

# WHOIS REVIEW TEAM CALL

## Wednesday, 18 April – 23:00 UTC

### PRELIMINARY REPORT

#### RT Selectors and Members

(KK) Kathy Kleiman – Vice-Chair  
(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  
(DM) Denise Michel

#### Apologies

(BS) Bill Smith  
(ET) Emily Taylor – Chair  
(MY) Michael Yakushev  
(ON) Olof Nordling  
(SH) Sarmad Hussain  
(WW) Wilfried Woeber

The WHOIS Review Team (RT) undertook the following:

#### 1) Agenda & preliminary report

The Review Team resolved to adopt the preliminary report of their teleconference held on 11 April 2012 - <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/31175346/Prel+Report+-+11+April.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1334842956136>.

#### 2) Data Validation

The Review Team discussed the data validation issue raised by (SK) on 11 April. Team Members noted that this discussion item was brought up in London during their first formal face-to-face meeting. (JB) stressed that the Team should be cautious as incorporating this item would imply rebuilding an amount of work currently ongoing (PDP, RAA etc.). (LG), on the other hand, argued that it would be appropriate to consider inserting a couple of lines to encourage data validation techniques as a way to achieve accuracy goals and noted that the Team should not dive into implementation details. (KK) suggested adding that numerous mechanisms had been identified but that the Team had decided to go for the low-hanging fruit. (JB) raised concerns that this discussion might confuse the Community and underlined that the Team should be consistent and restate definitions. He furthermore agreed that the accuracy goal should be emphasized and that the path to achieve that goal should not be mentioned. (JB) and (PN) volunteered to draft language and were tasked to determine where this additional piece of information ought to be inserted: executive summary, body of text, recommendations etc. (KK) requested that this information be found in different parts of the report.

#### 3) Compliance Recommendations

(PN) reported that the working document available at <https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreviewprivate/Final+Report> had mostly been prepared by (ET) and that additional information about compliance figures had been requested. The Team agreed that compliance clearly related to WHOIS landscape and that the strategic priority concept was also included in the compliance recommendations. It was resolved that each issue should be given an identity. (PN) invited Members to submit

their comments to the Subteam.

#### **4) Strategic Priority (Recommendation 3)**

The Compliance Subteam volunteered to take this on. With respect to the senior position put forward in the recommendation, (SK) expressed doubts as to what her drafting assignment entailed. The Review Team referred back to the Costa Rican discussion. (JB) suggested a Board-level Committee tasked with the implementation of the recommendations, a group that would oversee WHOIS. (SK) underlined that this should apply to the general WHOIS issue, not only to compliance recommendations and argued that, on the supposition that the Board issues the mandate, this would trigger more movement within ICANN staff. (PN) advocated a call for an independent report to advise the Board on benchmarking, best practices etc. with a view to keeping issues disentangled. (SK) volunteered to draft language in light of this discussion.

#### **5) Data Access – Common Interface (Recommendation 17)**

(KK) reiterated her intention to send in tweaks.

#### **6) Privacy/Proxy Recommendations**

(JB) made a reference to paragraph 3.7.7.3 of the current RAA and noted that the Team was currently asking ICANN to alter this paragraph. Particular attention should be paid to this. (SK) underlined that the Review Team's language had not caused a stir: only 2 comments were submitted on recommendation 16. According to (JB), this is due to the fact that the iteration in the report preserves liability. (PN) reminded Review Team Members of comments received in response to the discussion paper - <http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-09jun11-en.htm> - (who is responsible) etc. and of the RT debates held in Dakar (Registry Name Holder). He invited the Team to go back to the Dakar transcripts - <https://community.icann.org/display/whoisreview/Dakar+Meeting>

(PN) submitted additional comments on the structure of the paper (a written submission to be sent by Thursday, 19 April). (KK) volunteered to circulate language on Thursday, 19 April to reflect that discussion while the Subteam stated that their intention to work on the content of the last paragraph.

This exchange of points of views led to a fruitful discussion about privacy. Due to the sensitiveness of the term privacy, (JB) proposed that a reference be made to ICANN's *Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities* document. The Team agreed to find wording to present the problem of data protection. (PN) agreed to hold the pen and to submit a proposal to the Team by Thursday, 19 April to get the ball moving.

#### **7) Data Accuracy Recommendations**

(SK) reported that she had not created language per se but had shortened content. The Team discussed whether they ought to lose recommendation 7 (subset of accuracy) and add content to recommendation 21 instead. (PN) thanked (SK) for her work and provided her with advice to enhance readability of this section. The Team flagged "regulator" as an equivocal term and offered alternatives such as: administer, manage, coordinate, oversee etc; (SK) volunteered to take these amendments on and to put language forward. It was resolved that recommendation 7 would be deleted to create an overarching recommendation 21 (to become recommendation 20 once the deletion complete). A draft is to be circulated to the group.

#### **8) Deaccreditation**

(KK) announced that they would finalize and circulate a reiteration shortly.

#### **9) IDNs**

The IDN recommendations Subteam announced that a meeting with Steve Sheng and Francisco Arias was scheduled for the following day. (MY) reported that he had circulated revisions to the Subteam and that it had been passed on to Staff to determine whether that resolves the issues.

## **10) Chapters & Timeline**

In absence of chapter amendments/revisions, (KK) suggested that this agenda item be deferred to the next call. Members are to submit their input by 25 April.

The Team considered extending their deadline to May. (KK) suggested that this decision be made by (ET).