2021-11-11 Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team- Meeting #05

The Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team call will take place on **Thursday, 11 November 2021 at 14:00 UTC for 90 minutes**.

For other places see: https://tinyurl.com/znz8kmf4

ⓘ **PROPOSED AGENDA**

---

1. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 minutes)
   a. Project plan submitted to the GNSO Council (seehttps://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2021-November/025175.html)

2. Working definition of accuracy (10 minutes)

From assignment #1: "*The Scoping Team shall, with reference to the resources that will be included in the index of relevant resources cited below, consider whether there is an agreed definition of registration data accuracy and, if not, consider what working definitions should be used in the context of the Scoping Team's deliberations. Particular attention should be given to the definition that ICANN Compliance employs for "accuracy" in ICANN's contracts. Note, this does not preclude any subsequent effort from formalising the definition(s) that should be applied in the context of any existing and/or new accuracy requirements that may be developed*".

   a. Consider further input received on definition (see page 12 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1k9fvA4gnb13bNbB8O4o72mXMZ8mQnJGC/edit[docs.google.com])
   b. Confirm working definition (current state)

3. Aspirational definition of accuracy (10 minutes)

   a. Overview of homework assignment (see template - https://docs.google.com/document/d/11msexuoqWSUsFj8ZjVvWF-XHpcMJntWH/edit [docs.google.com])

   b. Scoping team input

   c. Confirm next steps & deadline for input

4. Follow up questions to ICANN org regarding enforcement and Accuracy Reporting System (30 + minutes)

   a. Note additional information added to the index of relevant resources from RDS-WHOIS2 RT, including responses to questions

   b. input received from scoping team to date: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1arlKdQkbRkE1LuurmDdd-PZP184_AdFm/edit[docs.google.com]

   c. Scoping team input

   d. Confirm deadline for submission of questions

5. Confirm action items & next meeting (Thursday 18 November at 14.00 UTC)

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

As a reminder:

1. RDA Scoping Team members to review the most recent working definition for accuracy (p. 12 of the Assignment 1 background briefing doc [docs.google.com]) and provide proposed edits or alternate definitions by COB **Wednesday, 10 November**. Once the Team agrees to the baseline working definition, groups can begin working on their proposed "aspirational" or "desired future state" definitions.
2. RDA Scoping Team members to populate questions to ICANN org in the dedicated Google Doc [docs.google.com] over the coming weeks with a goal to finalize questions by Friday, 27 November.

   - Compilation of questions WHOIS-RDS2RT 2018.docx

ⓘ **RECORDINGS**

Audio Recording

Zoom Recording

Chat Transcript

GNSO transcripts are located on the GNSO Calendar

✓

⚠ **Notes/ Action Items**

Action Items

1. STILL OPEN: RDA Scoping Team members to populate questions to ICANN org in the dedicated Google Doc [docs.google.com] over the coming weeks with a goal to finalize questions by Friday, 27 November.

    2. By Thursday, 2 December, each group to identify their future explanation of Accuracy [docs.google.com], i.e., what should accuracy requirements look like and how should these be implemented and enforced by ICANN org in a future state? As part of this future explanation of accuracy, you are asked to identify what problem(s) this future explanation is expected to address, as well as provide your insights into how this problem has already been documented or how it can be documented as part of the team's effort to scope the issue.

Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team – Meeting #5

Thursday 11 November at 14.00 UTC

1. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 minutes)
   a. Project plan submitted to the GNSO Council (see https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2021-November/025175.html)
      - The document reviewed by the Team last week was sent the GNSO Council this week. It will be included in the AOB agenda item at the Council's upcoming meeting.
      - The meeting will remain at this time going forward; the only variable is whether the meeting will be 60 minutes or 90 minutes. The goal will be to conclude every meeting after 60 minutes.

    2. Working definition of accuracy (10 minutes)

From assignment #1: "*The Scoping Team shall, with reference to the resources that will be included in the index of relevant resources cited below, consider whether there is an agreed definition of registration data accuracy and, if not, consider what working definitions should be used in the context of the Scoping Team's deliberations. Particular attention should be given to the definition that ICANN Compliance employs for "accuracy" in ICANN's contracts. Note, this does not preclude any subsequent effort from formalising the definition(s) that should be applied in the context of any existing and/or new accuracy requirements that may be developed*".

    a. Consider further input received on definition (see page 12 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1k9fvA4gnb13bNbB8O4o72mXMZ8mQnJGC/edit[docs.google.com])

         -

    b. Confirm working definition (current state)

- During the last meeting, the group came close to rough consensus on a working definition.
- Instead of a working definition, propose to refer to it as a working contractual construct
- The assignment of the scoping team is to consider whether there is an agreed upon definition and what working definition to use in the context of the scoping team's deliberations. Now it seems there is proposal to have a working construct.
- Suggest that the team does away with the unvarnished meaning of accuracy. There are three kinds of accuracy: identity, syntactic, and operational. The language that should appear in contracts and policies should include the appropriate labels. It would be helpful to use the type of accuracy and then the discussion will be easier.
- Accuracy is a loaded word and it means different things to different people in different contexts. Could live with the word definition – what some members are afraid of is that this definition will be set in stone and many are not OK with the current definition.
- The group is starting with an explanation of the current state of affairs. Do members agree that this is an accurate capture of the current definition in existing contracts? If the group does not start with a shared point, it will be messy. Understand there are three types of accuracy defined by others, but that gets into questions 3 and 4. This assignment is – what is the current state, and can the group agree on it.
- The words on the paper need to say current and have a disclaimer so that it is clear
- There is a different level of checking for phone number and email then for names – it's important to explain the different levels
- Confirming that the group has viewed comments from Melina and Lori – does this belong here or in the aspirational discussion? Melina would like reference to purposes in ICANN Bylaws and purposes in EPDP Phase 1

3. Aspirational definition of accuracy (10 minutes)

a. Overview of homework assignment (see template - https://docs.google.com/document/d/11msexuoqWSUsFj8ZjVvWF-XHpcMJntWH/edit [docs.google.com])

- Groups are now to work together to come up with their aspirational definition
- The idea is that the group now has a current state definition. Many members have spoken about what the definition "should be", which is why leadership is using the term aspirational. However, most have not provided why the definition should be changed. Groups are now asked to provide what the definition should be and then explain what problem this change is trying to address. Then, is there data that confirms that this problem exists? If there is no data currently, what data is necessary to gather to further understand the perceived problem?
- The definition in the RAA only applies for new registrations and to certain fields.
- To answer this question, the group should look at the final purposes of the EPDP Phase 1.
- The EPDP team did not agree to the definition of accuracy vis-à-vis GDPR. The EPDP team was discussing purposes based on the RAA. This should not be the basis for going forward.
- The definition used for accuracy was under dispute throughout the EPDP. The reason we have for accuracy is for contactability which does include third parties.
- The work of this group for assignment 1 and 2 is not in scope to be relitigating or reopening the work in EPDP Phase 1, 2, or 2A. If the group identifies a problem, it could identify issues for the Council to reconsider.
- Whatever the group is discussing in terms of accuracy must stay within the bounds of what was discussed in the EPDP.
- In the third column, the word need has been added – what problems and/or needs is this future definition expected to address

b. Scoping team input

- Aspirational is a loaded term. What is the need that accuracy is trying to fill – what goal is it trying to reach? Does the current definition meet that need? This is not a shopping list of items that we would like accuracy to do. The chart gets to this.
- Looking at this as an aspirational definition could lead the group down a rabbit hole. Trying to agree to an aspirational definition could cause a lot of consternation.

c. Confirm next steps & deadline for input

4. Follow up questions to ICANN org regarding enforcement and Accuracy Reporting System (30 + minutes)

a. Note additional information added to the index of relevant resources from RDS-WHOIS2 RT, including responses to questions

b. Input received from scoping team to date: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1arlKdQkbRkE1LuurmDdd-PZP184_AdFm/edit[docs.google.com]

c. Scoping team input

- The document that staff prepared for Council is very thorough – referring specifically to the a26 Feb 2021 letter from Swinehart to Fouquart. This dovetails into the group's first task nicely. After reading this document, did not come away with what definition ICANN uses. Perhaps this would be good fodder for a follow-up question with ICANN org. What does ICANN Compliance consider the current definition of accuracy and does that comply with the definition proposed by registrars?
- Support the above
- Important for the group to discuss these questions.
- There is a Compliance blog post about enforcement – please read this document and determine if additional questions are necessary. Also review the question and additional information Sarah Wyld put into the document.
- This work needs to take place intersessionally between the working calls; the calls cannot be used for the drafting of questions in order for the group to make progress.

c. Confirm deadline for submission of questions

5. Confirm action items & next meeting (Thursday 18 November at 14.00 UTC)