

**WHOIS REVIEW TEAM CALL**  
**Wednesday, 9 November – 11:00 UTC**  
**PRELIMINARY REPORT**

**RT Selectors and Members**

(ET) Emily Taylor – Chair  
(KK) Kathy Kleiman – Vice-Chair  
(JB) James Bladel  
(LD) Lutz Donnerhacke  
(MY) Michael Yakushev  
(SH) Sarmad Hussain  
(SR) Seth Reiss

**ICANN Staff**

(AJ) Alice Jansen  
(ON) Olof Nordling

**Apologies**

(BS) Bill Smith  
(DM) Denise Michel  
(LG) Lynn Goodendorf  
(OK) Omar Kaminski  
(PN) Peter Nettlefold  
(SL) Sharon Lemon  
(SK) Susan Kawaguchi

The WHOIS Review Team (RT) undertook the following:

**1) Agenda**

The WHOIS Review Team resolved to adopt the agenda:

<https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreview/Call+23+-+9+November+2011>

**2) Dakar Meeting**

(KK) provided the Review Team with a summary of Dakar activities and outcomes. This summary helped the Team shape its plan of campaign for next steps and objectives.

**3) Recommendations**

(ET) stressed that even though recommendations still needed to be wordsmithed, they represented a hard won consensus, and any proposals for change should be approached with extreme caution. The Team discussed (SK)'s concerns about proxy service providers. This led to a fruitful debate on security climate, professionalism, the distinction between principles and practices etc. The Team resolved to continue (SK)'s thread on the email list. (SK), (JB) and (KK) were tasked to craft a recommendation on best practices and end-user education.

**4) Letter to ICANN Compliance**

The Team reviewed the draft letter to ICANN Compliance (see:

<https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreviewprivate/Letter+to+ICANN+Compliance>) and took good note of (SR) and (JB)'s written comments. (JB) pinpointed a section on registries/registrars that required further explanation. (JB) volunteered to provide edits by the end of his business day.

(LD) offered additional content to recommendation 10: *Investigate the reasons why reporting of inaccurate WHOIS data has fallen, despite continuing high levels of inaccurate WHOIS data. Report on the findings.* (LD) is to circulate wording to the list; (ET) is to incorporate the suggested edits. Track-changes are to be submitted to the Team for final approval during their next conference call.

## 5) IDNs

(SH) walked the Team through the paper on IDNs – please refer to:

<https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreviewprivate/Internationalization+of+Domain+Name+Registration+Data>

(MY) formulated a number of comments: 1) unify ccTLD and gTLD process (legal differences are hard to explain to end-users); 2) ease of access to information and user-friendly Internet; 3) possibility to contact in ASCII format (applies to all registrants). The team agreed that the issues inherent to IDNs and translations should be captured in a recommendation. (ET) requested that (SH) and (MY) tease out one or two recommendations on this subject matter. (AJ) was tasked to circulate policy recommendations available in the letter to ICANN compliance to (SH).

## 6) User Insight Report

The Team enquired about the status of their request for a written report. (ET) informed the Team that she had not heard back from (LG). (AJ) echoed (ET)'s notification. In consideration of (LG)'s busy schedule, the Team requested that Staff coordinate with User Insight consultants directly. (SR) reported that he and (SK) had volunteered to help (LG) on the Consumer Study chapter.

## 7) ccTLDs

The Team discussed the status of the contribution received from former Member – Kim Von Arx - on the ccTLD section of the report - <https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreviewprivate/ccTLD>. (AJ) reported that she had provided Kim Von Arx with a compilation of all feedback received on ccTLDs. (AJ) is to circulate this document and to revisit Kim Von Arx's paper. (KK) suggested to include the ccTLDs response into the appendix of the report. (ET) reported that she would try to obtain additional data which had been promised by CENTR.

## 8) Timeline & Structure of Report

The Team reiterated its intention to publish a draft report by 30 November.

(SH) suggested that status mark-ups be added to the master document (open, closed etc.). The Team welcomed this suggestion. (ET) noted that a number of sections and material currently available in the draft report had never triggered discussions. The Review Team Chair concluded that she would circulate ideas of cuts to the list. The Team would ideally go back to authors of sections with one-to-one level suggestions. (ET) volunteered to oversee the progress of the report and requested that they move to a revised draft by the next conference call. (JB) confirmed that he would be in a position to send a finalized version of his chapter.

Team Members committed to dedicating two days of November to the WHOIS Policy Review Team work.