

# WHOIS REVIEW TEAM CALL

## Wednesday, 4 April – 20:00 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  
(MY) Michael Yakushev  
(OK) Omar Kaminski  
(SR) Seth Reiss  
(SK) Susan Kawaguchi

#### ICANN Staff

(AJ) Alice Jansen  
(DM) Denise Michel  
(ON) Olof Nordling

#### Apologies

(PN) Peter Nettlefold  
(SH) Sarmad Hussain

The WHOIS Review Team (RT) undertook the following:

#### 1) Preliminary report

The WHOIS Review Team adopted the preliminary report of their conference call held on 28 March:

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/31173869/Prel+Report+-+28+March+-+for+your+approval.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1333576040866>

#### 2) Action Items

Action items penholders provided the Review Team with an update on their progress and issues encountered (please refer to the private wiki for material

<https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreviewprivate/Final+Report>). The Review Team Chair encouraged penholders to request clarifications should expectations from them be unclear.

- Data Accuracy recommendations: scope refined following (SK)'s request.
- Recommendation 5: the Team discussed whether they should include budget implications and expressed concerns regarding the timeline. The Team agreed to expand the Affirmation of Commitments' language and to add an item step to the 6-month deadline, i.e. a comprehensive plan within 3 months. (DM) indicated that the final report would be posted for a minimum of 30 days of comments; a period during which analysis and background work will be conducted in parallel. A note was made that RAA negotiations (currently ongoing) will be taken into account when drafting the implementation paths. The Team agreed that it would be useful to have a milestone-tracking and clearly articulated work plan (PDPs, RAA etc).
- Proxy/Privacy recommendations: (SK) raised concerns regarding the absence of the recommendation which requires that relationships be disclosed is missing. The Team resolved that this specific item should be kept in the final report recommendations. (SK) furthermore

drew the Team's attention that although accreditation is what ICANN needs, this might take time. This led to a group discussion on whether practices should be voluntary or mandatory. Members of the group stressed that per their mandate, the Team was not constituted to make policy. The Team agreed that a lot of fact-finding was still necessary in the policy process and that it might be difficult to come to a consensus on this issue. The Team resolved to go back to findings and to reach agreement on language during the next call (language to be circulated prior to the teleconference).

- Recommendation 3 & 17: Review Team Members to circulate their comments by the next call.
- Accreditation text: (JB) volunteered to circulate a paper on hierarchy of enforcement. (JB) and (KK) to work hand in hand on this.
- IDN recommendations: (MY) reported that a consensus within the subteam needed to be reached first. (ET) asked that draft language be circulated prior to the next call.
- Compliance recommendations: the Team reported that they were in correspondence with (DM).

### **3) Staff report**

(DM) highlighted that a call would be scheduled to engage in a dialogue with ICANN Staff subject matter experts. (DM) walked the Team through potential implementation paths and Staff queries. The Team reached recommendation 11 (included) and agreed to resume this during their next call. The Review Team Chair and Members emphasized how this had been helpful and resolved to give this agenda item top priority on their next call. (DM) furthermore offered to provide the Team with an update on RAA negotiations but noted that a week's lead-time would be needed. The Team agreed that this would be useful and (ET) requested that any RAA material that would be in direct conflict with the RT's recommendations be highlighted on-line or off-line.