2021-11-18 Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team- Meeting #06

The Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team call will take place on **Thursday, 18 November 2021 at 14:00 UTC for 90 minutes**.

For other places see: https://tinyurl.com/5ba4vsun

ⓘ PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 minutes)
2. Follow up questions to ICANN org regarding enforcement and Accuracy Reporting System (45 minutes)
   a. Input received from scoping team to date: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1arlKdQkbRkE1LuurmDdd-PZP184_AdFm/edit [docs.google.com]
   b. Scoping team input
   c. Confirm deadline for submission of questions

3. Homework reminder:

   a. Future explanation / aspirational definition of accuracy see template - https://docs.google.com/document/d/11msexuoqWSUsFj8ZjVvWF-XHpcMJntWH/edit[docs.google.com])

   b. Deadline: 2 December 2021

4. Confirm action items & next meeting (Thursday 25 November at 14.00 UTC)

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

ⓘ RECORDINGS

Audio Recording

Zoom Recording

Chat Transcript

GNSO transcripts are located on the GNSO Calendar

✓ PARTICIPATION

CRM Attendance

Apologies: Melina Stroungi, Volker Greimann

Alternate: Owen Smigelski

⚠ Notes/ Action Items

Action Items

1. Michael to review the transcripts from the two recent meetings and distribute updated instructions for the gap analysis assignment by Tuesday, 23 November.
2. 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.
3. STILL OPEN (note: further instructions coming): 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 #6

Thursday 18 November at 14.00 UTC

1. Welcome & Chair Updates (5 minutes)
   - Steve Crocker's memo – looking for recitation of the previously agreed upon purposes. Is the focus of this group a single definition of accuracy for only email and phone numbers? If so, the job of this group is quite easy. This would make the future job of a PDP WG very easy, as it would remain silent for all other levels of accuracy
   - This is not a question of size – the group as a whole is trying to determine how best to proceed here. The questions asked in this email are not relevant to questions 1 and 2, which are before the group right now. These questions do not require examination of specific data elements or purposes.
   - A single level of accuracy could vary in practice – for example, operational accuracy may apply to email and phone – think it would be important to define or determine the purpose of the data at this time
   - The desire is to say – the group has almost finished its work on the current state of play, and now the group will try to understand how ICANN currently measures and enforces this. Should different accuracy requirements apply to different data elements – this seems to be about discussing what could be improved later
   - How can the group come up with an aspirational definition of accuracy in two weeks because this does require knowing what it will be used for
   - It could be possible to come up with an aspirational definition with the potential aspirational purposes that may or not be met. There was, for example, a lot of discussion regarding purposes in EPDP Phase 1. Part of the aspirational definition will be to determine if there is a gap b/w what EPDP did and what this group is doing. This group is a scoping team with a job to ask questions, gather facts, and present this to the Council so that the Council can determine whether to move forward with a PDP (or not).
   - It is foolish to discuss aspirational definitions. If the group is talking about the purposes of ICANN compliance, the group needs to discuss the role ICANN is playing in terms of controllership. If the group is talking about the purposes of gathering data, then you have to discuss controllership – if it is a secondary role, for example, ICANN's purposes are irrelevant.
   - Aspirational definition came into play to discuss the elements of accuracy that are important to each group. This is to allow for nothing to be forgotten and converge on a definition that everyone can agree with.
   - The aspirational definition exercise is about identifying gaps – if you believe there is a problem with the current definition, what data would be helpful to inform this gap. The goal is to have a data-driven conversation.
   - Disagree with approach of identifying an aspirational definition – the exercise of trying to create an aspirational definition at this point in the group's work is not helpful and is leading to more confusion.
   - Action: Michael to review this transcript and provide further clarification of the gap analysis assignment.
   - If the assignment is pending further instruction, the deadline also needs to change
   - The assignment has not changed; however, Michael is trying to be sensitive to the terminology of aspirational
   - Understand the importance of making target, but the quality of the work is also important. If the assignment is the same after having heard the feedback, this is ignoring the feedback of the group.
   - The accuracy regime never recognized the realities of data privacy law. The group needs to balance rights, responsibilities, and perceived requirements (aspirations of users). This needs to be assessed with the burden on data subjects and has to be assessed on the roles of the controllers and co-controller agreements.

2. Follow up questions to ICANN org regarding enforcement and Accuracy Reporting System (45 minutes)

   a. Input received from scoping team to date: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1arIKdQkbRkE1LuurmDdd-PZP184_AdFm/edit[docs.google.com]

   - The objective of the questions provided by ALAC is to better understand how accuracy is interpreted by compliance and how much they get involved
   - If a phone number has been verified, and an email changes, does the email need to be verified?
   - In response to this, the Whois Accuracy Program Specification needs to be read in totality. For example, Registrar is not required to perform the above validation and verification procedures in Section 1(a) through 1(f) above, if Registrar has already successfully completed the validation and verification procedures on the identical contact information and is not in possession of facts or knowledge of circumstances that suggest that the information is no longer valid.
   - If a change is made, the phone or email address needs to be validated. If only one field changes, this is unrelated to question 2 regarding transfer of the sponsorship of a registered name. A material change to the name, organization, or email address triggers the Change of Registrant process.
   - Interested in how ICANN interprets this – if I verify the phone number and I change the email address, would the phone number be reverified at this point?
   - Just because an email address is verified, this doesn't change the onus on the RNH to provide accurate contact information for all fields.
   - Confused as to how question 4 could be addressed effectively
   - At present, one field (email or phone number) is verified, but a requestor would not know what field that is. If someone requests both the phone number and the email address, does the registrar have the discretion to only return one of them.
   - What is the next step with these questions? The group has an ICANN org liaison – as questions arise, the liaison takes questions to the org and gets them responded to. Thought the purpose of these questions was to determine if a briefing is needed from ICANN org
   - It may help if Support Staff can put links in the document that show where some of these questions are already answered in the documents

   a. Scoping team input
   b. Confirm deadline for submission of questions

3. Homework reminder:

   a. Future explanation / aspirational definition of accuracy see template -https://docs.google.com/document/d/11msexuoqWSUsFj8ZjVvWF-XHpcMJntWH/edit[docs.google.com])

   b. Deadline: 2 December 2021

4. Confirm action items & next meeting (Thursday 25 November at 14.00 UTC)

- Attempt to undertake the work intersessionally
- Concerned that many people take this day off and would not be able to attend due to U.S. thanksgiving