WHOIS REVIEW TEAM CALL
Wednesday, 11 April – 17:00 UTC
PRELIMINARY REPORT

RT Selectors and Members
(ET) Emily Taylor – Chair
(KK) Kathy Kleiman – Vice-Chair
 (JB) James Bladel
(LG) Lynn Goodendorf
(MY) Michael Yakushev
(SH) Sarmad Hussain
(SR) Seth Reiss
(SK) Susan Kawaguchi

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

Apologies
(BS) Bill Smith
(LD) Lutz Donnerhacke
(OK) Omar Kaminski
(PN) Peter Nettlefold
(SL) Sharon Lemon

The WHOIS Review Team (RT) undertook the following:

1) Agenda & preliminary report

(AJ) and (SK) requested that items be added to the A.O.B section. See section 4) for details. The WHOIS Review Team adopted the preliminary report of their conference call held on 4 April:
https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/31174577/Prel+Report+-+4+April+-+v2+-+for+your+consideration.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1334175668191

2) Staff report

Starting at recommendation 12, (DM) resumed her presentation of Staff's feedback provided in response to the Review Team's draft recommendations. For recommendation 1-12, please refer to the material of the teleconference held on 4 April 2012 -
https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreview/Call+26+-+04+April+2012. In light of this discussion, the Review Team noted that the RAA negotiations would come into play once the implementation phase reached. (DM) reiterated Staff's availability to provide the Review Team with an update on negotiations. (JB) informed the Team that he could not take part in any Staff updates on RAA negotiations and would have to recuse himself from any related discussions. During the discussion, (DM) made references to the Draft Adivosry on RAA subsection 3.7.7.3 (posted in May 2010). (JB) noted that the Community did not welcome the document at the ICANN meeting in Cartagena de Indias (December 2010). (DM) volunteered to circulate the draft as well as the summary of comments to the Team so that Members could get a clearer picture of discussions at the time. (DM) also stressed that by mentioning this document, Staff was not specifically endorsing or encouraging the approach described in the report. (KK) enquired whether recommendations should be amended to reflect the ongoing negotiations and studies. Following a proposal put forward by (SK), the Team decided to acknowledge the ongoing studies/negotiations in its report and to not integrate RAA negotiation into its recommendations.

With respect to recommendations on IDNs, (DM) noted (SH)'s concerns on a number of issues (compatibility, standards etc) and offered to provide additional material. She furthermore noted that a call could be scheduled with Steve Sheng – ICANN Senior Technical Analyst, Policy – for Members to hold an in-depth discussion on the matter. The IDN recommendation subteam welcomed this offer and requested that Staff schedule this interaction.

The Review Team Members thanked (DM) for walking them through the comments.

3) Action items

Action items penholders (list available at https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreview/Action+Items+-+Spring+2012) provided the Team with an update on their progress and activities (repository at https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreviewprivate/Final+Report):

- Data accuracy – recommendation 5 (SK): the Team considered the substantial/full failure terms and agreed to adopt these terms. It was resolved that clear definitions would be added along with references and footnotes. (JB) volunteered to help (SK) on the references section. (SK) is to circulate findings (3/4 paragraphs), agreed recommendations and new wording by the next call.

- Proxy/privacy recommendations – (SK), (SR), (JB), (PN): The subteam noted that it needed to review (KK)'s draft which fleshes out findings and contains references to where material is. The Review Team Chair thanked the Members for their efforts and requested that a final draft be circulated by Friday, 13 April. (LG) volunteered to help with the drafting effort.

- Strategic priority - recommendation 3 (ET): (ET) informed the Team that she was in correspondence with (DM) and waiting for information from ICANN Compliance on figures and budget which would influence findings and recommendations. (DM) highlighted a discrepancy resulting from the slides on Staffing (presented in January 2011) which contained full-time staff only. (ET) declared her integration to integrate (PN), (KK) and (SK)'s comments while (SK) volunteered to draft some language on the Senior Member position for Compliance.

- Data Access – Common Interface – recommendation 17 (ET): The Review Team signed off (ET)'s revised version. (KK) informed the Team that she had new iterations to propose. The Review Team Chair requested that those be circulated and that if those are judged to be substantive edits, the recommendation would be back on the action items list.

- Deaccreditation (KK), (JB): References were made to Maguy Serad's slide and to Bill's comment. The Team agreed that incentives should be added when talking about penalties. (JB) is to circulate language by the next conference call.

- IDN Recommendations – recommendations 18, 19, 20 (KK), (MY), (SH), (WW): The Team declared their intention to hold a meeting with Steve Sheng and to issue a draft based on that discussion. They hope to share language with the Team by the next call.

- Language on timeframes (SK), (LG): No follow-up action is required. The AoC timing should be listed. The adopted language will constitute a separate recommendation at the end of the data accuracy recommendation. (SK) is to integrate it.

- Compliance recommendations (ET), (BS), (PN): No progress to report. (AJ) is to organize a subteam conference call within a week for Members to discuss findings and recommendations.

4) A.O.B

(AJ) requested a show of hands to confirm the slot with ICANN Staff. While the Team engaged in a discussion on whether this call with ICANN Staff should be kept, a number of Members pointed out how useful the previous call had been and how relevant it could be for their activities moving forward. The Team resolved to meet with ICANN Staff on Monday, 16 April at 22:30 UTC.

(SK) raised the question of validation which was brought up in Lawrence Strickling's letter as well as in public comments. (ET) highlighted that discussion was needed on whether the validation topic should be included in the report's findings or preamble. The Team agreed that this item should be added to the next call's agenda.