Accuracy Scoping Team - Initial Input - 5 Oct 2021

1. Your name

1	Jeff Bedser
2	Steve Crocker
3	Volker Greimann
4	Brian Gutterman - ICANN Org
5	Sarah Wyld
6	Sophie Hey
7	Velimira, Nemiguentcheva-Grau
8	Melina Stroungi
9	Beth Bacon (RySG)
10	Lori Schulman
11	Michael Palage

2. What are your or your group's objectives for this effort?

1.   To support the efforts for policy adoption regarding validation of data. All efforts to forward these efforts in effect have outcomes that assist in the rapid resolution of malicious activities and victimization of internet users.

2.   Raise the visibility of accuracy issues related to registration data. Attempt to adopt some terminology and concepts related to different levels of validation of registration data. Attempt to include the concept of validation as part of a directory data registration policy.

3.   Define Accuracy
Define Purposes for Accuracy within ICANNs mandate
Determine Accuracy requirements from current policies and contracts.

4.   As the ICANN Org liaison, my objectives/goals are to ensure a clear line of communication/participation in the group's work of ICANN Org SMEs/Legal team + others as requested/required. I'll also be following the policy discussions to ensure clarity for the Org when it comes to any Policy implementation work required downstream.

5.   My main objective for this work is to determine if there is a policy problem related to registration data accuracy (e.g. policy obligations are required but do not exist, or policy obligations exist but are not being followed). Agreeing on a definition of accuracy and considering who is responsible for identifying inaccuracies should enable us to determine if further work is needed to measure and enforce accuracy requirements.

6.   Gather facts and information on accuracy to inform any future work efforts

2. What are your or your group's objectives for this effort? (continued)

7	- Have a holistic approach in scoping the issue, in particular the work under accuracy should include the accuracy of all domain name registration data and not limit itself to compliance with GDPR (limited to personal data). Identify whether contractual terms on accuracy are sufficient and what is the level of contractual compliance and enforcement. - Respond to the questions: 'how to ensure accuracy of registration data'.
8	- Have a holistic approach in scoping the issue, in particular the work under accuracy should include the accuracy of all domain name registration data and not limit itself to compliance with GDPR (limited to personal data). Identify whether contractual terms on accuracy are sufficient and what is the level of contractual compliance and enforcement. - Respond to the questions: 'how to ensure accuracy of registration data'.
9	To establish a shared understanding of terms as well as the scope and goals of this effort.
10	Finding reasonable solutions for validating the accuracy of domain name registrant information this includes exploring best practices as well as look at potential changes to ICANN policy.
11	1) Reinforce the commitment to the multi-stakeholder model (MSM); 2) Engage in a fact gathering exercise so that any future work by either the GNSO or ICANN Org in this area has a solid foundation for decision making. 3) Opening people's eyes to other perspectives.

3. What do you or your group think will be the main obstacles that this effort may face? And how can these be avoided?

1   The exact standards that currently exist vary from place to place based on who is doing the validation and from what sources.

Getting into this level of minutia can result in the efforts to form consensus getting bogged down.

2   I view the development of accuracy standards as an incremental and evolutionary process. Attempts to be ultra precise and handle every boundary condition will likely lead to endless debate and lack of consensus. Another possible source of distraction would be attempts to specify penalties for incorrect data before there is agreement and, more importantly, accumulated experience, on the target levels of accuracy and the means for assessing the actual experience.

The way to avoid these obstacles is to focus on the general objective and to develop a basic framework that will be a substantial step forward if it is achieved and at the same time allows each party latitude on how best to design and implement its registration process.

3   Mission creep - Stay focussed on the main topic, do not allow side considerations to distract
Side debates - Be considerate of each others time and avvoid raising the same issues again and again.

4   While there will certainly be some diverging views/opinions on some topics within the working group/amongst the working group members, we hope that through productive multistakeholder dialogue and compromise + facts-based discussions towards ensuring the global public interest is being taking into account we hope the group can find common ground.

5   Main obstacle is going to be viewing all registries as identical - failing to take different business models and contractual obligations into consideration.
Encouraging participants to avoid making blanket statements where possible.

3. What do you or your group think will be the main obstacles that this effort may face? And how can these be avoided? (continued)

6	• Discrepancy in the level of appreciation on 'is data accurate?' and 'to what extent it is accurate'. The standard for accuracy may diverge among different constituencies. • Risk to spend too much time on defining accuracy, which could prevent advancing with the work. • There is a risk of focusing too much the discussion on 'how to measure accuracy' as compared to 'how to ensure greater accuracy of RDS'. • Unwillingness to go beyond the bare minimum and discuss solutions which would guarantee accuracy, such as verification of data
7	• Discrepancy in the level of appreciation on 'is data accurate' and 'to what extent it is accurate'. The standard for accuracy may diverge among different constituencies. • Risk to spend too much time on defining accuracy, which could prevent advancing with the work. • There is a risk of focusing too much the discussion on 'how to measure accuracy' as compared to 'how to ensure greater accuracy of RDS'. • Unwillingness to go beyond the bare minimum and discuss solutions which would guarantee accuracy, such as verification of data
8	The community has been polarized by the WHOIS issues. It seems to be approached as a zero sum game rather than the community compromise it is supposed to be. The contracted parties are understandably concerned about liability. Other parts of the community are concerned about law enforcement, security, balancing all consumer rights which include privacy but also the right to redress harms. Balancing these concerns has proved very difficult from a policy perspective. There is always some degree of risk while running a business operation. How can we minimize risk and still have a well functioning domain system that enables the flow of information for an assortment of legitimate purposes and how can we be sure that the data we input and receive is accurate in a commercially reasonable manner.
9	We need to make sure that all the facts are on the table. While every individual and/or stakeholder ground is entitled to their own opinion, they are not entitled to their own facts. While some previous PDP working groups have been contentious, as a Scoping Team with no authority to make binding consensus policy, I am hopefully that we can foster a more collegial work environment.