

20130912_ATRT2_ID816273

Brian Cute: Alice, (inaudible)?

Alice Jansen: Yes, it is.

Brian Cute: Okay. Well, then, let's get started. This is Brian Cute. The Accountability & Transparency Review Team conference call 12 of Thursday, 12 September. Welcome all on the call and on line.

We have a proposed agenda up in the Adobe room. First order of business, to adopt the agenda. There's seven items. Second after adopting the agenda is adopting preliminary report from call 12, updating statements of interest, discussion with WHOIS implementation staff; fifth item, progress update from template and issue owners; six item, preparation for launching the DC meeting and then any other business.

Are there any suggested changes, corrections to the agenda? I'm looking for hands. Seeing none, the agenda will be deemed adopted.

Going to item number two, which is adopting preliminary reports from call 11. We have just one preliminary report this time. Could you put that up on the screen, please?

Alice Jansen: Actually, Brian, this will be deferred to Washington, if okay.

Brian Cute: I'm sorry, Alice, say that again?

Alice Jansen: Sorry, my line's bad. I was just saying that, unfortunately, the preliminary report is not ready yet. So, if you have no objections, we will present it to the team by Washington.

Brian Cute: Okay, that's fine. That's fine. We'll put that off to next week.

Item number three, update to statements of interest, if any, for the ATRT2 members on the call. Do you have any updates to your statements of interest that relate to our conflict of interest policy that we've adopted? Looking for hands.

Okay. Seeing none, move to item number four on the agenda, a discussion with WHOIS implementation staff. So, I -- at this point we've been asking ICANN staff to provide us with inputs as we are developing our recommendations. And I assume that Margie Milam you are here primarily to lead that part of the discussion?

- Margie Milam: Yes, I am. And I also have Chris Gift and Steve Allison, who works with Chris, to talk about some of the technology issues, some of the development that's going underway with respect to some of their key projects.
- Brian Cute: Great. Okay. Well, welcome, Chris; Welcome, Steve. At this point, Margie, feel free to take the floor.
- Margie Milam: Sure. And hello, everyone. It's good to have this opportunity to update you on the work we've done.
- What I have posted at the Adobe Connect room is a document that I circulated or had asked Larisa to circulate the end of August that tries to give you a little bit more depth on the kinds of work that's being done in connection with the implementation of the WHOIS Review Team recommendations. I'm not going to go through all nine pages of it but, if it's okay with you, I'll highlight some of the high points just to give you the flavor of where we are on the implementation, and then I'll ask Steve to jump in on some of the exciting work that he's doing as well.
- And then the question for you all is would you like to take questions while I make my presentation or afterwards? What do you prefer?
- Brian Cute: Probably along the way, if you don't mind, a little bit.
- Margie Milam: Okay. Well, I'll keep an eye on the queue and if you raise your hand I'll know to pause.
- Brian Cute: Thanks very much.
- Margie Milam: Okay. So, what we did, I think after hearing some of the discussions we've had with the review team earlier, it was pretty clear that we hadn't provided enough detail on the amount of work that's been done. And so, I took the time to work with the various departments to hopefully give you a better idea of where the work stands and some of the expected milestones that you might see in the future.
- And so the first thing I really wanted to highlight, because it's hard to really condense this part of the recommendation down into concrete items, but the fact that WHOIS is a strategic priority for ICANN. I think -- as I thought about that question and how do you show -- how do you actually show that it is a strategic priority, I took the time to try to really layout the different areas of it, including -- when you think of strategy, you think of strategic plan work that's underway that Denise and Michele is leading up, as well as what happened in the past with where Fadia joined. Certainly, WHOIS is part of that. It's part of the budget cycle. And even once Fadia came onboard, that was very clear early on when he joined ICANN, that WHOIS was something he really intended to tackle and tackle well.
- And so, what you see since Fadia joining is really a series of activities that are trying to address all aspects of WHOIS. But, a lot of the focus was in the contracts themselves because some of the limitations that you may have read about in the report were related to perhaps not having the best contract language, not having obligations relating to validation or verification, for example. And so, since November, you really see in the chart and throughout the work that ICANN is doing, a concerted effort to try to improve the contracts so that we have a better base of obligations from which to examine how WHOIS is working and how to make it more effective.

And so, that's really I think what I wanted to highlight, at least with respect to the very first recommendation about WHOIS being a priority for ICANN. And then I'll just pause and see if there's any questions related to number one.

Brian?

Brian Cute: Yeah. Actually, Margie, not into the substance yet, but looking at the document you've provided, certain aspects of it strike me as helpful and -- or potentially very helpful. The indication of green, blue and purple to indicate the various stages, I think that's always helpful contextual type of information. Is this format a format that you developed to provide to the ATRT2 uniquely as it pertained to WHOIS, or is Denise working with the rest of the staff to develop this type of a format?

And the reason I ask is twofold. Just anticipating the inputs that we're going to get from staff in writing, number one, in what form and what to anticipate; but also in our recommendations for future review teams and metrics and reports from the staff, we need to put some thought to, if we have specific suggestions about how to measure and how to report out, this could be helpful to inform that thinking.

So, from those two perspectives, is this unique to your input or is this going to be something of a standard? And what was the thinking behind the three different colors and the presentation of the data to us today?

Margie Milam: One of the decisions that Denise and I had, and Larisa as well, is to try to standardize reporting going forward on all aspects. This was a kind of a unique design because I knew that you have specific questions. And also, too, I wanted to make it easy to read. I know one of my goals in putting this together was that you could look at it and get a snapshot. So, I do -- but -- and I don't know if Denise wants to address this, but I am aware that she's trying to -- within the approach going forward to try to standardize reporting. And if you think this format is helpful, that's good to know.

Denise Michel: Yes, just to follow up, we use a variety of different mechanisms to track the very complex and data-heavy implementation of the various ATRT1 projects and, ultimately, I think in the last year of implementation consistently used a -- with the reporting table. And so this -- so it's for public reporting. This is in line with that and we're working with our con team to come up with a user-friendly template that we can use to regularly update the public on the status of implementation of all the reviews, including SSR in the future consumer review.

Brian Cute: That's very helpful. Good to know. And again, we're going to want to engage in the broader conversation, Denise, absolutely about what is -- what are some of the better ways to present data, what should the review team be asking for so that the next time around we have even more efficiencies.

One question, and it's nothing that even has to be answered now, but obviously you've heard us hit this point a number of times in the course of the last few months, is what's the effective implementation. And I'm not sure, particularly with this bit of work, as much of it is in process or in planning, there are some I see is green, maybe not being at a point where measuring or reporting on the effective implementation is realistically possible. But, do put some thinking to that. And in other inputs you give us or other data that you provide as we go forward, if you can start to speaking to that or suggest to us how you might speak to that, that would be a very good point to focus on as well. But, this is helpful. Thank you.

- Margie Milam: Thank you, Brian. So, I'll also continue. The other thing I wanted to point out about the document is that it really measures against the Board resolution that responded to the WHOIS Review Team recommendation. And I did circulate yesterday something that was a little different, which actually highlights where there was alternative implementation with regard to the WHOIS Review Team recommendations so that you could look at it from two perspectives. I hope that was helpful as well, but I was just really trying to capture some of the discussions that you've had so that we had an easy way to understand where the implementation efforts went.
- Brian Cute: Yeah, very much so. Thank you. Please.
- Margie Milam: Okay. So, if we progress down the chart -- I'm trying to think what else is here, but -- oh, a couple of things I wanted to also highlight on number one. One of the areas where there was an alternative implementation related to whether there was a Board committee set up really to -- specifically for WHOIS. And as we indicated in the response, that the Board felt that it was important that the entire Board be involved in the WHOIS implementation and keep tabs of it. So, there was not a committee created for that purpose.
- But, I wanted to highlight how the Board does get updated because I think that was a concern that you've raised in the past. And really, what happens is the staff provides updates to the Board in Board workshops that are specific to WHOIS or (inaudible) in implementation to that they are aware of the status. And we have one scheduled for the next Board workshop at the end of the month. So, that's just something I wanted to highlight.
- And then with respect to the public's view on implementation, we have a series of things that are highlighted in the response that reflect how the implementation efforts are undergoing. And once we have the WHOIS informational website, that Chris will talk about in a few minutes, that'll be a great place to include those kinds of information on how -- where WHOIS is going and what the next steps are with respect to implementation.
- And then with regard to number two, the single WHOIS policy, we heard the concerns that, although the WHOIS Review Team wanted a single-source document and we published a document identifying where the contract language is that relates to WHOIS, we're actually engaging in internal efforts to try to come up with a non-lawyer's, simple English description of what the entire WHOIS policy or system is under the current framework. And so, that is something that is meant to really take the contract language, take the consensus policy language and try to condense it into a simple format so that someone can understand what WHOIS -- what the entire parameters of WHOIS is; publicly accessible by website -- by technical means, but in a very high level so that it's simple to understand. And that's scheduled for delivery. It'll be posted in then WHOIS informational website in -- by the end of October.
- Any questions on that? Okay.
- Brian Cute: Yeah. Margie, if you don't mind, it's Brian. Oh, Alan's -- go ahead.
- Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I just wanted to make a comment that in the companion documents that you sent along, there's a reference to, in order to have a truly -- in order to truly have a single WHOIS policy referenced in the agreements -- and I'm not quite sure what agreements are talked -- we talked about, a GNSO PDP would be needed. I don't believe, I may be wrong, but I don't recall that the WHOIS Review Team asked for a single policy. They

asked for a single policy document. So, I'm not quite sure what agreements are being referred to in that paragraph. And if you want to go over that other document separately later, we can do that.

Margie Milam: Oh, sure, sure. I thought there was a recommendation that asked for all the agreements to link to a single document and that's where we had a little bit of difficulty in the implementation because the WHOIS system, if you will, is spread out through the contracts and the policy itself. And so--.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. We need to go back to look at the actual wording. I don't--.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Recall that exact wording, but we'll deal with that later.

Margie Milam: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: Overall, by the way, my -- since I have the microphone, if we had received the document like this at the beginning, this would have been a lot less painful on all parties, but thank you now.

Margie Milam: Oh. Well, thank you for that.

And the other thing I wanted to point out, which was the theme throughout some of the responses, is that WHOIS is evolving as we speak. And so, even the document that we published backed in April, well, now that has to be updated because we have the new 2013 RAA; we have the new registry agreement. We have the renewals of some of the existing registry agreements. And so, it's one of those things where even when you do something like provide the single-source paper, now that needs to be updated. So, a lot of this work is going to be ongoing because it's just -- it's meant to be fresh and it's meant to be useful. And so, that's what I wanted to point out with respect to this recommendation.

And then with the outreach issues, the outreach is really -- and particularly the communications plan that's related to the outreach, is really going to be kicked off when the informational website is live. And that's where there's a lot of concentrated effort that's going to be done on the communications staff, to really get out there and try to publicize the existence of the WHOIS website and how it helps consumers. Because one of the key recommendations from the WHOIS Review Team was to try to educate the registrants on what their obligations are with respect to WHOIS and that's a very important one. And so, that's perhaps why you haven't seen very much from the communications standpoint on this issue up until we've launched. But as soon as we've launched, that's -- there's a plan to really take it out to the next level.

And I've heard the criticism that we haven't provided you a copy of the communications plan. I've asked the marketing team to go back and to -- the communications team to go back and update the plan and we'll provide that with -- provide a copy to you. We're looking at next week to be able to do that.

And then the other aspect of education is not the registrant side, but the registrar side, particularly with respect to the new obligations under the 2013 RAA. There's a huge effort underway that the Registrar Services Team is undertaking to try to educate registrars all over the world with respect to what the new obligations are and so you'll see that in that document we provided.

Any questions on number three?

Brian Cute: Margie, this is Brian. Just jumping back to number two for a second. And I think you were correct, it was a recommendation that the -- ICANN Board shall oversee the creation of a single WHOIS policy document. It was noting that the policy itself is poorly defined and decentralized. But, the precise recommendation was to develop a document. So, I think having that word in the single WHOIS policy document for clarity's sake, either a full quotation of the recommendation or, if short-handing it, make sure it's absolutely spot on. I think we've all witnessed how just slight misunderstandings in this area can lead to deeper, unnecessary misunderstandings. But, I think you were quite right; it was a document. So, my recommendation would be add the word document there and then check the rest of them just for clarity, or just a full quotation of the recommendation so there's no room for misunderstanding.

Margie Milam: Perfect. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan.

Brian Cute: Sure. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. In fairness to staff, the recommendation title in the review team report was single WHOIS policy. That isn't what they asked for, but that was the title they used. So, that already opens up the level of confusion. And what indeed they asked for was a single policy document. And Margie was -- I think is what Margie was alluding to, reference to it in subsequent agreement with contracted parties.

Margie Milam: Right. And that's the part -- that's the part we have--.

Alan Greenberg: Now, to what extent one could write a single document describing the policy that is understandable by humans and could be used to be pointed to by contracts, I'm not quite sure those two could be done at the same time.

Michael Yakushev: Brian, Alan, it's Michael Yakushev calling. I intervened because I am unable to raise the hand in the Adobe, unfortunately.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm finished.

Brian Cute: Certainly.

Michael Yakushev: Thank you. I'm sorry. Something is wrong with my Adobe, so I can't raise hand there.

So, what we meant in this part -- well, point two of the recommendations is exactly what Alan just mentioned. So, the WHOIS policy now is like a Constitution of the United Kingdom, where we all know that it is a constitutional monarchy, but it's not a written constitution as a single document. So, the idea was to create the single document, or single policy document, where it would be totally clear what it's all about, what kind of standards and requirements and policies exist.

So, I also do recognize what was mentioned by Brian and by other colleagues during our Los Angeles meeting, that the Board is not obliged to accept and to implement all the recommendations of the review teams as they were formulated for any reason. So, that is why I do accept and I fully understand the situation where some recommendations cannot

be implemented or should be implemented in the other way, as it was also demonstrated in the recent document which was distributed by Larisa.

However, it seems to me this is exactly the case, where the recommendation of WHOIS Review Team is implemented in other way rather than it was -- well, the main idea of our WHOIS Review Team from the very beginning. And there could be some, well, rationality and some justifications and arguments why it was done in another way, but of course we should state that what we got from the Board and from the staff was not exactly what we wanted, what the WHOIS Review Team intends (inaudible). And it's not like a criticism. It's exactly what I would like to state.

And I think it would be worth offering some (inaudible) in the future when, rather than to insist that we're implementing the recommendation, it's better to say we decided to make some adjustments, changes to the main idea, and we think it is better to come at it in this way, not in the way that it was recommended by the WHOIS Review Team. And (inaudible) the single WHOIS policy reflects example of this. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Michael.

Points, I think -- Margie, Denise, are all the points clear? Do you have questions for clarification between Michael and Alan and my observations?

Margie Milam: Yeah. No, I understand what he's saying.

Michael Yakushev: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: And I -- it's Alan. I think this is captured in -- we've been talking about a more general recommendation on interactions with review teams, both things related to budget and things related to how the Board addresses them. So, I think hopefully we'll capture that there.

Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks, everybody. Margie?

Margie Milam: Okay. So, now I'm on item four related to compliance. And unfortunately, Maggie was not able to attend the call and I'll be happy to forward any questions to her if you have any.

What I wanted to point out, though, from this, the chart, is that there's a series of areas where you can see compliance-related improvements. And a lot of reports, specifically -- although they're generic to compliance, such as the one-year audit report, they actually do go into great detail on what they're doing with respect to WHOIS and that's one of the main areas of auditing. So, I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

And then -- so I'll pause before I go on to number five. Are there any questions related to compliance? Okay. I'm hearing none so I'll move on to five.

Five talks about the data accuracy issues. And specifically, the area where I'd like to now invite Chris Gift to give you a little overview is related to the WHOIS informational website that we've been talking about. And I sent some communication to you related to that. That work is certainly underway and I think when you see it you'll be very pleased with the amount of progress that we've made with respect to this topic, but I'll let Chris talk to you more about that.

Chris Gift: Thank you very much, Margie. Everyone, this is Chris Gift. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.

Yes. So, we have been hard at work on the informational portal. We had -- we have something that is -- we are going to invite the ATRT2 team to demo or to see a demo of it next week. So, I think Steve Allison and Margie will be coordinating that activity and we very much like -- and welcome your input on the structure that we've created. Is it meeting the recommendation, as well as the content? Is it again hitting -- are we hitting the target with what we wanted to achieve and what the ATRT1 had recommended.

The content is very rich and in some respects may address the -- or just our previous conversation that had been regarding a centralized document for collecting policy. The website in many respects fulfills that function. I mean, it is not in and of itself a document, the website, but it does -- there are a number of pages that fulfill that function. And Steve can talk through that briefly in terms of aggregating all the policy content.

Steve Allison: Sure. So, the site's structured -- there's a couple high-level topics that it attempts to address, the first being more generic. It's an "About WHOIS" section that details some of the history behind WHOIS and how it's evolved over time and some of the direction that WHOIS may take in the future. And that section also addresses more of the technical side, giving some background on the protocol, what the current specification is today, and some more detailed technical articles around using WHOIS and ways that people can get the most out of it. And we envision that that content will grow over time as we develop later phases of the project.

There's also a policies section of the site which is dedicated to what that earlier conversation was about, consolidating everything into single source and the truth, if you will; detailing what obligations contractually different parties are required to meet, registrar benefits and their responsibilities as well, as well as just an index of all the registry and registrar agreements to date and the sections within those agreements that are WHOIS related. And lastly, it would address each of the different policy locations; so WDRP, RNAP, WMRP and such.

There's a third section of the site called Get Involved, which at a high level just points users to the different mechanisms that are available to them to get involved with WHOIS-related work. It details what those groups are or avenues are that they can become more involved with.

There is also an Improving WHOIS section, which today is dedicated towards more compliance-related activities so that people can actually submit WHOIS inaccuracy complaints, as well as the WHOIS look up service, unavailable. But, we envision that growing to include some of our statistical analysis, as well as monthly reporting from compliance so that we can start consolidating the improving WHOIS efforts into one location.

And then last is a Knowledge Center of WHOIS, which really aggregates content from all the different ICANN resources that have WHOIS-related information. So, there's everything in there from links to the agreements for registries and registrars to FAQ questions, to all kinds of reports and studies that were done from different organizations.

So that, at a high level, is the work that we've put into the WHOIS site today.

Chris Gift: So, that content -- let me go back. Sorry, we were navigating the site at the same time. That content is all -- is written in English. We are seeking inputs on the content; on the

function and the functionality of the website as well. So, next week we'll have the demo and we can also send out the content under separate cover if people want to start reading that now and start giving input on that. And then once we have a good draft of that content or we feel -- everybody feels comfortable about it, we'll then translate it into the languages we'll be supporting, because we definitely want to launch the service in the six languages. We don't want to just launch it in English.

So, that's sort of where we stand on this. Our timing right now, depending on turnaround and other people -- depending on feedback next week, our timing is -- in translation is -- excuse me?

Steve Allison: Oh, for translation?

Chris Gift: And that's about another two weeks--.

Steve Allison: Yeah, it be roughly around the 23rd.

Greg Feldman: Yeah. So again, it depends on input, but if everything goes smoothly, then we're looking at early October for a production launch of this.

Margie Milam: And this is Margie. I wanted to highlight some of the issues with creating the content for the webpage. A lot of the content needed to be developed now and you couldn't really just use old content because of the changes that have occurred over the last few months with the new contracts. So, there's a lot of new information there that brings in the obligations, for example, under the 2013 RAA for validation or verification; that kind of information.

And when you take a look at the Knowledge Center, we'll try to schedule a demo when you guys meet next week, you'll see there's a lot of documents in there. And as we reviewed the big -- a huge Excel spreadsheet of all the documents that related to WHOIS on the ICANN.org website, we needed to filter it down to something that was useful as opposed to just outdated information. And so we're trying to really have this Knowledge Center be a place where you could quickly find the key documents that you need to be able to understand WHOIS.

Do we have any questions related to the informational portal?

Chris Gift: Well, if I may before any questions--.

Margie Milam: Sure.

Chris Gift: I just want to correct something. This is Chris Gift again. I know I'll -- we're looking at the status -- the document that was shared and we're seeing the dates there. And I just -- Steve was pointing out that I had communicated an early October date, which is in conflict with the dates on the document. That's correct. We're comfortable with the 23rd, but that's assuming that we're -- that what we've built is okay and is meeting the requirements. So, we'll have to get information from you on that.

And then lastly, that we would launch the foreign translations a week later. To be frank, I'd rather launch them all at the same time. I'd rather not favor English in this case, so I'd rather launch everything on the 30th of September. But, we'd welcome any feedback on that as well. Thank you.

- Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. There's a famous line from a movie which starts off, "Frankly, Scarlett, I..." I'll let you finish the end. I don't think the dates matter from our point of view. Our report's going to be coming out at the end of December. We're going to write it before this stuff is probably launched or proven that it's right. We're dealing with how is ICANN overall implementing, not -- at least I'm not particularly concerned with -- by the 30th of October when we have to freeze the draft report is everything completed. And I don't think we're going to rewrite the whole section in December just because the world has progressed slightly.
- So, I think basically what we're looking for is how are these things progressing? Are they being done? Are we likely to have the problem that the review team was calling out addressed in the reasonable terms? So, certainly from my point of view, I'm not going to have any angst over whether it's the 23rd or the 30th of September.
- Margie Milam: Thank you, Alan. Any other questions?
- Brian Cute: Margie, this is Brian.
- Margie Milam: Sure.
- Brian Cute: Yeah, Brian. Just want to say, Chris, thank you very much for the offer of a demo. I think that's really helpful for us in terms of our work. Secondly, if you were inclined to send the content out by e-mail in advance of next week, certainly the ATRT2 members who are working on this particular assessment of implementation, Michael and Alan, it might give them an opportunity to come to the demo with some thoughts formed and some reactions that might help you move toward your launch date more efficiently as well. But, that's a good opportunity for us. But I agree with Alan's points, general points, which is that it come back to assessment of implementation and that's something that has to work its way through our report one way or the other. The mid-October issuance of our report, while we can benefit from seeing the demo and seeing what you're doing so far, we do have the report on December 31st, so we'll have a following-on window of opportunity to look deeper into what you're doing here. So, thank you for that.
- Chris Gift: Thank you, Brian. And we'll send out that information, the content along with some screen shots, so that the demo can be fruitful for everybody. Thank you.
- Margie Milam: Thank you, Chris.
- And then the other thing I'd like Chris to highlight is the other aspect of the work he is doing, which relates to the search capability and the statistics reporting. So Chris, do you want to give an overview of that?
- Chris Gift: Sure. The statistical analysis, I'll start with that. Again, this is Chris Gift. Where we have a -- so over the past few months we've been trying to figure out, understand how to conduct the statistical analysis and we've had several discussions around that. We do have a proposal, a viable proposal from a vendor. And so it's within the price range, within what we have budgeted for this year. Originally, if you'll all recall, I had been trying to get to a proposal where we could do this quarterly rather than annually. I know the recommendation is annually, but that had been my goal. But, the price point we're looking at is such that it would have to be annually. We wouldn't be able to do it with more -- with greater frequency.

The study would basically follow a lot of the NORC methodologies that were established by them. It ends up being a very -- well, no surprise, it just ends up being a very good methodology for doing this kind of study. So, it would be similar in many respects.

We are reaching out to another vendor, or have reached out to another vendor, to get yet another proposal to compare. But to be frank -- well, I shouldn't say that. We've reached out to five vendors all told. We only got one proposal that we thought was viable so far. We've reached out to a sixth vendor over the past couple of weeks to attempt to get yet another proposal that we thought would -- we could then compare it to the one we have.

The timing, unfortunately, is -- the implementation timing is long and so we're negotiating with them right now to see if we can bring that in. Right now, to be honest, it's -- well, to be -- it's about five months, which we feel is -- while the price is right, it's far too long to implement. So, we're discussing with them a means of bringing that implementation in to just a few -- whether -- our goal is to get something within two months.

So, okay. That's where we stand right now. Again, if all goes smoothly, we hope to have another -- yet another proposal within about two -- about three weeks and then we can rapidly make a decision then and then it would be two months after that. So, probably by the end of the year, early January. And I know there are some dates in the document, so I'm not (inaudible) those, but sometime in the December, early January. We have good visibility into those days and that we feel comfortable with them.

Lastly on the search, when it comes to the search, we had looked at the option of outsourcing the search to organizations that do that today. And after talking about it with many people in the community and members of ATRT2, we decided that that was not viable, that it would not be -- that it was not acceptable. And so we're moving forward with doing it in-house. The issue that we have in-house is that the development resources necessary, the development team that can do this work is currently completely -- they're tasked. They are busy with other projects that have been ongoing for a number of months as well. They are rolling off of those projects in early October. So, in early October, this is their very next project that they are going to work on and it is approximately about two weeks to do the analysis, they were saying, to finish off some of the analysis and about two months to develop the search. So, we should have the search completed by the year-end, if I recall, at the end of December.

Steve Allison: (Inaudible.)

Chris Gift: Oh, yeah. So, you can just speak--.

Steve Allison: And then agreements. I think one of the important keys for the search functionality to be successful is for us to start building a little stronger relationship with each of the registries and registrars that we want to work with and making sure that the search actually functions the way we need it to. So, we just have to also get on the agenda to start scheduling some time to meet with them.

Chris Gift: So, making sure we're on the right list, that's all, for their search.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'm having a senior moment. I don't know what search you're talking about.

Chris Gift: Oh, sorry, a global -- I apologize. The Global WHOIS search. That was one of the requests that--.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. Global WHOIS. That's not a--.

Chris Gift: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I wouldn't call that a search. Okay.

Chris Gift: Yeah. Look up?

Steve Allison: Yeah. Yeah.

Chris Gift: Look up, yeah. And that's it for our update.

Margie Milam: Thank you, Chris.

Any other questions on that part of the functionality? Alan, is your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: No. Sorry, that was to explain my senior moment.

Margie Milam: Okay. Then I'll move on now to the data (inaudible), the issues related to privacy and proxy, number 10. There's a lot of information in the chart. The area I wanted to highlight is that work will be commencing in the GNSO fairly quickly to kick off a PDP, a policy development process, on the issue of privacy and proxy services. What's going to kick that work off is a staff report that's to be published tomorrow that identifies the areas where policy input is needed to be able to create the privacy and proxy accreditation program.

And so, as you -- when you see that report you'll see that it's done some analysis based upon prior work in the community, such as the WHOIS Review Team report and other work that highlighted the areas where you might need policy input, such as what are the rules that should apply to reveal a privacy or proxy registration, to reveal an underlying customer? And when would you be required to relay communications? What types of basic services should apply. So, those are the kinds of questions that the report will highlight so that the GNSO council can vote and kick off the -- create the charter and the working group to start off that effort.

And then simultaneously with the GNSO council's work, staff is looking at it from an operational perspective to see what are the operational areas that we need to develop. So for example, in the current processes the registrar team has an accreditation process that they follow. They do due diligence, they get an application, those sorts of things. What are the operational issues that staff needs to identify in order to kick off an accreditation program? And so those are the aspects related to the privacy and proxy services, that you'll see some work being done. And the timing of it is really linked to the conclusion of the policy development process that the GNSO would have to undertake. And for those of you -- obviously, you've heard about the PDP process and the length of time in resolving issues, but that's a required step in developing this program.

Alan, do you have a question about the privacy and proxy?

Alan Greenberg: I do. Two questions. You said there's going to be a staff report issued tomorrow. What - - where does the formal issue report fit into all of this?

Margie Milam: Okay. So, this stems from the RAA related work. And if you recall, back when the Board kicked off the negotiation for the RAA, it also asked for an issue report to be written and that issue report was already written. That's why it's listed in the chart. Back

in 2012. And then we published a final issue report, which essentially said that the policy development process should wait until a staff report on the conclusion of the RAA negotiations that identifies the issues that are still remaining to be resolved. And so, that's the report that's going to be published tomorrow. And because there is no separate issue report for the process to kick off, that's -- we're using the issue report from the RAA, which was published about roughly a year, a year and a half ago.

- Alan Greenberg: Okay. And--.
- Margie Milam: The staff report is identifying those issues as if it were an issue report.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay. But, in your--.
- Margie Milam: But, that--.
- Alan Greenberg: You're going to be recommending that the privacy/proxy be handled in the same PDP as the other issues, or separate them out into two PDPs? So two or more?
- Margie Milam: The report identifies what the outstanding issues are based upon the high and medium priority recommendations that came from the GNSO in the ALAC report. And as you look at that report, the only issues that were identified as unresolved yet were the privacy and proxy issue and a eUDRP issue, which was subsequently dealt with through a PDP that just was recently concluded. So really, that is the only issue that's being dealt with--.
- Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. Alright, great.
- Margie Milam: Out of the RAA.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay. I thought that there were others. However, you've wandered into my next question. The privacy/proxy whole issue is tightly interwoven with the UDRP. The UDRP is presumably going to be subject to a major review a year after deployment, or whatever the timing is. Is the privacy/proxy PDP going to be recommending that alterations be done to the UDRP as necessary with regard to privacy/proxy reveal or are you going to try to keep that separate?
- Margie Milam: I believe, if I'm not mistaken, the recommendations that came out of the UDRP PDP that just concluded addressed a lot of those issues, including how you deal with UDRPs in the context of privacy and proxy--.
- Alan Greenberg: Not really, because there were so many--.
- Margie Milam: Not really.
- Alan Greenberg: Unknowns still. For privacy/proxy that are handled by the registrar itself it's easy.
- Margie Milam: Okay. So, that is something that could -- it could be addressed in -- through the chartering--.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay.
- Margie Milam: Office with the (inaudible).
- Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Okay, you're not making an exclusive recommendation at this point.

- Margie Milam: No, no. It's not.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay.
- Margie Milam: This is just recommendations to the GNSO council on how to manage, because it's a big topic. Alan, you know a lot of the issues. And so we were trying to provide guidance and reference points to reflect back on some of the work that's been done in the past so that work isn't lost somehow.
- Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you.
- Margie Milam: Any other questions?
- Alan Greenberg: I think September/October '13 is rather optimistic at this point, I guess.
- Margie Milam: Okay. And then I think -- oh, okay, the other area I wanted to also highlight was the international registration there, the print international characters. As you look at the chart, you'll see that a lot of that work is contingent upon some of the policy work that has to be undertaken with respect to transliteration of data. And then there is a separate effort underway to try to identify the model for presenting international as the main data. And so that work is being kicked off. We're calling it the IRD team. And that IRD team is -- I think their first meeting is scheduled for next week, so that's being kicked off.
- And then the other aspect of the international domain name areas, or internationalized data, relates to the work done by the IETF. And so on the chart I've indicated estimates on when the IETF will come up with its recommendations from what we call the weird group, which is trying to come up with a technical protocol to be able to deliver data in an internationalized format.
- Any questions about this subject?
- Alan Greenberg: Lots of questions, but nothing we need to talk about today.
- Margie Milam: Yeah. And this is a difficult topic.
- And I think that's all I wanted to highlight from this chart.
- Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I will make an editorial comment because it's part of the -- what we're looking at in terms of the review. It's well understood that the issues are very complex here and are tied to a lot of other work. And in some cases, such as transliteration and translation, it's not quite obvious how it's going to -- how the world will unfold. At the same time, it's disturbing that ICANN doesn't have any sort of interim guidance for registrars for what they put in WHOIS when the registration data is in another script and not representable directly in three -- in 7-bit ASCII. It really leaves the registrars in limbo. And one would have hoped there was something interim.
- Margie Milam: Thank you, Alan. I can appreciate that. It's a very complex issue.
- And so, Brian, I think that concludes our presentation.
- Brian Cute: Okay. Thanks very much, Margie. I'm trying to get myself back to Adobe so I don't--.
- Michael Yakushev: Michael calling from Moscow. Can I intervene for a while?

Brian Cute: Yes, certainly. Go ahead, Michael.

Michael Yakushev: Yeah. So, as you see, I would like again to state that the implementation of items 12 through 14 is -- well, is being done using a different methodology from what was proposed by the WHOIS Review Team. So of course, the question is complicated. We shouldn't need this. However, what was suggested, proposed by the WHOIS Review Team was something that was not accepted by the Board and by the staff. So, the question is that if we still can follow the methodology of creating just a smaller expert group especially for IDN and etc., then maybe some communications would be solved and avoided.

So, with all that, I think that we -- again, we should admit that there is a full right of the Board and of the staff not to accept the proposal, so they'll not accept the recommendations of the review team. But here, we see that the methodology is different from what was proposed and maybe it would be much more reasonable to try to use what was proposed rather than to -- now to talk about complications with another methodology which is implemented and practiced. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Michael.

How much time do we have? We've got about 38 minutes left and a couple of more items to go through, so I think we have ample time.

Michael, let me offer a couple of perspectives I have and they're just mine. I'm certainly open to others who see it differently or have slightly different views. And I've heard you pick up on the comments that I made in Los Angeles about if you look at the Affirmation of Commitments, that the Board is not obligated to accept the recommendations of a review team and I believe that is the case. And certainly, the statements that the Board did not accept the recommendations of the WHOIS team, WHOIS Review Team are on the record and part of the thinking right now. And I think that's certainly been an area that's been subject to debate, too, between the review team members and the ICANN staff and Board as to whether there was, in fact, acceptance or not. That's part of our record.

And I also think it's fair to say that if the Board, for whatever reason, did not accept recommendations of a review team, consistent with the Affirmation of Commitments, it would be expected that a clear rationale for not accepting them would be part of the record and communicated. And I'm putting ifs in all of those places appropriately because I don't think we've come to hard conclusions on the questions, or perhaps we will land in a place where there is a difference of opinion or a disagreement. But, there would be an expectation of a clear explanation as to why it wasn't accepted.

But to your next point -- and certainly if the Board sees issues where improvement can be made on accountability and transparency being born from the work of a review team, even if they didn't accept its recommendations, that's certainly appropriate. And taking your own stock, and as you are working on this along with Alan as to how ICANN, the Board and staff are going about implementing the actions that they've decided to take arising out of the review team work, is really the central focus.

But, I wanted to offer those thoughts because I know we're getting toward a report and toward conclusions in some way and I think those are a little bit more flesh on the bone than I offered in Los Angeles. I'd certainly be open to hearing other people's perspectives on that as well.

Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I think the real issue--.

Michael Yakushev: Thank you. I do accept this approach.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Brian, it's Alan. I think the real issue is clarity. And let's -- I don't want to belabor the point of the Board resolution on this, but when a moderate or large number of intelligent people read it and read it differently than other moderately intelligent people, then there's a clarity issue. And I think we've already decided we will be addressing that in our report and I don't think we need to go over it here.

The real issue on some of these recommendations, it has been the amount of time it's taken to get off the ground. And that may be the most troublesome part when you start analyzing it. Pretty much everything is being worked on at some level. The completion time for some of them is so far out, however, that it's disturbing. The completion time is likely to be not -- they are likely to be far from complete by the next WHOIS Review Team kicks off, if there is one, and that's a little bit troublesome. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Alan. Margie, I see your hand is up.

Margie Milam: Yes. There was one thing I wanted to clarify or understand Michael's perspective, because he said we -- the Board did not adopt IDN-related recommendations. And as I run through it, I don't see where that happened other than with the timing. Definitely the timing because of the policy work that needs to be taken -- take place, that sort of thing. But I thought as I looked at the recommendations that each of the recommendations were being addressed in some way, just the timing was different.

Is that -- is my understanding correct or incorrect?

Brian Cute: Michael?

Michael Yakushev: Yes, yes. I'm just muting and unmuting the line. I -- well, I can agree with this. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Brian, it's Alan. One more comment on that and I see Olivier's hand is up. I -- Margie, I think your analysis is reasonably correct based on what we know today. What we learned in the earlier reports from staff was not nearly as clear. And again, that comes back to the clarity and reporting, which I talked about in my first intervention. Thank you.

Margie Milam: Oh, okay. Thank you for clarifying that.

And Brian, there was a separate point I wanted to make, if I may.

Brian Cute: Sure. And then Olivier. Thank you.

Margie Milam: Sure. And maybe you could add Chris to the -- Chris wanted to add one more thing, if you could add him to the queue.

Brian Cute: Okay. Did you have something to offer, Margie?

Margie Milam: No, I just wanted to -- yeah, Chris -- I forgot Chris wanted to mention one more thing. That's all I have.

Brian Cute: Okay. If you don't mind, Chris, just -- Olivier's had his hand up. Olivier and then Chris.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, thanks very much, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. Just a quick question since we have staff here. Has the timing that is on the document, has that been affected in any way by the expert -- the creation of the expert working group on directory services?

Denise Michel: No. This is Denise. No.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Denise Michel: On the various recommendations on the implementation projects? Is that your question?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Yeah.

Denise Michel: Yes. No.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Has the timing there been affected in any way because you might have--.

Denise Michel: No. Yeah.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well, there's a new group that's working on this so we'll put less resources on the implementation of WHOIS RT.

Denise Michel: Right. Yeah.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And that's not the case.

Denise Michel: Yeah. The Board was very clear that they were directing a parallel approach to -- sort of a parallel approach while -- improving the current system while a group looked at simply inventing WHOIS so -- for the community's consideration. So, these have always been treated as separate and parallel tracks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks.

Brian Cute: Thank you. And Chris, please.

Chris Gift: Yes. Thank you, Brian. I apologize. This is -- I should have maybe added this as an agenda item and I apologize if this is very much off topic. It's just I wanted to take the opportunity to invite the ATRT2 team to a demo if they're interested on public comment. In my last discussion with you on Monday, if I recall, around public comment, I pretty much said that in some respects the work was not exactly dead in the water, but we had tried an experiment and it failed and we were then pivoting and thinking about trying something else. And we've actually done quite a bit of work that had been going on in the background as well.

But anyway, I just feel -- I'm very comfortable with what I've seen and I think it's very interesting and exciting and more in line with what you guys were talking about earlier in the week about solving these more direct problems. And I'm just -- I would very much like to demo it if people are interested, to really get your feedback. Anyway, it's just an offer if you would like to do that. I can certainly work through Margie or others to schedule that.

Brian Cute: Sure. We'd be happy to take that up. Thank you very much.

Anybody else on this topic before we turn to item four on the agenda? Okay, I don't see any hands. So everyone on ICANN staff, thank you very much for that. Very helpful and looking forward to speaking to you again before we get to the end of the year. Thanks very much.

Denise Michel: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Brian Cute: Okay. On item four, progress update for -- from template and issue owners. We had a call a couple of days ago and a partial attendance from the review team members. I'm not sure how much is overlap or how many members from the last call -- we were at the last call are here, but let me put forward what I did on the last call in terms of templates.

What we need at a minimum from all who are developing templates, myself included, is posted before we get to our face-to-face meeting next week the full templates, as full as they can be made in terms of having the elements, the background elements, the background from the bylaws, from the policies, from the procedures, and as full an analysis as you can make at this point in time based on all of the facts as you know them.

We need to have very informed discussions about whether a given template is going to actually evolve into a full-blown recommendation in the report, those recommendations. So, we really can't afford gaps in those templates and be trying to fill them in as we're sitting together for only two days' worth of time in Washington DC.

So again, I'm going to ask everyone to please get those posted at the end of the week. This week would be fantastic. No later than next Monday would be good, to give everyone at least a few days or a couple of days opportunity to walk through the templates and be prepared for what has to be a fairly robust debate around all those recommendations. And again, we have a standing offer to the ICANN staff, as they did today and as they did two days ago, to provide us with additional background information that helps inform our views on these topics.

So, that's what's needed for next week's face-to-face meeting. We want to come out of next week's face-to-face meeting with a clear understanding of which ones are going to go forward in the draft report and have some consensus there.

Any questions on the templates or -- and the next item is work preparing for the Washington face-to-face, but any question on the templates themselves? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, there's no question. I'm just serving notice I am not meeting my commitment by tomorrow. I will, but I will do my damndest to try to get them ready for Monday. My schedule has collapsed on itself over the last few weeks and I just haven't been able to put the time into it as needed. But, I do hope for Monday.

Brian Cute: You're not alone in that category. I'm in the same boat myself and I apologize.

Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. I'm looking at the inventory page, which is a big Excel document. The 9th of September version. And I still note a number -- in the action items there are a number of schedules to be decided and I'm not quite sure where we are with those, whether they're yet to be decided or was that to be decided because one didn't quite know when the information would be made available, or was that to be decided as in for us to decide now? So, that's my question on there.

Apart from this, I have noted that there is some movement on many of the draft observations or recommendations, whichever they are. But, there's still a heck of a lot of information that we're still awaiting and I'm a little concerned that we're already designing templates when there is a request for some more information in many of these cases.

Now, unfortunately I missed the last call so I might be asking a stupid question. And I do apologize if that is a stupid question, but I'd like to be reassured on this. Thank you.

Brian Cute: So, you're referring to the inventory document, Olivier? I want to make sure I'm looking in the same place you are.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's correct, yeah. ATRT2 inventory. It in -- the September version. That can be downloaded from the ATRT2 documents page.

Brian Cute: And you said there are some schedules specifically on there that were not yet determined?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Correct, yeah. It says schedule to be TBD, basically.

Larisa Gurnick: Brian, this is Larisa. I can address that, if I may.

Brian Cute: Thanks very much.

Larisa Gurnick: That to be determined was placed in there in the expectation that there would be some further refinement and explanation from the review team relative to the specific recommendations. So, once that would be available, if needed to interact with the ICANN staff or to provide clarifications, we would have those scheduled. But as it stands right now, Olivier, all the information that has been drafted so far has been reviewed by staff. And in addition to the meetings that we've scheduled this week, and will continue to schedule as necessary, we've also started responding in writing to some specific points that have been drafted and discussed so far. So, the TBD refers to the fact that more concrete formulation or recommendations, perhaps, was still to take place before the scheduling of any additional meetings.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, okay. Thank you. Well, that's helpful. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: But if I may, I would like some examples to make sure that I can follow up, of the items that you are still waiting on. I do know of a handful and we're working through those, but if there is something in particular that you have that's pivotal to the work that you are doing, please let me know so that I can make sure to get that to you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Do you want it now or -- I mean, I can just pick any at random. For example, recommendation 24, assess ombudsman relationship in concern with same work is consistent with international standards. There is a draft observation of recommendation on there and then next to it there is a number of things, review transcript or recording from Durban session with ombudsman. That's TBD. Discuss proposed observation recommendation with implementers and that involved Amy Stathos in this. So, I wasn't quite sure how far we were down this road.

Larisa Gurnick: Well, relative to the review of the transcript, that was something that I believe Avri and others that were planning to work on this were going to do. Staff is preparing a clarification and a response on this point. But the action items that are captured in that

column that you are looking at, there is a mixture of action items from the review team as well as staff.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. I've certainly noticed that and I've noticed the blue color for the review team and the green color for the staff. So -- and that's fine. That's really helpful. It's just I'm trying to cross the t's and dot the i's at the moment so that we can really push forward in our face-to-face with having the additional -- well, additional information column starting to be filled up as to where we're going from there. But, I'm -- as long as this page -- I'm using this as a dashBoard. As long as this page is updated, that's great. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, it will be. And more information and updates will be forthcoming from staff as well.

Brian Cute: Okay, thank you. Anything else before we move to the preparation for DC meeting? And I do in the any other business have an update on the independent -- work of the independent expert, too.

Okay, seeing no hands, preparing for the DC meeting. We don't yet have an agenda out. I can say that there are going to be -- what I did in speaking with the independent expert was to invite their participation as well to provide, for Mark to provide a full update to the review team so that the review team could have a sense of where things were with their work. That's one item that will be on the agenda for sure.

We've now had the offer to see a live demonstration of the WHOIS tool as developed by Chris and his team and that's certainly informative and useful in terms of our work. I think we do have to be careful to guard the agenda, to save the balance -- the majority of the time for healthy discussions around whether or not we move forward with the recommendation. And also a draft outline of the report to review as well.

So, those two items I'm aware of as being on the agenda. Larisa, did you have anything else from the staff side that we might want on the agenda for next week?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, Brian, I do. We are planning to -- we are proposing to have an update from -- regarding the benchmarks and metrics project, as we had discussed some time ago. We've engaged One World Trust and the project has begun. So, ideally next Friday we'd like to have 20 to 30 minutes on the agenda to provide you with an update on that.

Brian Cute: That's very good. Metrics is an important one. Will One World Trust be joining or is it just an update from staff at this point?

Larisa Gurnick: Well, they're located in London so they will be joining remotely.

Brian Cute: They'll be joining remotely. Okay. Alright. So, that -- the demo on WHOIS, an update from the independent expert. Anything else that we need to consider for the agenda?

Alan Greenberg: Brian, it's Alan.

Brian Cute: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. To the extent possible, I think these demos and other expressions have to be as concise as possible. We've only scheduled two days and we really can't afford to give up a third of the day or half a day to some of -- to these other things at the expense of having the discussions that we scheduled the meeting for. So, I--.

Brian Cute: Yeah--.

Alan Greenberg: Would ask, to the extent possible, they be kept concise and early in the meeting so we can factor what we've learned into the rest of the discussions.

Brian Cute: Yeah. Your point is very well taken, Alan, and we may get to a point where we say let's push that demo to the following week so we can maximize time. I just want to hear what else might be something we want on the agenda. I think the independent expert's report and the interaction with One World Trust and staff on metrics is important work for the face-to-face.

Larisa, what else do you have?

Larisa Gurnick: I just wanted to suggest that, for the exact reason that Alan just brought up, that the demos might be scheduled -- and I believe the demo is 20 minutes or so -- that it might be scheduled during the working lunch hour if the group would be open to that.

Brian Cute: Sure. Not a bad idea.

Anything else in terms of items for the agenda beyond walking through the draft recommendations and an outline of the report?

Okay. Well, let's--.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier has his hand up.

Brian Cute: Oh, I'm sorry. Olivier. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, sorry. I was not on mute -- I was not muted and I muted myself when starting to speak. That's very clever.

Hello, Brian. It's Olivier speaking. And hopefully unmuted now.

I was going to suggest that we -- when we have our face-to-face we set a short amount of time aside to look at the full -- this full document inventory, if you want, looking at all of the recommendations for ATRT -- from ATRT1, and that we then make a decision on those recommendations where we believe there is no further recommendation necessary and we therefore put the issue to bed on those. And that will reduce the size of the table and certainly will introduce some clarity as to where our work really is going to be.

Brian Cute: Makes sense. Thank you for that.

Any other inputs on the agenda? Items to be on the agenda? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. Larisa, thanks for that. Let's put together a draft agenda for the two days and take a look at that and get it circulated, if you don't mind.

And the last -- next to last item. No, it is the last item, pardon me. Seven, any other business. Let me offer the conversation I had with Mark McFadden from ICC just two says ago, I believe it was. Here's where the -- where ICC is in their work and that is on the analysis of the PDP genus or the PDP process.

The good news is that, basically, the data collection on PDPs is effectively finished. There's still ways that they want to slice the data, if you will, or present the data to the

review team and they're working through that. But, to a large degree, that part of their exercise, the data collection part, is complete and they feel that's well on track.

The not so great news and the not unsurprising news is that their outreach did move slowly over the month of August due to our vacation and holidays. And of the 106 persons that they were targeting to have fill out a survey or have some interview, they completed 20 of the 106. The encouraging news is that, with holidays over, the up -- it's starting to uptick. They're getting more people scheduling and being available. So, he's comfortable that they can get the lion's share of that piece of their work completed by the end of the month. We were looking for the middle of the month. That may not be realistic, but if it's largely completed by the end of the month, then that's still a timely presentation of that piece of their work, in my view.

What we did talk about was with respect to the draft report that we're going to put out and the proposed recommendations. The way I communicated it to Mark, and I certainly am looking for guidance here, but on the phone, on the spot, I suggested that it would be important for ICC to have really the bones of their report drafted, whether all of their interviews with targets are complete or not and whether their final analysis has -- or conclusions have been reached or not, that as full a report as they could provide to go out as part of our draft report and proposed recommendations as an appendix or as a companion document would be important if it gives the community an opportunity to see the work of the independent expert, with as much substance as possible at that moment in time. He, based on that description of what I was asking, felt that they would be able to deliver that given where their work is not and what they have in front of them.

So, they -- that really was the full scope of the discussion and where they are in their work right now. Questions, suggestions, clarifications on those points? Looking for hands. Okay, I see no hands.

Let me add one other point, too. Mark did say, and he asked because it was -- he felt it was a delicate question, but that he and their team discussed at some length whether or not to interview ATRT2 members who were either former GNSO Chairs or Chairs of PDPs. And after their own deliberation decided to not ask those members to be the subjects of a survey given the fact that they have a role here on the review team, even acknowledging the fact that they have the experience of participating directly in those processes.

He was looking to me for guidance there. I -- frankly, I can see it both ways. But also, wanting to respect the independent aspect of their work, which is important to them, didn't want to reverse a deliberation, a thoughtful deliberation that they had. So, on that question I said I really would personally, Brian, leave it to you to make that determination. Does anybody feel strongly about that decision that they've made or have other considerations for me?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan.

Brian Cute: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I guess there's only a couple of us who are in that position. There's Avri and me and, to a lesser extent, Olivier, I think. Maybe there's someone else I may have missed. But, I guess I would have thought that they would have been better served by including us and labeling them to look at it carefully and decide to what extent there are things that they shouldn't be considering and what extent not. Between Avri and me, we've been very, very heavily involved and have seen perhaps a better cross-section of PDPs than

most other participants around. So, I guess I disagree. I'll certainly honor their judgment. And I'm not in a position to override it, but my personal feeling is that was probably not the best decision.

Brian Cute: Thanks, Alan. Any other points? Okay. Any other business? Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Brian. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. Just on Alan's point just now, I believe that this team here is going to make assessments. Would it be incorrect to assume that both Avri and Alan would be able to bring part of their own knowledge in the PDP in the final recommendations themselves as well, rather than having the team interrogate them and ask them questions about it?

Brian Cute: Well, I think -- clearly, we're all going to bring our own perspectives and experiences to bear as we go through these tasks. Again, we have to be as impartial, independent and objective as we can be and we have some safeguards in place for that. So, I absolutely anticipate that Alan and Avri and their work on this review team are going to bring their perspectives to their assessment of these pieces of work, the PDP pieces; no doubt.

As for the independent expert, as a group who are carrying out a task and are trying to approach that task from the position they think is best suited to deliver what we're looking for, I wanted to show some deference to Mark on that point and to ICC on that point. If there's a strong feeling that the quality of our work is going to suffer because of that decision, we can certainly revisit it with them.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'm certainly not suggesting we force the point. Given that Avri's and my position on many of these issues are at polar opposites, I think it would have added an interesting perspective to their -- to that review. (Laughing.)

Brian Cute: Fair enough. Well, it's -- we're still in the early parts of September, the first half of September. We can keep this question open. Our work isn't completed yet if we want to revisit it.

Any other business? Okay. Hearing none, seeing no hands, for myself included, everybody please, templates in by Monday at the latest to give folks time to go through it and we can have a very productive two days together in DC. And safe travels to everyone and we'll be seeing you shortly. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible.)

Alice Jansen: Thank you.