

WHOIS REVIEW TEAM CALL

Wednesday, 28 March – 21:00 UTC

PRELIMINARY REPORT

RT Selectors and Members

(ET) Emily Taylor – Chair
(KK) Kathy Kleiman – Vice-Chair
(BS) Bill Smith
(JB) James Bladel
(LD) Lutz Donnerhacke
(LG) Lynn Goodendorf
(OK) Omar Kaminski
(PN) Peter Nettlefold
(SR) Seth Reiss
(SK) Susan Kawaguchi

ICANN Staff

(AJ) Alice Jansen

Apologies

(DM) Denise Michel
(ON) Olof Nordling
(MY) Michael Yakushev
(SH) Sarmad Hussain

The WHOIS Review Team (RT) undertook the following:

1) Agenda

The WHOIS Review Team adopted the preliminary report of their meeting held in Costa Rica:

<https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreview/San+Jose+Meeting>

The Team agreed that the document of revised recommendations that was pulled together in Costa Rica should be considered as a resource for the Team to continue their work.

2) Action Items

The Review Team Chair requested an update from action items' penholders – please refer to the list:

<https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreview/Action+Items+-+Spring+2012>

See below the current status of items:

- Data accuracy recommendations (SK) – work in progress;
- Proxy and privacy recommendations (PN), (SK), (JB), (SR) – conference call held and first draft circulated to the list (please refer to (SR)'s email);
- Text on accreditation (KK) – work in progress;
- IDN recommendations (KK), (MY), (WW), (SH) – work in progress;
- Language of recommendations 3 & 17 (ET) – first draft circulated to Members – comments to be submitted by next call. While Members expressed support in response to recommendation 17, they noted that pieces were missing from recommendation 3; (ET) volunteered to deliver a revised version.

Members resolved to dive into the drafting effort and to submit a draft to the Team in anticipation of the next call, i.e Wednesday, 4 April.

The Team unanimously stressed that the initial deadline given to the *review your chapters* action item was too optimistic. Based on this feedback, it was decided that Members should circulate their amendments to (SR), (OK) and (AJ) by Friday, 13 April.

3) Public comments

The Review Team acknowledged the quality of comments received in Costa Rica and in the public comment box. (ET) walked the Team through the comments submitted to the Team via the public comment box and made the following comments:

- Recommendation 1:
Need to clarify that referring to documentation, not a PDP per se.
- Recommendation 2:
Appropriate processes
- Recommendation 3:
Clarify that not talking about compliance but WHOIS as a whole. Noted an interesting suggestion from the U.K government.
- Recommendation 5:
To avoid confusion, use undeliverable instead of unreachable. Should respond to Staff that do not necessarily need a NORC study: they should find a cost-effective way. The Team agreed that they ought to make a reference to ongoing dialogues about verification and that a distinction should be made between legacy problem and verification.
- Recommendation 8:
Is it our role to define serious breaches? The 2009 RAA already allows for graduated sanctions; a fact the Team thinks it may have missed. Discussion to be continued on the list.
- Recommendation 9:
Staff suggested that might need to have a PDP – (DM) will be requested to clarify this during the next call.

(ET) also drew Members' attention to the links the European Commission refers to as well as the U.K. government's proposal to set up a reform Team.

4) Next steps

In addition to the action items list, the Review Team agreed that they ought to draft some language regarding timeframes and implementation plans in light of the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) and go back to contributors among ICANN Staff. (SK) and (LG) volunteered to take this on. The Team agreed that they would request an update from (DM) on their next call and request an additional call – that would be recorded - with relevant ICANN Staff.

The Team stressed that it was highly necessary for the Team to respond to Staff's comments for the Community's information.

While he expressed satisfaction with the current level of compliance recommendations, (PN) proposed to strengthen the text. (ET), (BS) and (PN) are to work on some language and to add a justification to their proposal.