

---

ICANN84 | AGM – ccNSO: IANA Data Accuracy  
Saturday, October 25, 2025 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

CLAUDIA CRUIZ

Hello and welcome to the Birds of a Feather IANA Data Accuracy Study Group session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with my colleague Joke Braeken, are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICAN Community Participation Code of Conduct, and the ICAN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom.

When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you very much. And with this, I will now hand the floor over to Jordan Carter. Thank you.

---

***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.***

---

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Claudia. Good morning, everyone. Happy day. Is it one? Do we count today as day one or day minus two? I don't know anymore. But thank you for coming along to this bird of a feather session for the IANA Data Accuracy Study Group. This is like a pre-planning moment. The call for volunteers for this study group hasn't gone out yet, but it will go out in a few weeks.

And so, what we're going to do today is have a session that's run by Bart about the issues that are on the table for this and how we are going to approach it. And together, we're going to do a bit of pre-planning to start structuring the work for this study group as it comes on. Basically, taking advantage of our presence here together in Dublin to kickstart the work in a way that's a bit easier than a few Zoom webinars. The face-to-face always makes it a bit easier. So it's nothing too formal, nothing too difficult, hopefully. And with that, I'll hand over to Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thanks, Jordan. So what I want to do and intend is to run through a series of documents, which are more or less the, I would say, the foundation of the work that you will be facing if you're interested. At the end, we'll do a kind of, say, some Zoom boarding exercises to deliver. So, you are kindly requested to log into the Zoom room for this meeting at the end, maybe last half an hour.

So without further ado, let's go through the documents. Can you? I can share it if you allow me. Otherwise, let's start with the topic area, ccTLD Policy Work. That is the starting point. No, not the

---

account. Yeah, the other one. Go to the, so you can see. No, that's the next one. The final one. Okay. Forget about it. Go with the purpose and the fourth one I sent you. Start with this one in a minute.

We'll get there. So, some of you will recall that the whole discussion about the IANA, who is the accuracy started with a letter from Kim Davies from IANA to the council in June, 23 on the .LB case. And that was an issue of say a new, I would say method to deal with ccTLD issue. And that was a caretaker, a special role of the caretaker, which was not defined in any of the policy documents or practices of guidance.

So, that kicked off a discussion first at council level and then with the policy gap analysis group. And in the process, in that process, the council asked Kim Davies to identify areas of potential gaps in policy guidance or procedures or practices that he has encountered from his perspective running IANA with respect to ccTLDs.

One of them or effectively three are the IANA data accuracy and the issues around it, the purpose of public records and finally enforcement or graduated compliance options specifically with respect to the data accuracy. Another one, which will have a Working Group or study group is the disaster recovery. And there will be two, there are three or four other topics which all will end up in study group.

---

Just to understand the scope of the issues itself. Say during the discussions with Kim around his topics, the PGA spent a little bit of time on each and every of these topics. But that was, thank you, it was very limited. It was more to check whether there was an issue and whether there should be follow-up work. So, that's the basic area. So, this is the topic areas. If you can scroll down, you can see it.

This is what I'm referring to. One was the IANA data accuracy. Scroll down. The other one is, and we'll send the links afterwards, they will be on the website. Purpose of Public Records. So, that's the IANA WHOIS. And then thirdly, enforcement. And the Working Group advised, so the PGA advised the council to start with a study group combining these three topics. And that's the birth of the Federal Working Group is what we're doing right now. As part of that exercise or as part of the preparation, the council also adopted the terms of reference for this group. Can you go to the next one, which is the terms of reference? No, the other document. Yeah, purpose and scope.

Yeah, yeah, there we go. And so, this is what I just said is in the background of this one as well. So, this document was adopted in June of this year. And so, it goes back to the combination, why and the rationale. Can you scroll down? And then we go into the, scroll down, go to the rationale. So, and it has the purpose of the study group. And this is status number two, section two, please.

---

Yeah, purpose of the study group. And as you can see, the purpose of the study group is to identify or explore and understand the issues associated with the purpose of IANA Public Records. Why do we have IANA public records? That's the foundational question. The expected level of accuracy of the IANA public records and the enforcement and or graduation compliance options.

And in the discussions around the latter one, so starting with the latter one, it was very clear, say, there is this almost nuclear option of revocation. But it was considered really a nuclear option without any, if there is no gradual and no, how we could say, pre-warning, etcetera. It will not work. It's overkill, definitely overkill. The around the expected accuracy, there is this claim of expected inaccuracy, etcetera.

The number is unknown. So, that's probably an area to look into and to closely cooperate with IANA to understand the levels of accuracy or inaccuracy. And probably more important, is that relevant? Yes or no. That's again, and this goes back to the first question. The purpose of IANA public records and why we have them in the first place. So, that's, this is setting, I would say, the high-level questions, scope and purpose of this study group and the areas it needs to look into. The output of the group, and before we go into the scope, I just want, the output of the group is not coming up with, say, policy or etcetera.

Just again, with recommendations or next step to the council. Next step could range, and this is one of the things you will find in the

---

Final Report of the PGA, could range from a policy development process to something, a recommendation, say, IANA, go ahead, whatever you want to do is up to you. So, and anything in between. So, these options are open, but come up with a recommendation and then a good rationale. I think that is what is expected of this study group. And do effectively some, and based on some data and evidence. Can we go to the next section of the document, Scope of Activities.

So, again, exploring, it's a lot of exploration, as you can see, exploring. So, that means a lot of data gathering, interviewing, whatever this study group thinks is necessary. So, it's clearly, there is room for interaction and to really go in depth into the issues. Exploring enforcement and gradual compliance options. What I want to mention here, what I need to mention here, is a potential link with the work of the ccTLD Finance Working Group.

One of the things, if you call recently the ccTLD Finance Working Group produced its final report with a recommendation to ICANN to interact directly with ccTLDs to inform them about the work that is done and of, for example, the financial contribution guideline of the ccTLD. And this is really to establish a, I would say, a more direct link between the ccTLD and ICANN. In the past, and my personal example is always, if you're somewhere in a government and you receive a letter or an invoice from an entity you have never heard about, what will you do? Will you pay that invoice? Probably

---

not. And that's more or less the, I would say, the experience with some ccTLD managers and especially with the smaller ones.

One of the things that this Working Group has uncovered is especially the smaller ones are mostly directly related with governments. And the, let's say, their contributions is, if you look over time, it's, they haven't made any voluntary contribution for whatever reasons, without any judgment to it, but say, this is the type of expedite. You could imagine that the same mechanism or ICANN reaching out to individual ccTLDs is used to just check in on your, say, the accuracy of the, WHOIS data in the root zone.

It is just, yeah, basic account management, I would say. And there probably is, there's a lot. So, there is definitely room for these types of options. And maybe, yeah, piggyback on the recommendation from the finance Working Group as well. So, I just wanted to have this mentioned. So, this is the scope of it. And can you scroll down to the exploration, etcetera. And just scroll down. So, and these documents, as I said, we'll publish them.

They're available anyway. Working Group and deliverables, we'll start today with discussing a little bit about the scope and your sense of it. That's why this long introduction. And then the working method, yeah. Once the group is established, this will, yeah, that's really up to the study group to detail, I would say. So, with this, are there any questions on this part before I really go into the background of some other materials and why the IANA accuracy

---

and, or the starting point of the discussions? Any questions, comments? So, I can have a zip, of course. None?

Okay, thank you. Can we go to the, not the accountability framework, the other one? Strawman, the Strawman document. And go, what you see in front of you is, again, a document that was developed by the council ad hoc group. So, that predates the PGA Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. What was done was a consolidation of RFC 1591, the framework of interpretation and, for example, the retirement policy in one document. And now the review could be added as well.

What was also done was work the ad hoc group did together with Kim Davies running through RFC 1591, identifying areas which have become more or less obsolete. There is a very telling paragraph in RFC 1591 that the expectation wasn't, think about the timeline, the time this was developed, I think early 90s, that there would be only eight gTLDs. So, clearly that bit has been, is obsolete by now.

And there are more areas in this document which are overtaken by time. So, they are still in this document, but they are faded and, to make very clear, say they are not really part of the bit around gTLDs. So, what you see in front of this document is a consolidation RFC 1591 framework of interpretation and policy and of the retirement policy. Can we scroll down, please? Go to section three, I believe. Now you can see what happens.

Scroll down a little bit. Yeah, introduction, the top level. This is the area. This you can see. There we go. The administration of

---

delegated domains. So, this is section three of RFC 1591. And why is it important? Because this is, I would say, the foundational document for having data in the WHOIS database. If you scroll down, you will see some. So, that's two letter codes. Can you scroll down? Scroll down.

There we go. Key requirements. There must be an administrative, the manager, of course, be on the internet. There must be etcetera. That the role of the manager is defined or that is at least included. And the relation with the administrative contact and the technical contact. This is the basis for having an admin bay contact and a tech contact and how it's interpreted.

Can you scroll down, please? And you can see the FOI worked on this as well. And there is this requirement on the admin contact that it must reside in the country and how this was interpreted by the FOI Working Group. And this is already 2013.

So, again, just wanted to highlight this is this is clearly one of the foundational documents and that needs to be taken into account. And this is the relevant section. Can we go to the other one, the accountability framework? And this is for a very specific group of ccTLDs who have signed an accountability framework or a letter of, what was it? Exchange of letters with ICANN.

Can you go to section three? The commitments of C. Commitments of ICANN, that's fine. You can see the bit about the root zone WHOIS information. That was an issue at the time when this was developed. Can you scroll down, please? We talk about

---

the commitments of ccTLDs. Again, one of the, if you look at the Accountability Framework or the exchange of letters, the major, the major commitments in these documents is effectively keep the data up to date. And that's it.

And in some cases, there is a bit about the financial contribution, but these are the core principle or the core commitments of ccTLDs. Again, this is probably something that needs to be taken into account and something to look into once you start delving into the accuracy itself and maybe make even a distinction between ccTLDs who have signed either an exchange of letters or an accountability framework and those who haven't.

And there are mechanisms in this document to deal with it. Some of them are very heavy handed, like going to the ICC or the International Court, say the Chamber of Commerce, arbitrary rules, I believe that's the one.

And so, again, this is one of the foundational documents, I would say, and the thinking behind it, because this is, this is a result from the whole discussion around the creation of the ccNSO as well. With this, again, are there any questions before we go to the fun bit?

Okay, thanks. Now we can go to-- and please now log into the Zoom room. And you go to the whiteboard. Yes, and go to, yeah, that's the basic one. It doesn't show to me. Yeah, it shows. I don't know if you're in.

---

What you see in front, can you increase the size a little bit? It's one of the nice things about, sorry, this is one of the nice things about using Zoom. They have some templates. And this is a template to build, I would say, project frameworks or other frameworks as a start of focusing work of small groups.

And where you start is, first of all, have a brain, do a little bit of brainstorming, a few minutes around scope and goals of the activity you want to undertake, in this case, around the study group. Then you go into, I would say, the key activities and tasks. You can, then you think a little bit about timeframes and durations. That's a little bit of the order. If you go to the slide or frame two, you can see it. Go to the next one.

I've increased it. Go to the next page. If you click on two, that's the one. Yeah, so this is the reduced and you can delete test. So, what you can see is effectively, this is a condensed format. And this is the one I suggest we're going to use. And the way to do this is you think through, say, what you believe is the scope and goals of the IANA study group.

If you more or less did you do, you agree. I have some more details about, say, the purpose statement in the terms of reference, which we use for as an introduction. And then we go into the, I would say, Key Activities and Tasks. What do you suggest this study group will do and will undertake? What are its main activities? The way it works is I'll give you a few minutes and I will do a little bit of roundtable. And you can even, if you're in the Zoom room, you can

use the sticky notes on the left-hand side and post them in, I would say, first scope and goals.

If you add your name to it, then I will get back to you if it's unclear and you want to have any, yeah, yeah. Add some comments. So, elaborate a little bit on the scope and goals, yeah. Yeah.

CLAUDIA RUIZ

That's in the settings. Are you going to be able to go into the notes?

JORDAN CARTER

I clicked on the link that you put in the chat and then that took me into a copy of the whiteboard in the Zoom application.

BART BOSWINKEL

Okay.

JORDAN CARTER

But it isn't the one that you're showing on. How do you-- well, I don't know how to change pages.

BART BOSWINKEL

But you need page two. Don't worry about the other one.

PETER KOCH

Mine is getting stuck at 50% reload.

BART BOSWINKEL

Okay. So then we'll stick to the main one. Don't worry. We'll stick to the mainframe, this one. We just focus on scope. Can you use your...

JORDAN CARTER

Who has succeeded in getting into this whiteboard? One, two, three, four, five. You don't know on the feedback, but--

PETER KOCH

It suggests, I asked for, do we need edit access or comment access? That's what the thing asks.

BART BOSWINKEL

Otherwise, what we could do is, forget it, we'll do it the other way around. If you think through for a couple of minutes what you want to have as scope of goals-- I have access, Joke has access. We can put in your comments as such in a sticky note and it will capture it. You can see what is typed and we make it available afterwards. Otherwise, we lose too much time. I should be able to.

So, think through scope and goals for a couple of minutes, even write them down on a piece of paper or on your phone or on your laptop. I will go around Robin if somebody has any suggestions on scope and goals and then we'll enter them. Irina, yeah.

- 
- IRINA DANELIA      Maybe I missed something, but are they different from the scope and goals defined in the chat?
- BART BOSWINKEL      Maybe if you think they should be different, yes, then they are different. If not, then you can use the terms of reference.
- IRINA DANELIA      Okay.
- JORDAN CARTER      I was just observing to Bart that Joke has put a helpful link in the chat to the terms of reference for this group, which is a little bit different to the version that we worked through on the screen, but breaks down the scope of activities into a bit more detail. So, if you're perhaps one way to think about the scope and goals is to take a look at that, which kind of came out of a staff dialogue with a few of us who were on the study group and went to the council in June.
- And just maybe we can use this time to validate that scope, either to validate it so you're comfortable with it or to work out if there are any things that are missing or too broad in that to take a look at. Because it hasn't really had any community scrutiny or input into it so far. We think it's fine at the council level, having signed it off as the terms of reference. So, take a look at those. And maybe that could be where we start the discussion, right?

BART BOSWINKEL

May I give the floor to add anything around scope and goals of this group? Do you agree with the initial, I would say, what's in the document or want to add anything or think it's too broad? Go ahead.

GORDON DICK

Gordon Dick, Nominet. I would just indicate that although it's covering the public records in the current scope, I think it is worth just making sure that you reference there are additional new records that exist in all IANA systems now that the authorized contacts that can make changes and not necessarily the public records anymore because of the change in data model and that's a substantive difference from when all of those documents were originally written. It's worth that being a part of the discussion.

BART BOSWINKEL

So, identify, by your knowledge, is there any documentation where what is in public and what isn't public, so general documentation?

GORDON DICK

So, IANA has some published documentation on what, they're basically contacts which can make different changes to certain parts of the records and different authorization levels. Majorly they're used in gTLDs, but it works the same in ccTLDs.

- 
- BART BOSWINKEL                      They do, and they are just recorded for gTLDs or is it the way IANA published them?
- GORDON DICK                          They exist on UK and all the other ccTLDs as well, but they're private, they're not visible to the public. So, they're the people that are actually interacting logging into IANA systems.
- BART BOSWINKEL                      Okay, and they can make the major changes?
- GORDON DICK                          They can make all the changes. The public contacts are no longer the ones that make changes.
- BART BOSWINKEL                      Okay, so then you, anybody else?
- JORDAN CARTER                        Right, I just want to follow up on that and just explore it a little. So, one thing is what's in the public records and then the other is who is authorized to make what sorts of changes to those public records? You're saying that we should look into the second of those things alongside looking at the first.

---

GORDON DICK                      You're saying you need the context in the discussion whether or not it's relevant to expand the scope to that is another question. I think the context of understanding that these are no longer the people, the public contacts are no longer the contacts that instruct changes to those routes on records. That's a key substantive difference.

BART BOSWINKEL                And then you, if I go a little bit, say again another question related, it's really about what's the purpose of these public records?

GORDON DICK                      Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL                Because you put them in the context, yeah, they don't make changes, so what for whatever reason are they published?

GORDON DICK                      Exactly. Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL                Thanks. Irina.

IRINA DANELIA                    Yeah, Irina for the record. I was thinking about mostly the same as Gordon just mentioned. So, the scope of this study group is public records. There is no definition of what is public record, but we can

---

assume that it is the one which is publicly available. But there are other records and to which extent we should care about them. And if it's not within mandate of this study group, should there be another discussion later on, on the other types of the records in the IANA database?

BART BOSWINKEL

There's something like, yeah, it's again scope and goals are not part of this. Borrow up work needed. Anybody else?

JORDAN CARTER

Just to add on to that. I think that part of why that comes into an interesting thing might be in part B of the scope around the expected accuracy. Because if you're thinking about expectations on that front of the accuracy of these records, probably you do need to inquire about who has the authority to keep them up to date or to change them.

So, I think there's a logical connection there within the scope of the work. It's a bit tricky to talk about expectations of levels of accuracy and compliance if you ignore entirely the question of who can make the changes. Whether there are other sorts of private IANA records that need to be a part of this work, I don't know. It might be something that we can ask Kim to give us a report on as one of the outputs of this or inputs to the group's work is what are all the sorts of records that IANA keeps pertaining to ccTLDs and which are public, which are private. So, at least we have a shared

understanding of what data there is. Now that's jumping ahead of scope and goals.

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah, it's key activities. Anybody else on scope and goals? So, and then you've got the basic building blocks from the terms of reference. So, with this I would say if you would, and that's an interesting discussion as well, and this goes a little bit to the way you expressed it, Jordan. If you look at the say what needs to happen first from, I would say, study group perspective, if you've got these say the scope and goals that have been identified, what should be the first area of research discussion from the study group? So, that's more or less the key activities and tasks and the order. Are we moving to the next item? Yeah, Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH

Thanks Bart. This is Peter. Someone put a note in there saying related to accuracy, ignore question changes.

BART BOSWINKEL

Oh, that's me.

PETER KOCH

And what?

BART BOSWINKEL

It's a typo.

PETER KOCH

Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL

So if you think about it, so the scope and goals, keep in mind this is about data accuracy, purpose, and compliance. What are the first key activities the group, you suggest the group undertakes? What type of information would it need?

JORDAN CARTER

My opinion on that is that we start with what the operational reality is today. So, we asked IANA to prepare a report that relates to these three topics. One is like a listing of the records that are kept because it's information about what entity the manager is, right? And who the key contacts are at it, are ones that we're kind of all familiar with. But getting a full download of those which are public, which are not. And as part of that report, I guess it would be good for IANA to express an operationally informed opinion about the utility or otherwise of such records. Like it may be that because they've replaced the substantive contact model, the legacy public contact model isn't useful anymore and should be replaced or retired or something, I don't know.

And then it would be also good to get in the scope of part B of the scope on the expected accuracy to understand what information they have about levels of accuracy or inaccuracy and how diligent people are at updating them if it's identified. Whether IANA

---

actually tells people if it notices incorrect information, have those conversations, whether they happen and so on.

So, I think there's a lot of knowledge inside IANA as an operating entity about all these topics. And the first most useful tool, I think, to start being able to discuss them is to get that into a written form and share it with the group.

PETER KOCH

Thanks. Peter. Thank you. I put a note in there about this accuracy topic. I think it's important to agree on one, which is probably impossible, or multiple definitions of what accuracy is. We know from a lot of discussions that there are lots of expectations attached to that, where people say, well, I wrote to this address, but I got no response. So, the address, the information is not accurate, which in my world is wrong, but in other people's world, it might be okay.

And we need to do that before we task anybody else to measure the accuracy, because that would always follow from one side. Also, I would suggest that the study group, while all this is informed by the operational practice that IANA has gathered, develop additional perspective on what this is. IANA is not the only consumer of the public record. That would not make sense, because then it wouldn't necessarily have to be public. So, we need a, not necessarily an opposite, but a balancing view on that. Thank you.

---

BART BOSWINKEL

Thanks, Peter. Anybody else? Yeah, go ahead, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE

Stephen Deerhake, for the record. Jordan, given the substantive changes in the data model with these private contacts now in, with the authority to make changes, do you suppose, given that there's no serious confidentiality issues, we could extract from IANA an ER diagram of what their current data model looks like? I think that would be useful to see what's going on. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

I think that would be useful, yeah. Understanding how that framework hangs together, both the public and the private elements, I think would be valuable, and wouldn't disclose any PII. And if IANA thought that sort of revealing information like that would create some vulnerability or something, then I'm sure they can say so.

Can I just follow up on something that Peter said? Peter, you said we need to look at other perspectives. In the section four of the terms of reference around the working method, it talks about studying the issues from multiple perspectives. And it gives three examples. It says from IANA's perspective, from a general ccTLD manager perspective, and from other ICANN SO/AC perspectives. So, I can imagine us at some point in this process asking the SSAC for a security lens on this.

---

I can't quite imagine asking the GAC for a lens on this from a governmental public policy point of view, though maybe having said that, I can imagine asking that question. But I was wondering if you thought there were other perspectives that would be useful to and make sure that we record. Because I think that a part of the work will need to be asking ccTLD managers for their perspectives on these things. And we can use surveys to do that. We can use intersessional meetings to do that. We can use in-person sessions at ICANN meetings to do that. Were there any other angles you think it's important to put on the table?

PETER KOCH

This is Peter, assuming I was given the mic. No, my point was, I believe that we don't let one step forward and then all of the others can only react. And one question to you, Jordan, I just didn't catch. Did you say that you can or cannot imagine asking the GAC?

JORDAN CARTER

I can. Okay, yeah. Because I think there are-- you know, I can imagine government public policy perspectives on what information should be provided around who a ccTLD manager is. And the importance, given that parts of the GAC have made, they've taken an interest in the accuracy of records of second level domains. I can imagine them also being interested in the accuracy of data around top-level domains as well. What do you think?

---

PETER KOCH

That's an interesting point, because accuracy is always tied to a purpose. And these two accuracies might actually be different. They might overlap, but they're different. I'm sorry, I'm having scars from 15 years of discussion about accuracy, like many other people, so.

JORDAN CARTER

It's okay. It's all going to be okay.

BART BOSWINKEL

So in that sense, I think the order, if you look at the scope and the way you expressed it, Peter, is first have a discussion around the purpose of the data before you enter into the accuracy, because the purpose of the data determines the level of accuracy that's necessary. So, that's the logical order of the work for the study group.

PETER KOCH

This is Peter again. The introduction that follows, you might not like, but I'm not going to make it more complicated, which usually means I do. There are different purposes, right? There is the purpose, the initial one that was, why was it collected? And then there are, meanwhile, other purposes or say other uses that have evolved over time. And at some point, the question is which should, if they collide, which one is the dominant one, right? Which is probably more important for the second level of accuracy, blah, blah, discussion.

BART BOSWINKEL                      At the end of the day, it doesn't matter. If you have multiple purposes, then you have multiple levels of accuracy, because still the purpose depends.

PETER KOCH                              But you could also say that that purpose doesn't count. You're doing things with the data that the data wasn't collected for, so you should not complain that the data doesn't deliver what you expect.

BART BOSWINKEL                      You still start with the purpose.

PETER KOCH                              Indeed.

JORDAN CARTER                        Well, I took from Peter that he was making the point that different people have different purposes for the same data. And it's like the whole discussion around who has privacy, right? We collected this information about domain names so that you could contact the registrant. And then law enforcement or IP-type people started using that data to do different things. So, it's a different purpose for the same record. And I think that that gives rise to perhaps a working method that's been used a little bit.

---

I think we've used the term stress tests before to sort of assess the adequacy of a recommended approach. And I think there might need to be a bit of creative thinking around use cases for the various records. That sits alongside understanding historical or contemporary purposes for these records.

And that might be something that could be based on some thought about personas. Like we might say we want to put on the hat of a civil servant in a country who has government policy responsibilities related to a ccTLD. What records are important for them? We might say, intending registrars for a ccTLD. What's important for them?

We might say ICANN community participants, what's important for them? Or people who want to lodge DNS Abuse claims, what's important for them? So, there just might be a layer of analysis that helps us sort of tease out the various perspectives. And where the group doesn't necessarily have expertise in those perspectives, just taking a guess and publishing it can provide something for someone else to react to and correct or improve. So, it's not quite stress testing. It's kind of use case generation.

BART BOSWINKEL

Anybody else? You will definitely have an opinion, but you can share it.

---

JORDAN CARTER

I've got a question which might help nudge some people. Some of you have been involved in GNSO debates around this accuracy question at the second level and so on. There's some of the scar tissue that I think got mentioned by Peter. Are there any perspectives thinking about that work that should be included here and what this group either does or doesn't do?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

This is Chris. The only thing I would say, and I think it's covered, but the biggest problem that the GNSO had with any accuracy work was actually getting clear what they mean. What they mean by accuracy. And I think someone said it earlier on this, but it's a continuum, right? You can be 100% accurate. Is that what you're aiming for? And what do you actually mean? It's not so much accuracy as if you ask the question, are you getting the correct answer?

So, you've got to figure out whether you're asking the right questions first and then if the answers are accurate. But other than that, it's just really hard. And that's why it hasn't got anywhere.

BART BOSWINKEL

We can talk a little bit about the next steps and what we'll do with this. Okay. So, based on what we're saying, and thanks again for your input. I think it's very helpful. My suggestion is that we'll see if I can compile this in a kind of overview with around these different areas, like what we discussed, scope and goals,

---

requirements, key activities and tasks, and probably also constraints and risks. Share this at least for the time being with the council and use this as part of the call for volunteers. And based on that, say, expect a call for volunteers in, I would say, mid-November.

So, we can have a first kick-off meeting before the break or maybe after the break, something like this. But at least we got this material and we can really start running before Mumbai where the group will have its first in-person meeting. That's more or less, that was my roadmap for going forward. And thanks for your input. And I hope it was at least, yeah, made you interest in the work of the study group. So, thanks. Back to you, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER

Thank you. Yeah, just to echo the point, I hope that if you hadn't started thinking about this too much, this has piqued your interest. And if you do have other thoughts about the work, feel free to fire them to me or to the secretariat. And we'll look forward to getting that call for volunteers out. I hope we get a nice diverse group of participants to dig into these issues alongside IANA and the others.

So I think with that, unless there are any other questions or comments, we can call it quits and get five minutes back for coffee. Thanks, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**