BRENDA BREWER:	Good day all. Welcome to RDS WHOIS2 Plenary call #45 on 7 January 2019, at 15:00 UTC.
	Attending the call today is Lili, Chris, Alan, Cathrin, and Stephanie. From ICANN org, Jean-Baptiste, Jackie, and Brenda. We have no observers. We do have apologies from Erika, Carlton, Dmitry, and Susan.
	Today's call will be recorded. I'd like to remind you to state your name before speaking. Alan, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. It looks like it probably will be a relatively short call. The only item on the agenda was to discuss the changes that Lili had made to data accuracy and an overall status report of where we are and trying to figure out how we're going to get finished in time.
	As we sort of expected in the face-to-face, we have not had a lot of progress done. Jackie has been quite active in doing edits, but we have not had a lot of other action in the time since the face-to-face and that, unfortunately, includes me as well. But we really do have a target which we have to either meet or come very close to meeting.
	With that, sorry, I've just given the introduction and I didn't ask, among other things, if there are any statements of interest changes. And there are none, so we will proceed.
	Lili is on the call. Lili, could I ask you to take us through the changes? The significant changes are around the recommendations in the report,

EN

and I'm hoping that Jean-Baptiste can put a copy up of the Google doc or something similar to that. There is a pointer in the chat which people can bring up their own copies on. I don't know whether we can display it in the chat or not in the Adobe Connect screen. We are trying. Does Lili have speaking capabilities?

LILI SUN: Yes. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can. Happy New Year to you.

LILI SUN: Happy New Year. I'm going to Update #1. The first [inaudible] update is on Page 6. If you can open your Google doc, you can go down to Page 6.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, and you've updated the tables there.

LILI SUN: Yes. I updated one table and just included the figures from Cycle 6 or ARS Phase 2 since Cycle 6 report was published in June last year. So it was before I finished my draft. So just to include the figures of Cycle 6. It's not a [significant] change.

The next update is on Page 8. It's also an update on a table. Actually, the table I just [inaudible] all the detailed figures from different cycles from

Phase 2 and made a [comparison] between [different] cycles. Since the compliance metrics have been published for Cycle 5 and Cycle 6, I added Cycle 5 and Cycle 6. I also made a structure change for the table and I included the [inaudible] [reasons] for tickets closed before first notice. So you can see the [inaudible] closed reasons are WHOIS data changed [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Lili, I have a question. When I looked at the statistics published by the ARS and then I looked at number of tickets issued, they don't seem to correspond. The percentages of tickets issued of the 12,000 sampled is a different number than what the ARS claims are items that have accuracy errors. Did you ever look at that in any detail?

LILI SUN: I'm sorry. I couldn't get the point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember the exact numbers, but there's something like for Cycle 5 if you look at the number of tickets issued, it's something like 39%, I think. Whereas, if you look at the Cycle 5 report from the ARS, it says the number of errors is 32%. I don't remember the exact numbers, but it's something like that. They're not the same, and I'm wondering if you ever looked at what the difference was and why they were different.

LILI SUN: I get what you mentioned is a difference. I will go back to the report to check why the difference [generated]. So the statistics cited here were from the web page for compliance metrics. I didn't refer back to the ARS report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you didn't really look at it yet. So, okay, that's something we could do. It's just I'm a little bit troubled when the two different reports for the same data seem to be indicating two different error rates. They're not different in a huge amount but they're not the same, and I would have thought the number of tickets generated is exactly equal to the number of errors that they found.

LILI SUN: Okay, I will go back to the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thanks.

LILI SUN: For the compliance metrics, it [keeps on changing] for the tickets was an ongoing process. So the compliance metrics keep on changing. I noticed the update [were stopped as of] 1 October last year since ARS was suspended. I just updated all the statistics [that] have been published so far.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

LILI SUN: Okay. This is the second update. It's on Page 8 to Page 9. If you go to the Google doc, you can see the updates. It's all about the [stats].

[The third] update in Page 11. From Page 10 to Page 11, there were several observations listed here. As you can scroll down to [Item 6]. It [was referred] back to the observations we highlighted last time before the previous recommendation. So there was [inaudible] result like the [inaudible] percentage around 40% of ARS generated tickets closed with no action. [inaudible] further clarification about the reason why there was no action.

[inaudible] I noticed that Jackie had a comment here to ask the review team to review the updates. I'm not quite sure whether the language or text here reflects what you and [Susan] mentioned during the last face-to-face meeting. If you can take a look at here, Alan, that would be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Jackie, your comment said review by me or the team. I'm just wondering, it's not clear to me from your comment what the overall focus is. Just that it's unclear and needs rewording? Or is there some other issue? If you remember.

JACKIE TREIBER: I believe, let's see here. I don't think that you and I reviewed that when we worked [together]. I think this may have just been a general review of the wording in general. I don't think it was confusing or anything like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I'll take a look at it then.

JACKIE TREIBER: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you, Lili.

LILI SUN: The fourth update is on Page 17.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is the substantive one, I think.

LILI SUN: This is relating to the relating the problems or issues of [inaudible]. I just made a change to the last [point], and [this] item was listed as 1.1.4.5. So I just changed the title: "The Accuracy Reporting System Has Demonstrated RDS (WHOIS) Accuracy Concerns." To further justify the title, I just listed the [text] during the observations [above]. There are considerable ARS-generated tickets closed with no action and there are

considerable ARS-generated tickets [linked] to the WHOIS data updates of I'm not sure. There are still very big concerns regarding the WHOIS data quality. This also [leads] to the new recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. The part you deleted included a reference to the amount of time it takes from the time the data is first sampled until the time Compliance looks at it. With your permission, when I do the next level of editing I'm going to put back a reference to that because the new section now talks about the number that are closed and gives the reasons but doesn't mention the timeframe which is one of the things driving the number of changes, that it could easily be a year from the time the data is actually sampled until the time Compliance looks at it. So with your permission, I'll put back a reference to that timeframe because I think that's an important key to understanding why there are so many changes.

LILI SUN: Okay, I'm fine with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you.

LILI SUN: So the last update is if you're going to Page 18-19, it's regarding the [recommendations]. I just updated the findings and the rationales for

the recommendations. Maybe you or the whole team can review the text here, whether it's appropriate or precise.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LILI SUN: I just updated the findings and the rationale. For the next part, for the impact of the recommendation or feasibility, I just want to finalize [inaudible] all of the recommendations themselves. And then we can come back to the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, the feasibility, of course, is going to depend heavily on outcomes of the EPDP and we don't know where that's going yet. But probably we need a reference to that.

LILI SUN: Okay, for the EPDP reference, I [also] made it clear [at the last] point of the possible impact of GDPR and other applicable laws. I made it clear the ARS has been suspended due to the temporary specification and the [way forward] is pending to the EPDP result.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, okay.

LILI SUN: So that's all [of the] updates.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, any questions for Lili? Comments? Thank you for doing that work. I'm afraid you're the only one on the team who has put that effort in, in a timely manner. And sadly that includes me, but it's been an interesting holiday season. Any comments for Lili?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I see nothing. All right, we had no other items on the formal agenda if I remember correctly. Sorry, I've just destroyed my copy of it. But we do have appended to the slides the list of confirmed decisions and action items and actions that are pending. I wonder if Jean-Baptiste or Jackie can take us through those.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Before we move on, can I please ask you what are the next steps for this recommendation that we just covered?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, Jackie and I haven't done our review of it yet. So that's going to be one more clean up done, and then we'll go back. What the overall intent is, Jackie and I started cleaning up the document. That is,

accepting changes so that we have something that's a lot cleaner to look at.

Right now, it's a real challenge to work on the document because there were so many pending changes on them. So Jackie and I worked on several sections. She's continuing to do the changes associated with moving the reference material to an appendix. I'm going through the rest of the documents over the next few days and giving her notes so we don't have to do everything together on a conference call.

So the intent is hopefully sometime this week we will have a set of documents that are a lot cleaner than they were before and a lot easier for people to do their review. Plus, I and the leadership team will be trying to go through some of these documents and identify things where we still feel there's significant overlap and duplication of information so that either Jackie can do a redraft or the individual can do a redraft.

So essentially, once we finish the cleanup partway through this week, we're going to be in an editing phase where we're expecting both people within the individual teams and the team leaders to try to clean up their sections. And Jackie and I will be identifying sections that we think specifically need effort. I would like to think by the end of next week – and it's going to be made difficult because two of us, both Stephanie and I, are on the EPDP next week which is pretty well going to dominate our week – but nevertheless I think by the middle of the month we need to have a copy that's pretty clean so people can start doing detailed reading.

Once we go over the action items right now, at least for those that are pending for people on this call, I think we need to do a realistic assessment over the next few days as to whether we're going to make the deadline or not and, if not, how do we extend it? I'm just worried due to a number of problems some of us have had, and some team members have been other non-RDS review team and non-EPDP things that we're not quite on the scheduled we hoped we were.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. For this Recommendation 5.1, do you want it to be circulated in its current [state] to the review team, since we're missing a few review team members, for comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, I think Jackie and I are making some changes in wording to other recommendations as well, not to change the intent but to clarify them. So I think it's going to be better if we defer that a little while and do them all at the same time.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's hard enough to get responses from people, and I think I prefer not to go over them five different times [on] five different specific things.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, sounds good. [Another thing] I wanted to mention is that there is Stephanie in the queue and she had several comments. I'm not sure whether [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I see Stephanie's hand. We'll go to her now.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. Can you hear me now, or do I have to unmute again?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, you're unmuted.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Oh, good. Sometimes it works; sometimes it doesn't. I just wanted to ask a couple of things. I haven't [done] other than a [cursory] glance at this at the moment. I do have an itch to edit and offer some proposals. When do you want that? Do you want it now or after you and Jackie go through and make the changes? What's the most efficient way of operating here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you talking about the whole document or a specific section?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: The whole document.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess [what I would find best is] if you know what sections you're going to have specific significant comments on, let us know what they are and we may spend less time finetuning them. If it's just the whole document in general, I would hold off until probably immediately after the EPDP session.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay, so what I'll do is I'll focus and go in on the ones where I think I can really contribute something substantive. The rest was more just to help with the duplication issues and things like that. You know? [inaudible] those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Actually, Stephanie, to the extent you have time between now and next week, going in and at least adding comments on the sections that you think really need the work would probably be helpful or ones that you think you will be able to put something in.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. [That's easy to do.]

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: To go in and do fine editing before we finish our pass probably is not worth the effort but identifying the sections you think really need it I think is a good thing.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay, good. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right then. If we can go to the list of open action items.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. Just to review quickly, Susan had volunteered to work on the level of priorities. (And just to mention that Volker is entering Adobe Connect now.) So Susan will evaluate each recommendation and define the priority level for each recommendation with some quick description. She will include a brief statement that refers to timing envisioned for recommendations while highlighting some of the dependencies and make sure that the agreement to consider the six-month Bylaw window in assessments.

Then on the report itself, Susan will look at the discussion on "the board should negotiate" since there was discussion to update this wording through the report consistently and this was on [inaudible] recommendations.

On the executive summary itself, there will be a section on the problems of the policy development process regarding a single RDS (WHOIS). The review team needs to evaluate the recommendation

numbering and add a potential explanation in the executive summary. There was also a section on the history of WHOIS on ICANN's website. Erika is to provide Jackie with the right content and references link so that the introduction section can be properly updated.

In the background section, Alan and Jackie will review and modify the WHOIS background section.

Under Recommendation 1: Strategic Priority, there was a decision reached to do a rewording and reaffirmation of strategic priority, in the implementation note [has a] reference to stakeholders. Work should be interactive and board should not act unilaterally.

Under action items, since the former board working group was dissolved, the recommendation should be reformatted to say any working group that is focusing on RDS issues should be made public and not make specific reference to a particular working group. Comments from NCSG need to be updated to neutral instead of disagreement in the public comment summary. As per Dmitry's note, Cathrin will report for this recommendation that legislative efforts are not enough.

Under [Recommendation 2:] Single WHOIS Policy, Jackie will work with you, Alan, to mention the problems of the policy development process regarding a single RDS (WHOIS) to be placed in the executive summary.

Under Recommendation 3: Outreach, Alan will update the language based on the DNRC comment on the section.

On the Recommendation [inaudible] section, ICANN org will change the public comment of NCSG to neutral if that comment is not already

marked as such. Alan to clarify what specific improvements we are currently looking for.

For the second recommendation, Alan will work with Jackie on rewording the recommendation to clearly articulate the need for outreach before and after RDS changes are finalized.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear on that one, I've looked at it and I don't believe the recommendation itself needs any changes. The surrounding text will [however] mention it. It already effectively says that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right, so we can remove this [section amendment]. Just one more [inaudible] under the recommendation was that the review team does not have any input on the ICANN budget.

Under Recommendation 4: Compliance, Susan will clarify that ICANN will not go on fact-finding missions but use the information they currently have on hand. Susan will clarify that Compliance enforces registrars to enforce data accuracy for registrants.

And under the first recommendation, Volker will provide language to update Recommendation 4.1 based on RrSG and NCSG comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: That has [been done] already.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. Susan will delete the portion of the recommendation that refers to sanctions and make a reference to it in the report text.

[And the second recommendation], Volker and Alan will work on rewording the R4.2 and add some metrics in for measurability and success of implementation.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I believe we also presented a revised recommendation on that at the face-to-face in the last day.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right, [inaudible] this one too. Under {Recommendations 5-9]: Data Accuracy, ICANN org will double-check the recommendation numbering to ensure comment was in response to recommendation 5-9 and adjust as needed.

Under Recommendation 10: Privacy/Proxy Services, Lili to address Alan's comments or confirm whether Alan and Jackie should address it.

On Recommendation 11: Common Interface, Susan and Volker to clarify that this recommendation was not specifically aimed at Compliance.

Recommendation 12: Internationalized Domain Names, review team to review this section and recommendation to decide if changes are needed. Review team to evaluate recommendation numbering and add a potential explanation in the executive summary.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG:	Back on Recommendation 10, does anyone remember what that is?
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Yes, Alan. That was a discussion on the leadership call, I believe.
ALAN GREENBERG:	But I don't remember what my comments were or what Lili was going to address on privacy/proxy services.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Let me look. Lili, you have your hand raised.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Lili, go ahead please.
LILI SUN:	Yes. Actually, I added one line into the findings of this recommendation. I mentioned one sentence. There has been no way to enforce – let me have a look. I mention one sentence. There has been way to enforce the verification and the validation environment to date. And then you mentioned this is true only prior to the review also [tickets on that] [inaudible] about the proxy provider. So I agree with you. I'm thinking about reverting the sentence or just deleting it. [inaudible] I just [delete] the sentence.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, it's now coming back to me. Thank you. I always get confused when someone tells me I made a comment and I don't remember it. All right, Jean-Baptiste, you can please go ahead.

LILI SUN: Yeah, I will make comments [via] the Google doc again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Lili. Jean-Baptiste, back to you on Page 15.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Lili. Yes, thank you. Under Objective 3: Law Enforcement Needs, there was an action item for MSSI to estimate the number of hours spent on the law enforcement survey in response to the NCSG request for estimated cost associated with conducting the survey. Cathrin to bring this recommendation to GAC's attention and Alan to EPDP's. Clarify what "regular" means and include rationale: 1) ex-ante impact assessment and 2) evaluate new policies once there are in place.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I ask the statuses of the first item?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Ongoing.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was an estimate of how many hours MSSI spent.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: On the Objective 4: Consumer Trust, Alan and Erika to update the section.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, on that one, there was a clear misunderstanding. I left the meeting believing Erika said she would do a first pass at rewriting it in the following week. She recalls that I said I would send her some notes. Neither of us communicated until a week or so ago. At this point, I'm going to be sending her some notes and she will do an update soon afterwards. There was a clear miscommunication and it's not clear why, but it doesn't really matter at this point. But we are in touch and will get it done.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right. Under [Objective 5:] Safeguarding Registrant Data, Alan to update recommendation. Agreement to add "ICANN board should consider whether and to what extent notifications of breaches should be publicly disclosed." And Alan to clarify recommendation in light of the section.

Objective 6: ICANN Contractual Compliance, the first recommendation, Alan to reword recommendation so that it does not say "the board should negotiate." The goal is to ensure the recommendation is not dictating a PDP but suggesting a change somehow.

Under the second recommendation, Alan and Volker to add more details to this recommendation to clarify the registrant fields being addressed in the recommendation. Additionally, the whole recommendation should be reworded to better convey intent. Based on the updated recommendation and rationale language Volker provided on 11 December, Susan is to take the pen and update the relevant sections of the report accordingly. Jackie to add in introduction to the extent that their deliberations so far impact areas in the review.

On the third recommendation, this one is to be deleted. Add this is a more targeted outreach in the relevant recommendation. Cathrin to clarify board options in a footnote.

Recommendation #4, Alan to write to ICANN org Compliance and negotiate language to be added to relevant pages. If successful, recommendation will be deleted.

Finally, under [Objective 7:] ICANN Bylaws, Carlton to amend the recommendation to incorporate the words "safeguarding the registrant data" and provide clarification that the suggestion is meant to postpone the topic to future reviews.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and I believe in all cases where the action was to update the recommendation, we do have an updated recommendation. I don't think any of them are pending at this point, although some of them may still need some minor rewording.

All right, thank you very much. I think that covers it. Is there any other business anyone would like to add? We all have a fair amount of work to do either with specifically assigned or the general review of the document. That can't be done over the next week or so by most people, so you have a little bit of time off. But toward the end of the month, we're going to have to put some intense effort into this.

Jean-Baptiste, is…?

JACKIE TREIBER: Excuse me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, please go ahead.

JACKIE TREIBER: Can you go back to Page 17, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

JACKIE TREIBER: We regard to CM2 and the last part with "Jackie to add an introduction to the extent that their deliberations so far impact areas in our review," I just wanted to clarify who "they" or "their" was.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gee, you're picky. Without any clarification, you can make it up yourself, you know.

JACKIE TREIBER: Ooo!

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone remember? "Jackie to add an introduction to the extent that their deliberations so far impact areas in our review." Jackie, I think at this point, you can safely assume if we don't know what it means, you don't have to do it. It may become obvious as we do our detailed review what it meant though.

JACKIE TREIBER: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's an executive decision, but anyone can override it if they think it's wrong. I hear no one objecting.

JACKIE TREIBER:	Great. I then have another small request. I reached out to Erika with regard to the ICANN history links that she mentioned in our face-to-face meeting. I haven't heard back from her, so I was wondering if anyone else might be able to maybe point me in that direction. I can certainly do the research myself, but I thought maybe [inaudible].
ALAN GREENBERG:	I thought she actually produced the links in the chat of that meeting.
CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:	[Actually, I can clarify.]
ALAN GREENBERG:	Oh, go ahead, Cathrin.
CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:	Because I showed them to her. There's the ICANN WHOIS page which has information on the – hang on. I'm looking at it now. The ICANN WHOIS policy page. In any case, I can provide the links that we were looking at so that we can add it in the document. And that was the one she ended up being happy with [at the time].
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Cathrin.
JACKIE TREIBER:	Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I will send it via e-mail because I don't have access to the chat.

JACKIE TREIBER: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else from anyone? Jean-Baptiste, are there any – other than embarrassment and Jackie's going to have to work further into or past January – are there any other implications of us slipping a little bit? Because at this point, I'm becoming less sure that we're going to make an end of January date, but it shouldn't be too far into February. Are there any other implications that we have to note other than potential cost and a little bit of embarrassment?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The implication I can think of right now is just to let language services know about that and comms.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: But other than that, I don't think so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so let's say by the beginning of not next week but the week after, so the meeting two weeks from today, we should make a decision on where we think we are at that point.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, then I'll turn it back to you for action items and anything else you need to report.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. In terms of action items, the one I had noted is for you, Alan and Jackie to review and clean up the report sections. That's the only action item I have. And also just to clean up the list based on the input received during the review of action items.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. For those who managed to attend the meeting, I wish you all a good year and a productive year in all ways. And we'll see you again next week for hopefully another short meeting. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]