To ensure a comprehensive and inclusive examination of the challenges and potential solutions related to the Accuracy Scoping Team's recommendations.
- To leverage the collective expertise of all SGs through a uniform task, ensuring that every aspect of the issue is explored from multiple perspectives.
- To provide an overview on regulatory developments that might impact policy development on Accuracy.

Proposed Approach

Our overall approach is divided into two key steps:

1. Legal Questions to ICANN: We will start by examining some legal framing questions, ensuring we have a clear interpretation and guidance from ICANN staff on regulatory developments that might impact accuracy work.

2. Threshold Questions to SGs: Once we have resolved the regulatory aspects, we will move on to addressing threshold questions that determine the broader implications and strategic direction on Accuracy.

- Each SG will be tasked with the same set of threshold questions. This approach ensures that all SGs are exploring the same critical issues, which allows for a broad collection of insights and perspectives.
- A single set of comprehensive threshold questions will direct the discussions within each SG. These questions are designed to focus the exploration on the most pressing issues and potential paths forward.
- Each SG will have [3 to 6 months] to discuss the guidance questions, gather relevant data, and compile a response with their findings and recommendations.
- After the SGs submit their findings, the council will review the outcome and decide on the most appropriate next steps. Depending on the outcome, a small team may be formed to consolidate the insights and develop a comprehensive strategy.

Rationale for the Approach

- In contrast to an open request for ideas on how to proceed with the topic of accuracy, a set of uniform threshold questions allows for SG/Cs to take time to consider and frame the important issues and underlying concerns for their group. A uniform starting point will also enable the Council to review and synthesize the responses more easily.
- Each SG/C will bring its unique perspective and expertise to the same set of questions, resulting in a wide range of potential challenges, considerations, and solutions.
- This approach allows for thorough exploration, and ensures all relevant information is gathered before allocating resources to a small team.

Regulatory Questions to ICANN Staff

First, we will be asking three regulatory questions to ICANN staff. The purpose of these questions is to identify any regulatory developments that could influence or impact the direction of policy development on Accuracy.

By understanding the upcoming regulatory landscape, we aim to anticipate potential challenges or opportunities, which will guide us in making informed decisions regarding the next steps in this process.

The insights from these questions will help us determine the necessary adjustments or actions required to align policy work, ensuring that our approach remains both compliant and forward-thinking.

- What current and near-term legislative efforts could affect the requirements for registrants to maintain accurate registrant information?
- What current and near-term legislative efforts could affect the requirements for contracted parties to maintain accurate registrant information?
- Is there any legislation currently implemented or anticipated that could trigger a PDP or EPDP to evolve ICANN policy or contracts related to mandatory accuracy?

Threshold Questions for SG Exploration

Each SG will address the following questions in their exploration:

- What are concrete and articulable examples of what inaccurate data DOES prevent or inhibit, and how does it do so?
- What are concrete and articulable examples of what inaccurate data does NOT prevent?
- Are there specific stakeholders, industries, or sectors particularly vulnerable to the effects of inaccurate registration data? If so, what are they and why?
- Given the examples provided in response to the three questions above (if any), please articulate a short problem statement for accuracy. The problem statement should consider:
 - What is the current problem or challenge?
 - What are the consequences of this problem or challenge?
 - What is the ultimate objective of working on this problem or challenge?
 - Considering the limitations of data processing, how do you propose to address this problem?

Is now the appropriate time to address the problem? For example, some stakeholders have mentioned the implementation of NIS2 as an important

precursor to understanding new accuracy requirements. Should this or other examples be considered prior to engaging in potential policy work?

Are the ICANN org alternatives proposals worth exploring, such as:

- Provision of historical audit data that measures registrars' compliance with accuracy-related provisions in the RAA.
- Engagement with contracted parties and ccTLD operators on developments in European policymaking regarding registration data accuracy.

What are the limitations of the ICANN proposals? Why should or should they not be pursued?

What other possibilities can be explored to move our work on Accuracy forward?

Timeline

- Assignment Distribution: Immediately following the approval of this proposal.
- SG Discussions and Exploration: [3 to 6 months], depending on the complexity of the assignment.
- Report Submission: At the end of the exploration period.
- Council Review and Decision: Within 1 month after receiving the reports.

Conclusion

This proposal provides a structured, inclusive, and uniform approach to addressing the Accuracy Scoping Team's recommendations and explore paths forward. By engaging all SGs with the same set of threshold questions, we ensure a thorough and comparative exploration of the issues. The council will then be in a stronger position to decide whether to form a small team or take other strategic actions based on the comprehensive insights gathered. This method optimizes resource use, prevents premature decisions, and maximizes the likelihood of reaching a consensus on the best way forward.