

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone, and welcome to the RDS WHOIS 2 Plenary meeting No. 10, on October 12, 2017, at 12:30 UTC. In attendance today, we have Alan, Cathrin, Dmitry, Erika, Volker, Thomas, and we have no observers at this time. From ICANN staff, we have Alice; Jean-Baptiste; Lisa; Steve Conte; myself, Brenda. I'd like to remind everyone today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for transcript, and I'll turn the meeting over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The first item is welcome, and I won't ask for changes to the statements of the interest because we only have new statements of interest. There are still a number of people who haven't returned them -- who didn't return them while we were in Brussels, including myself. I am now told that ICANN would prefer a written signature and sending it in, presumably by paper or fax, if we still have fax. But they will accept an electronic signature. I don't know whether electronic means you have to paste on a picture of your signature, or they will accept typing your name in a slot as acceptable.

Does anyone from staff know which of those electronic signatures are acceptable? ICANN accepts your name typed in, in some cases, but I don't know if they're accepting it in this case. Do we have any clarity on what electronic means?

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

ALICE JANSEN: Alan, this is Alice. I'm afraid I don't have that [inaudible], but I can go back to legal and ask for a clarification, and with respect to your item No. 1, I think that if you scan the document and send it back to us, that's sufficient, as well. There's no need to fax it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Scanning is also -- all right. Thank you very much. I said fax because from a legal perspective, fax is considered legal in some cases, where a scanned document is not, apparently, and I don't know how onerous they are considering this. The other part of the question I asked, regarding SOIs is both signatures on the two documents seems to be affirming that you understand the conflict of interest. The one on the SOI also covers the accuracy of the SOI.

I don't understand why they still want the conflict of interest, which seems to be replicated on the SOI signature, but apparently, they do want both signatures, so we will comply. The first substantive item on the agenda is scope and objectives, and I will turn it over to Lisa to go through them, and I do have a number of comments, part of which I did write in an email earlier today for many of you, or yesterday for some of you, and I'll introduce those as we get to them. Lisa? Is Lisa with us?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Yes. I was waiting for the scope to begin projecting. Lisa Phifer, for the transcript. So, what you have in front of you is the scope and objectives table as it ended up on the second day of your

---

face-to-face meeting. Each of the objectives' text is the clean version of the changes that were applied during the two-day meeting, and if you recall, on the second-half of the second day, as you did some exercises on beginning planning for each of the objectives; this is actually the objective text that was displayed on the wall as you were doing that. Alan, did you walk through the objectives, one-by-one?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, and I'm trying to find a copy I actually wrote on, and I seem to have lost it overnight, so if you can start, and we may go back to the first one, if I have any comments. Sorry, I'm somewhat embarrassed, but I cannot find the six pieces of paper I wrote on, but I'm looking for it as you speak, so if you can start on that one, yes.

LISA PHIFER:

Sure. So, the first objective is the objective to examine implementation of the first review team's recommendations, and I believe the wording has been fairly stable on this one for awhile, but I'll read it out, "Consistent with ICANN's mission and bylaws, Section 4.6(E)4, the review team will A) evaluate the extent to which ICANN work is implemented each prior directory service recommendation, noting differences, if any, between the recommended and implemented steps; B) assess, to the degree practical, the extent to which implementation of each recommendation was effective at addressing the issue identified by the prior review team, or generate additional information that's useful to management and evolution of WHOIS, that is RDS; and C) determine if any specific measurable steps should be recommended to

---

enhance results achieved through the prior review team's recommendation.

This includes developing a framework to measure and assess the effectiveness of recommendations, and applying that approach to all areas WHOIS, originally assessed by the prior review team as applicable." And I think the major change in your face-to-face was the addition of that last sentence that was reference the suggestion that Susan made about how effectiveness might be applied, and the decision was taken to include developing that framework as part of actually achieving this objective.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you, Lisa. My question was just on that sentence. The reason applicable is at the end, so that's the escape hatch for the some of the recommendations, where it really doesn't -- I'm not sure we can define effectiveness when, you know, we were told to take it seriously -- you know, this would be strategic or change the reporting structure. I'm not quite sure how we can define effectiveness in some of those, and some of them, the implementation is not done, but I wonder if we're going to go out of this meeting and start asking people to start looking at the individual recommendations, when are we developing that framework?

I'm going to have a similar question when we start going through the detailed timeline -- there's a lot of things listed on the timeline and it's not clear when we're going to do that, so I'm a little bit at a loss to know -- are we stopping and going en masse develop that framework before

---

we go ahead and do any work at this point? Is that what this is implying? I know Susan's not on the call, which is unfortunate. Do you have any wisdom to add?

LISA PHIFER:

So, if you're asking me -- this is Lisa, again -- I think you have the working definition of that framework from Susan -- notice distributed on the first day of your face-to-face, and didn't really receive any focused attention. You could either look at that framework as the first part of your actual effort on this objective, as a group, or within a sub-team, or you could look at it prior to your planning.

I think what you're going to do next is actually planning the effort involved in each of these, and it sounds like the question is whether you need to understand that framework better, in order to complete the planning.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would think we will have to do that as a group before we split off into little subgroups because that would lead to, at best a varied framework, and at worst, people with completely different interpretations of what they should be doing. So, I think [CROSSTALK] --

LISA PHIFER:

Possibly that could be a use of the next planning, excuse me, next plenary call?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I would suggest we may want to do that. And if you could do an action item to ask Susan to be in a position to lead that? And let's go on to the second one unless anyone has any other comments. I see no other hands.

LISA PHIFER: All right. I'll go to the next one then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Yes, please. No, you can skip reading the first couple of lines, which are pretty much the same for all of them. So, just get to the substance.

LISA PHIFER: Sure. Will do. So, consistent with the bylaws -- there would be -- actually, this one I have to read out. [CROSSTALK] -- "Consistent with mission and bylaws, the review team will assess the effectiveness of today's WHOIS, the now current gTLD RDS, including cumulative changes made through the then current RDS, which was assessed by the prior review team by A) inventorying changes made to WHOIS policies and procedures since the prior review team completed its work; B) using that inventory to identify significant new areas of today's WHOIS, if any, which the teams believes should be reviewed; and C) determining if any specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance effectiveness in those new areas."

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have any idea when that inventory will be done? My recollection is that's a staff action item, at this point.

LISA PHIFER: So, this is Lisa. That would be part of actually doing this objective, so in the planning phase, perhaps you would identify that that's a staff requirement, and the time frame when you like to have it? And that's -- certainly staff would work to achieve that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I thought that was already an action item out of Brussels. I may be wrong though. I think we did discuss that it would be a staff function, at least at the first cut to do the inventory, so if there isn't an action, could we please agree to put that on? Erika says we discussed it, but not decided about the time frame. I think we did discuss -- we did decide though, as a first cut, it would be a staff responsibility.

LISA PHIFER: Yeah. This is Lisa. That matches my recollection, as well, that it would be a staff action. However, the team still does have to actually raise an objective and plan it out before the objective starts. That doesn't mean staff can't begin on the inventory, knowing that's what you want.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. If you can, formally or informally, come back, someone, and gives us an idea of when that's reasonable to be done? I don't think there

---

have been a lot of changes in policy or implementation, other than the directing, as a result of the review, but that's just my recollection.

All right. I see no other hands. Let's go on to the third item. I think we have tentatively agree that we can, you know, we can remove the "should review." I've received no other comments from any of the team members who are not on the call. So, let's go on to the third one, I do have several comments on that one.

LISA PHIFER:

All right. The third one is, again, ""Consistent with ICANN's bylaws and mission, the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today's WHOIS, that is the current gTLD RDS, meets legitimate needs of law enforcement for swiftly accessible, accurate, and complete data by A) establishing a working definition of law enforcement used in this review; B) identify an approach used to determine the extent to which law enforcement needs are met by today's WHOIS policies and procedures; C) identifying high-priority gaps, if any, in meeting those needs; D) recommending specific measurable steps, if any, the team believes are important to fill gaps. Note that determining which law enforcement requests are, in fact, valid, will not be addressed by this review."

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Lisa. I have two questions. One is we start off by using the expression, "Legitimate needs of law enforcement, and we define it," and then about a sentence or so later, we said, we will



---

“identify an approach used to determine the extent to which law enforcement needs are met.”

Is that the same legitimate needs identified above, or is that a different definition? I think it is meant to be the same needs as we defined in the previous sentence, or previous part of the sentence, in which case, I would suggest, we say, “to which these law enforcement needs” to make it clear that we’re not coming up with a new definition, other than the legitimate ones -- unless anyone has an objection to that, and Cathrin, you’re the author, so if you do, please speak up.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes --

ALAN GREENBERG: And Carlton says, plus one. Cathrin, go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Alan, I mean, what I put in is the part on swiftly accessible, accurate, and complete data. What you were just saying is that under small b, we should say, “To which these law enforcement needs are met by today’s WHOIS policies?”

ALAN GREENBERG: That. To make sure we’re talking about the same ones.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. I think that's perfectly fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. Okay, thank you. So, I'll make that change. The other question, I have, is the last sentence, "Note that determining which law enforcement requests are, in fact, valid, will not be addressed by this review." I don't know what valid means, and therefore, I'm quite sure what that sentence means. Are we talking about the needs -- the requests, which fall outside of our definition of the legitimate needs, or ...? I'm a little bit at a loss. Volker, go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Hi, Alan. This is Volker speaking. I understood this term to mean that it's not our job to tell law enforcement what their needs are, basically. So, they put forward the need, and we are not to determine whether that need is false.

So, that's I think valid means in this case. If they say, for example, they have a need for all registrant data around the world, underlining WHOIS data for privacy proxy services -- whatever -- it's not our job to tell them, well you can get that for certain cases, and not for underlining data; that's not our job, our job is just are the needs that they've put forward met, and not comment on the needs that they are putting forward.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Volker. But is your understanding the only needs we will assess are the ones that were defined earlier in that sentence as the legitimate needs?

VOLKER GREIMANN: I think that's not the question that the added word "valid" asks in this -- or answers. I think the question put before it is quite clear that there are needs that they say they are legitimate, and we take that at face value. We're not to make assumptions about their claim of what their legitimate needs are. I think that's what's meant by that valid here.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. But we are defining legitimate needs earlier, and that's an assessment I think we can do. I agree that we are not commenting on whether the needs are valid, but we are not going to assess the various needs that may or may not be valid that law enforcement may or may not make. I just -- are we all agreeing on that -- that Cathrin provided a -- what seems to be a reasonable definition of legitimate needs that is swiftly accessible, accurate, and complete data.

And we will assess to what extent WHOIS provides that, but we're not going to go any further? I think we're all saying the same thing; I just want to make sure that we're not going to enlarge the scope as we go forward because of the lack of clarity on what valid means. So, if everyone's happy, I'm happy. We have Cathrin and Lisa with their hands up. Please go ahead. Cathrin?

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, hi. This is Cathrin. Just to say that I agree that we, as far as I recall our conversation, we came out with the common result that we would not assess -- that we would agree that the needs that we have identified are the ones that we put in the definition, and beyond this, we would not assess the legitimacy, either of the needs of the law enforcement agency, or of the specific request cause that's beyond the scope of this exercise, and that's what that sentence tries to explain.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, I think we're saying the same thing.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, go ahead, and then, Erika.

LISA PHIFER: I will yield to Erika. I only put my hand up to give voice to her comments in chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Erika, do you wish to speak? We cannot hear you at this point.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I think Erika said that she would have trouble speaking because she has low bandwidth, but I can read out her comment.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Okay.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:           ICANN will have to judge sometimes but law requests valid is a good indication may have to refuse sometimes requests.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Yeah, and I have no problem with that. I just want to make sure that we're not trying to assess the other requests, which may or may not be valid, which fall outside of what -- the definition we're using of legitimate. If we all agree on that, then I think we're safe to proceed.

The next two items are the ones that were the continuation of that sentence, and you will recall we had a discussion much earlier in our process about whether in the sentence, "The legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data" -- whether legitimate needs was modifying all three or just law enforcement, and I went back to the original affirmation of commitments, which made no mention of safeguarding registrant data - - that was added during the CCWG accountability movement of the AOC commitments into the bylaws, but the sentence that they had made it very clear that they were not trying to assess the legitimate needs of promoting consumer trust, but just asking whether WHOIS promoted consumer trust or not.

And I think we have somewhat of a problem, again, like in the previous one, determining what the legitimate versus the non-legitimate needs

---

promoting consumer trust are, so I would suggest, in this case, and the next one, we go along with the implication of the affirmation wording, and remove the reference to legitimate needs and just focus on consumer trust, and protecting registrant data. And does anyone have any comments on that or concerns with that?

Erika, you have your hand up, but I don't know if that's an old hand. She says she agrees with Alan in this case. Cathrin agrees. And we have Dmitry and Carlton. All right. So, Lisa, if we can -- and when go through these now, if you can revert to just whether we are addressing consumer trust and safeguarding data and not reference the legitimate needs of them? And perhaps, you want to read it out either as it is, or on the fly change it as you wish, but with the understanding in both cases, we're removing legitimate needs. Lisa, over to you.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you. So, I believe how it would revert would be, so, for example, under original issue, it would say whether it promotes consumer trust -- whether its implementation promotes consumer trust? Is that how you think the question is?

ALAN GREENBERG:

When I was writing my email, that's the way it pretty well had to be phrased because otherwise the -ing ending didn't make a lot of sense.

LISA PHIFER:

Right. Okay. So, whether its implementation promotes consumer trust and then that would be reflected in the reframing of the objective that,

---

“Consistent with ICANN’s mission and bylaws, the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today’s WHOIS, the current gTLD RDS, promotes consumer trust in gTLD domain names by.”  
Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think so. Yeah, we used the word enhance consumer trust, but I see no reason not to use the actual word from the bylaw and say promote.

LISA PHIFER: Okay, and then a similar change to the next?

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s correct.

LISA PHIFER: The next item. So, whether its implementation safeguards registrant data?

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

LISA PHIFER: And then, a corresponding change to the text.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It's interesting, I have absolutely no recollection of the CCWG adding that phrase, but apparently, we did. All right. Any comments on either of these two? If not, we'll go on to the next one.

LISA PHIFER: And no further comments on safeguarding registrant data?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We don't know what it means but it was added, and we will dutifully write something about it.

LISA PHIFER: Okay. That brings us to an item that you discussed drafting from the review as an objective, but providing rationale in your report. And so, for the terms of reference, a brief statement was suggested that, "The review team will not conduct a review of OECD guidelines, as suggested by ICANN's bylaws, Section 4.6(e)3 because they do not appear to be applicable to today's WHOIS, which does not protect the privacy of transborder data flows."

ALAN GREENBERG: Or, that should be an "or" not "of."

LISA PHIFER: Privacy of?



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Does not protect privacy or consider transborder data flows.

LISA PHIFER: But it's the privacy of the flows that are not protected, correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it's also privacy of the data -- the bulk of the OECD guidelines are on protection -- privacy of the data, but they also consider transborder data flows. We can refine the wording of that as we go along. I think the intent is understood at this point.

LISA PHIFER: So, one question that I would have about this phrasing and maybe you'd want to further refine all of these rationale statements because they're fairly brief, but so, the bylaws actually ask you to consider the guidelines and it sounds like you have actually considered them, but then reached this conclusion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. There was certainly general agreement at the face-to-face meeting and in prior discussions that we don't know why this was added. It doesn't seem to be applicable, and therefore, we don't want to focus a lot of effort on it, but --

---

LISA PHIFER: I guess what I was wondering is if it would make sense that the rationale statement that you have considered the guidelines, but the decided that you'll not conduct a review --

ALAN GREENBERG: A further review, yeah.

LISA PHIFER: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We clearly need a little bit of wordsmithing, but I don't think there's any disagreement, so may want to keep a flag there that we need to, you know, clarify the wording or enhance the wording, but I don't think we want to try to do that on this call. I'm happy to work with you offline on that, and we can come up with something to propose.

LISA PHIFER: So we'll take an action on that then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

LISA PHIFER: I see Erika's typing here.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Okay.

LISA PHIFER:                       And Volker has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Volker, go right ahead, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN:                Yes. The conclusion that we came to at the face-to-face was that the OECD guidelines are not directly applicable to anything other than data accuracy, and while that is correct, we have to consider that, of course, the guidelines are then used to create law that then, in turn, might have effect on the private entities and ultimately, ICANN registries are struck indirectly.

So, OECD does not have any direct impact but it may have indirect implications -- I'm not suggesting that we should knock at each countries implementation of the OECD guidelines because that will be a task someone mentioned that it would probably take us years rather than months to complete, just that we -- what I'm trying to suggest is that we do not put aside the guidelines, but we use them as guidelines as in what the underlying principles, regarding transborder data flow and special private data that are contained therein, and therefore, then

---

review how WHOIS conflicts with them or meets these requirements or guidelines. I think that would be our best way forward of dealing with this, while still taking the other problem head-on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Volker. As you were speaking, I realized something, but first, to clarify, Stephanie did have an intervention at our face-to-face, saying the OECD guidelines, in fact, do make recommendations for non-state actors, and therefore, we cannot claim that they are not applicable at all. However, given that we know the current implementation does not provide any level of protection of the data that is stored within in the RDS WHOIS database, that there is current activity going on to address the GDPR issues within Europe, that the PDP is charged with creating a replacement, which will have to factor in regional laws and issues, such as transborder data flow, that it is, therefore, out of our scope.

Due to the other ongoing activities that are overlapping it and have responsibility of addressing the OECD guidelines, or further activity, we really -- it is out of scope, and therefore, we're deciding that we are not going to focus on it right now. Does that sound reasonable? I think that actually covers why we're not doing, rather they apply or not. Volker, go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Yes, I would agree that something along those lines would be the appropriate solution for us. I wouldn't necessarily say that it's out of scope, but I would just, as you said, point out that there is currently work ongoing. I would propose that we point out some of the areas, in

---

our report, where we believe that current WHOIS would have issues with the guidelines if they were to be [inaudible] taking this really -- if they directly applied to it, for example then, A or B might be a problem. I think data analysis is something that we can do, and without proposing any remedies for that because that would then be, in turn, work of the ongoing work of the GDPR review, and the RDS working group as well. We just should say there are problems, but there's work ongoing to review those problems and point out those problems, so we are not making any recommendations as to what should be done and that is all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

It's out of scope, not review itself, being out of scope, so [CROSSTALK] review is not in depth, then point to the work that's ongoing, and say that making recommendations is out of scope because there's work ongoing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. No, the word out of scope is not right. It is within scope, but we are choosing not to address it, this go around, because of other ongoing work, but we will summarize the fact that the current WHOIS is rather deficient in addressing the guidelines in any case. Cathrin, go ahead. Do you still want to speak, Cathrin? You lowered your hand.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah. Sorry, I lowered my hand again because I think we're coming to closure on this one. I just wanted -- I mean, I did go back to the guidelines and text, and there are specific recommendations in there, and each and every one of them is addressed to state -- to limitations of OECD, so there's nothing in there for a non-state action, of course, it can serve as inspiration, but as Volker was saying, it requires implementation, and that can be quite different and the principles are extremely high-level.

So, I'm just wondering what the usefulness would be of us engaging in this type of assessment, and how we do it in practice because, I mean, that, I think requires some legal expertise, and what we had -- I mean, we're coming back to this -- we've discussed this before, and what we agreed before was that we would refer to the fact that different parts of the community have identified different issues surrounding data protection and privacy, and that we just want to highlight this fact without taking a stand, and that there is work ongoing to fix this, which we're not interfering with, but if we go anywhere near having our own position on this, then I think we do need some sort of legal advice and a more in-depth look because here, I come back to the very important point that Susan Kawaguchi raised earlier, which is that if we go into substance on any of these points, then we need to take a look at them, and we need to take ownership, and otherwise, we cannot make any sort of judgment on them.

If it's just to say, okay, we're not -- we take note that other parts of the community have raised issues, and we don't take a position on the legitimacy of these issues, and we note that there's processes ongoing to address them. That, I would feel comfortable with.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I can certainly live with that. I don't want to really go into whether the guidelines are applicable to non-state actors. Stephanie made a very strong statement that there were parts of it, which said we need to encourage the adherence to the guidelines by non-state actors, and I don't think there's a lot to be had over us having that debate, since I think we all agree we are not going to put substantive work into making recommendations, if for nothing else than the ongoing work.

So, I think being silent, we cover that. All right. Lisa and I will work with that, and Erika has said, she'll work with us, and we'll have something ready, either for the next meeting or prior to it. And if we can go on to the next item, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER:

The next item is actually the last objective being further developed, and that is, "Consistent with ICANN's mission" -- and I'll skip the play-by-play stuff -- "the review will, to the extent that this is not already covered in prior review team recommendations, A) assess the effectiveness and transparency of ICANN enforcement of existing policy relating to WHOIS RDS, through contractual compliance actions, structure, and processes, including consistency of enforcement actions and availability of related data; B) identifying high-priority procedural or data gaps, if any; And C) recommending specific measurable steps, if any, the team believes are important to fill gaps.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Any comments? I have none. Seeing none. Erika says, "Okay." Let us go on to the next items.

LISA PHIFER: The next two items are, again, items where you decided not to actually have a specific objective for further review, but to make a statement, both in the terms of reference and then again, presumably, in your report. "The review team will not conduct a review of RDAP at this time because policies have not yet been developed to enable assessment of the value and timing of RDAP as a replacement protocol for WHOIS. The review team will not conduct a review of the WHOIS protocol, at this time, because activities are already underway to replace the WHOIS protocol with RDAP."

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I don't think we definitely say, replace it with RDAP, I would just stop at replace the WHOIS protocol. It's clear that a lot of other options, but I don't think the PDP has made that formal decision, and I don't think we want to raise that controversy that seems to be there among, at least, a few of those people.

LISA PHIFER: So, delete the phrase with RDAP?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think so.



LISA PHIFER: Which leaves it more open-ended.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

LISA PHIFER: And again, my assumption is that, for these two items, as well as the OECD item, the report can actually give more about the rationale for not reviewing these in detail, should you wish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed.

LISA PHIFER: This is just the rationale given in the terms of reference.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed.

LISA PHIFER: And then, the last one is actually an item that was merged; it was internationalization, or internationalized domain names, and that we agreed in the face-to-face that was actually part of the first objective of looking back at the implementation of the first review team's

---

recommendations on IDNs, or it could be part of the second objective, which is looking at anything new that needs additional consideration.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yep. I did spend a bit of time looking at that and wondering, do we need to actually mention it in the first section? And I came to an interesting conclusion, at the moment we don't and when you look at the three recommendations that were made last time that are under the heading of IDN, internationalized domain names, in fact, only the first of those three is on internationalized domain names.

The second are on internationalized registration data, and internationalized registration data applies to non-IDN names, as well, so if someone registers a name in China, but an ASCII name, we still have an issue of contact information, or the name of the organization or the name of the registrant using internationalized character sets, which is not IDN, but is internationalized registration data.

And the second to the recommendations, despite the title that was used over all three of them are not IDN, but are explicitly talking about internationalized data. So, I think we can note in our report that their title was wrong, but the recommendations already completely address those, so I think we are okay in simply folding it in to the review of RT-1 recommendations. If anyone has any comments on that. I see nothing.

Carlton says, "That's why we agreed to look at internationalized registration data." And, in fact, Carlton, that phrase is used in the second two recommendations. It's just not used in the title, and you

---

know, that's -- I don't think we need to worry about what title they used to cover three recommendations.

I believe we need one more item, though, because we decided, de facto, that we would assess the bylaw and make necessary recommendations for revision, if necessary, so I think we do need a scope item that will address that.

And Carlton says, "Good catch." We did discuss it; we just never actually wrote the words down for it, but we all agreed that that's something that we should do within our scope, and, in fact, the bylaws explicitly say that that is within our scope. It's not said in the section on the WHOIS review, but it is said in the general section. So, Lisa, again, I'm happy to craft something with you, and we'll present it for the next time.

LISA PHIFER:

Alan, just for the record, so Jean-Baptiste can record it as an action. You and I will work together to craft text for an additional objective that the review team will assess the bylaws.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Correct.

LISA PHIFER:

Very good.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a reference somewhere in the bylaws to us doing it, so we can reference that. We'll find it when we do the work. So I think that's at the end of the table, and at the least, there's probably an action here that I can go ahead and apply the edits that were agreed during this call, and send this back out to you, and we have two action items to -- is it two? Yes. Two action items to refine some of the text, and then, also, an action for Susan to help lead a discussion on our next plenary call about the framework for assessing effectiveness.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. May I suggest, in lieu of refining this table again, that we cut out all of the boilerplate that was put into the terms of reference, when we were still developing this and replace it with new text? And that we do any further commenting, in regard to the actual text in the terms of reference? There's no point in not doing that step now, and getting that part done, I think.

LISA PHIFER: So, focusing on the -- what's the third column, the center column of this?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

LISA PHIFER: Got it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure if that shrinks or increases the terms of reference, but I guess it's one step closer to us being able to finalize that.

LISA PHIFER: And one further question about that, Alan, this last column here actually says day one results; it should say day one and two, but do you want that column deleted, as well? I know that at some point, the team does have to prioritize the objectives that it's agreed to --

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah [CROSSTALK] --

LISA PHIFER: But if this column is helping you at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I don't think so. Certainly, Lisa, if you want to clean up this document -- just so we file it away and have it for reference, that's fine. I have no problem with that, but let's as part of the overall process then incorporate it into the terms of reference. It probably makes more sense to have a final clean version, and then incorporate. I don't think it's a lot more work to do that either.

---

LISA PHIFER: It isn't and, in fact, I believe that Alice has already begun incorporating this into the working draft summary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alice should be focusing on what we're saying, not typing. All right. Any further need to continue on this item, or we can go onto the next one? And the next one is objectives, expressions of interest, and first-pass planning assignments. And I think Lisa is also going to read this. The leadership team and staff reviewed the volunteers of who volunteered for what. We attempted to assign teams that we of moderate size. We were looking for at least three.

In a couple of cases, we volunteered people, even if they hadn't volunteered themselves, but I don't know if that chart reflects that, but if anyone has a problem, we can address that. We do have a couple of teams that we are looking for someone else cause we did not have enough volunteers on it, and as we go through it, Lisa will identify those. We did have a little bit of discussion, but I think we need more of exactly how far we are going to be going on this -- with these teams and what they will report back.

That discussion, perhaps, we want to defer until we look at the work plan because there are a lot of details in the work plan that have to do with that. But that's something we should come out of today, having a slightly, at least, a slightly better idea on. Lisa, do you want to read them, or do you want to let people stare at them for a while, or does anyone want to comment and say they refuse to take on the assignments?

---

LISA PHIFER: Why don't I just introduce how to read the table [CROSSTALK]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Please.

LISA PHIFER: Again. Lisa, for the transcript. So, on the left side, the first column is, of course, the topics that ended up objectives. For topic one is split out into the individual first review team recommendations. Across the top, it says, of course, everyone's name, review team member names, and then, under your name, you'll see either a V or an A. V means you volunteered for that topic. A means you volunteered and were assigned to that topic.

And the goal here was to, if you note the total assigned on the far right, to try to get teams of three, and for some of the new objectives, four to participate in this first-pass planning for each of these topics. In assigning volunteers to topics, by and large, the leadership team chose from those who had volunteered, trying to have at least one member of the leadership team assist with each of these items, as well as, two or three additional members of the review team, distributing the workload across people.

If you look at the bottom row of the table, you'll see the number of subgroups, I guess it would be, that each of you were assigned to, with most people being assigned to three or four, and leadership team actually taking up five or six, largely because they needed

---

representation on every one of these efforts as a moderating role, a facilitating role, however you like to entitle that.

You'll note that there is one case where the cell says, "Ask" under Lili's name, and Lili, that was because the leadership team identified the need for an additional person on the internationalization planning activity, and noting that you were only assigned to two teams at that point, suggested, possibly you might be willing to volunteer to take on that third team, as well. We had another area where [CROSSTALK] --

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's Alan, if I may intercede? Lili is also one of the few people on this group who actually use internationalized character sets, and therefore, we need all the expertise we can on that one. Sorry, Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

No problem. In that, you'll notice in the far right, there's a cell that's marked a little bit orange for the IDNs row, and that requests the need to either get the additional volunteer of Lili, or if she declines, to get a third person to volunteer for that. And then, you'll see the same things for the outreach recommendation 3 for implementation, there were only two volunteers for that, and so, the leadership team was hoping someone would volunteer to join that one, as well. That's how to read the table.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. If anyone -- it's Alan -- if anyone has any comments now, fine; otherwise, in the next couple of days, can you please send something to



---

the list if you either want to add yourself to a list, one of the sections, cause you believe you really want to participate in it, or if you want to claim that you really cannot do it, or should not do it for some reason, please let it be known. And otherwise, we will presume -- we will formally adopt this at the next meeting, but we'd like to get any changes made to it as soon as possible. And Carlton says he'll take recommendation 3 on outreach. Thank you, Carlton.

All right, seeing no more hands, no more comments, then we can take this with the modifications we've suggested as close to finalized, but we'll wait for any comments on email over the next couple of days. If I could ask someone on staff for an action item to send out a brief email for those who are not on the call, pointing out that they should make any comments by the, let's say by the, end of Monday, if they have any comments to either add themselves to a group they haven't been assigned to, or to claim there's some reason why they cannot do it? I presume you'll make the necessary changes to the table before you send that out.

And with that, I think we are finished on agenda items, unless anyone else has a comment to make, or Lisa, in case I missed anything. Yes, Erika, the revised version will be sent. You did receive a copy of this version in your email. I think, actually, two copies were sent out, but you will receive a revised version asking for other people's input. Volker, you're dropping early -- and noted. Thank you. The next item is work plan. Volker, if you're still with us -- Volker's already gone, I see, so too late.

---

The next item is work plan, and I think Alice will be presenting that. I suspect, although I may be wrong, that no one has put a lot of focus into looking at that, and I really think we need to, and we need to do it in some depth. I've gone through it, and I have a fair amount of concern that there are action items, or items in the plan that we haven't really even thought of, and I'm not quite sure when we're going to do it, and I have a lot of concern over the detailed dates that are on some of these kind of things, and you know, effectively saying that we are committing to them, and I don't feel very comfortable with some of these, and I'm not quite sure how to go forward, but I did want to raise that issue.

And as an example, you know, near the bottom of the first section of plan review, there's an item of develop and adopt outreach plan, and with the target of doing it by the end of November. You know, define structure of subgroup reports by middle-January, and you know, I'm not sure we're really at the stage to do some of these things. The outreach plan, yes, I guess we need to talk about it, but I'm not sure we're going to finalize it.

And so, I really would like -- I'm not worried about my particular concerns that I'm raising, but I really think everyone on this group needs to look at this table in some depth, and to what extent are our we comfortable in making the commitments, which it implicitly says we're making. And with that, I'll turn it over to Alice to review, you know, exactly what it says, and I'm not quite sure how we get sign-off from everyone, but I am noting that I don't feel comfortable with the level of detail that is both in the items -- the vertical column, the number of items listed, and the dates associated with many of these. Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:

Yes, thank you, Alan. So, maybe I could walk all of you through the changes that were made since Brussels. All right. So, first of all, we've changed the completion date -- not date, sorry, percentages on rows 11 and 12 to reflect the progress that was made in Brussels. So the next [inaudible] to privacy issues, and adopt the framework of the scope, essentially. So, these two were changed, and Jean-Baptiste, thank you for pointing that out on the screen.

Okay, and the next change that was made is the completion date for rows 13, 14, and 15. We now have November 24th as the completion date as agreed in Brussels. That was one of the key updates that was asked on the day we [inaudible]. And in the research and study buckets, we -- thank you, Dmitry, we've changed the date to January 31st. As I know, some of you had some concerns with the end of December date gave Satish, as the deadline for the background material, data sources, as well as the need on that for an independent expert.

And then, the major change that was made to this document of law is that we included the topic buckets -- the buckets, the workforces, subgroups -- whatever you want to call them, and each of these have been assigned a work plan. It, essentially, mirrors what we had in the first version, so there's no big surprises there. We did include the planning template, Cathrin suggested, to help set up these subgroups. It's actually in the admin [inaudible] that you will see in the comment box, we included a reference to the planning document that Cathrin suggested.

---

So, these are the changes that were made. I'm hearing some concern from Alan, and you know, Alan, if we can already collect all these discrepancies and we can address them, but essentially we do have a template for the subgroup report, as indicated in Brussels that we are going to share with you by the end of this week, and for the outreach plan, we were going to put something together based on your work plan discussions, you know, outlining when your public comment will take place, what outreach would that entail, so you know, having outreach meetings at ICANN events or holding webinars.

So, we were going to prepare something as well to help guide that discussion, and also, answer any additional questions there are at this stage. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alice. May I suggest then you, under "assign to," when staff has a component, and perhaps an initial component, that you put "staff, RDS-review team," or something like that?

ALICE JANSEN: Sure. Okay. Yeah. It's actually in the comment box, if you look at the third row, column H, ICANN [inaudible] template, but we'll make that distinction.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We can abbreviate our RDS WHOIS review team, perhaps, and use that space more effectively.

ALICE JANSEN: All right. No problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there's any other review team that's doing it. This is perhaps an opportune time to mention that activities are going on with regard to the SSR security, stability, and resiliency review team. They did submit their terms of reference to the board. The board is, effectively, rejecting part of that, claiming that they have exceeded their scope.

A letter has been written by the SSAC, saying they believe, for the reasons the board has identified, and other reasons, that the review team is doomed to failure on the path they're going, and just to highlight the fact that people are watching and are going to be scrutinizing us, as well -- you know, although I don't think we need extra scrutiny about whether we do a good job or not, that is part of the world we're living in right now, and I think what we have to do is make sure that if we are making commitments, that as we go forward that we really have some understanding of them, and agree as a group that this is the target.

Alice and the staff team have done a lot of work in putting, you know, numbers down and words down here, but I think we have to own them, and that requires, essentially, a level of comfort that I'm not sure we've put the effort into -- to get to achieving. So, if anyone has any thoughts on this, I'd really welcome them now. Otherwise, we will have a homework assignment that people really, really do have to look at this

---

in detail. Anyone have anything to say at this point? It is the Alan Greenberg Show, apparently.

Nothing else? Then, let us go on to the agenda item, which is terms of reference. And Lisa, I presume you will take us through this. I did go through the terms of reference in a fair amount of detail yesterday, and I did not have the time to document them, and I will send up a marked up document, perhaps, after we get the next version presented to us. I do have some concerns, but I'll raise them as we go through them right now, verbally, in any case. Lisa --

LISA PHIFER:

This is Lisa. I believe that Alice was going to walk through the changes that have been made to the terms of reference.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. And if, perhaps, we can sort of stop for a moment on each section; if no one else does, I have some comments or questions? If we could have the document displayed?

ALICE JANSEN:

Actually, I don't have a final version for today. I'm afraid it's going to be next week, but I think today's [inaudible].

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Alice, you broke up. I didn't quite get that, and Carlton is asking, "Does the last terms of reference on the Wiki include the changes from Brussels?" As far as I can, it does not.

ALICE JANSEN: Can you hear me now, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Yes, you're clear now.

ALICE JANSEN: Terribly sorry, I'm not sure what's going on with my phone. I was saying, I'm afraid we don't have a final version up for review today. We're still working on integrating some of the comments, but I believe based on our leadership/staff conversation earlier this week, that the objective for today was to talk about the consensus policy language, Susan and you have been working on -- does that ring a bell?

ALAN GREENBERG: It does. Susan is not with us. I'll go on to that in a moment. I would like to raise a couple of issues as we go ahead and -- you know. Anyway, let me just go through them. To start with, there's a huge amount at the beginning of page, essentially listing what ICANN's mission is, and listing what contacted parties responsibilities are; is that really necessary in this document?

---

There's to two to three pages of quoting what's in the bylaws -- not explicitly -- 2 ½ pages, not explicitly on what's in the bylaws for this review but just what's in the bylaws regarding ICANN and implicitly, although vaguely talking about registration-data services, and I'm just questioning whether that's really necessary. If it is, so be it. It just seem like we're adding a lot of pages that don't really add substance to our review. So, I don't think we need any comment on it, but one might want to think about it.

The next comment is on definitions, and we have asked several times, "Do we need any definitions?" I think we do need to define RDAP because we do make reference to it on a regular basis. And Dmitry had suggested we define IDN and Lisa, I guess, I'm not sure if it was Lisa or someone else, put a comment in that quoted the IDN definition from the, I guess, the ICANN dictionary or ICANN glossary, and I would suggest that we have a much abbreviated version.

That version is over half a page long, and I think we need a much-abbreviated version. Not talking about how they're implemented and punycode and dashes, but just define what it is quickly, and we could have a URL pointing to the full definition, if that's okay with people. I presume someone will either put up their hand or yell out if they disagree.

There is a section saying we may choose to include additional terms, as needed, to reflect the review's scope and possible definition sources include all of the other PDPs that have been going on or are going on, the various other projects, and I'm happy, to be honest, to leave out additional exhaustive definitions. We may choose to put them into a



---

glossary in the report as we go forward, but unless, I'm missing something, I don't see an awful lot of merit in spending a lot of time, right now, extracting definitions, and adding what could well be pages of them. Does anyone disagree on that? Anyone have any thoughts?

And Carlton says, "Consumer definition can be listed from the CCTRT report." Carlton, I would question that because I think one of the deliverables that we are saying is where will define the consumer as part of our process, so I'm not sure we want to -- a priority -- put a definition in, unless we're willing to take it out of the scope.

Seeing no hands, I hear no objections; we haven't a lot of suggestions on definitions, and I see no objections here that I would suggest we strike the highlighted paragraph, at least tentatively, and not plan on putting vast numbers of definitions in at this point. The next item is on deliverables and time frame. The scope, the terms of reference, list a timeline, a tentative timeline, which is for an 18-month review.

Our fact sheet lists a 12-month review. As has been pointed out, we can say whatever we want and then deliver ahead of time, but the two should coincide with each other, and since, I think, we are targeting a 12-month review at this report, and not longer, perhaps we want to adjust the timeline in the terms of reference to come closer to what it is in the fact sheet we're using. Does that sound like a reasonable target Lisa or Alice, whoever's working on that -- or Jean-Baptiste? I don't know.

ALICE JANSEN:

Hi Alan. Yes, we'll match what we have in the work plans.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. And I believe, other than removing all the interims, I think that's the bulk of the substantive changes that I made. I will send out a document. Once you give us the next clean version, or the next version, I will mark that one up and send it out to the group. And I'll turn over to Alice now, to do what she was originally going to plan to do, and highlight the changes.

ALICE JANSEN: Alan, thank you. As previously indicated, I don't have a final version for discussion on this call, this week. We will have one for next week's call, but we'll make all the changes you've just listed. We did want to -- I think we want to touch on the consensus policy language, which Susan put together. Do you want us to display that in the room?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm not -- she sent us something late last night, and I did do a reply on it. Are you in a position to display what she sent? She sent it to the leadership team, not to the whole group, so no one else has seen that at this point. If you're in a position to display it, then we can talk a little bit about it. Again, she's not on the call, and no one else has seen it yet, so I'm not sure we're really in a position to debate it at this point, but if you can display it -- what she sent, then we can talk about it, at least a little bit. I do have some concerns.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay. Let me get that up on the screen.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

While you're doing that, let me talk a little bit about it. If you've read the terms of reference, it uses the terms full consensus, consensus, and a variety of other ones that were essentially drawn from the GNSO guidelines that have also been used by the cross-community working groups, I believe. They're done with the theory that the chair will make a call on whether there's consensus or not.

Our terms of reference, then goes into a fairly complex iterative process that if there is disagreement with the chair's call that we attempt to do it over and over again until we get agreement. Following that, if people still agree, there is an escalation and appeal process that goes, first, to the board liaison to the review team, Chris Disspain, in our case; and if there is still disagreement, between various parties that it will then go to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and the chair of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee to pass a final judgment.

In an aid to try to define what we need, I suggested we might want to use, as the first cut a percentage that the ALAC uses that is, 80% defines consensus. That is somewhat at odds with what is in our terms of reference cause the terms of reference, explicitly say, we may take polls on occasion, but we generally don't, and if you count yeses, and nos, to look for 80 percent, you're effectively taking a poll on everything. So, there's that potential conflict.

Susan came up with what you see on the screen now, and she added a complex of block that is someone who has a fundamental disagreement and goes on to say, if you scroll down, that if you have anyone who is

---

---

blocking that you do not have consensus, which essentially says the only definition of consensus is full consensus, where no one is disagreeing. You can have people who don't like it, and sort of bow out of the discussion, but anyone can essentially veto, by saying they block, which defeats the purpose of consensus not requiring unanimity.

So, I think we really have to get down to what we are doing, and I wish Chris was on the call because he was the one who said we have to define it better, and yet the whole concept of consensus that has been used in the GNSO and follow-on processing implies you do not define it better, but use an iterative process with escalation and appeals to try to cover it. So, I'm not quite sure where we go from here. And I wish Susan was on the call, but she isn't. Anyone have any thoughts?

You haven't seen this before, and I've been talking a lot, maybe I'll be quiet for a moment, and let you read what's there; it's not very long, and if anyone has any thoughts, then speak up please cause I think we're -- I won't say a stalemate, but I'm somewhat confused. Cathrin, please, go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Yes, hi. Thank you, Alan. This is Cathrin. It's just to say that I think, as Susan herself was saying, we probably need to flesh this out a bit further, but I think it leaves open this question of the 80 or whatever percent that we still need to figure out whether we want to agree on. You know, I think that's -- we should see whether we just want to go for something sort of intangible that's more a process, but then we still

---

independently of that need to determine whether we set some sort of baseline percentage.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, but that does imply that we effectively are doing polls on everything, and I have no problem with that, but that is counter to the intent of the way this was described. I'm just noting that. I basically, I think we can live with anything, and I have no great desire to be, you know, the god seeker, who determines what consensus is and what isn't, but we need to agree on a set of rules that are consistent within themselves, and what is in the terms of reference, right now, is consistent with the way we're talking. So --

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

I think if we go back to the bylaws -- sorry, this is Cathrin again -- that the idea is that we would try for consensus and if we cannot achieve consensus, then we have to look at a majority decision. So, I think it is a bit consistent with -- I mean, we have to expand what's there, but I don't think it means that we have to take a vote on very single issue, but maybe I'm misunderstanding how this would work.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Consensus, in the context that it's used in the GNSO, certainly, is far stronger than a majority, and I will point out in the SSSR review team, where I said there is some current dissention and disagreements, they are citing that they have made decisions by, and I quote, "majority consensus," which those who I've talked to think that means, majority,

---

and that might lead to a problem if we only are -- if, you know, that implies 40% or 45% of the group may disagree, violently, and I think in ICANN's terms that's not consensus. Again, I can live with it, but I don't think that meets the original intent.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Right. I mean, I still think of it as a two-step process. So, if we have consensus on things, which means that nobody fundamentally disagrees, then we can move ahead without taking a vote, and if we fail to reach consensus, then there might be a vote, or something majority, where we can agree on a percentage, but then we wouldn't mix the two concepts of having a vote and having consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And Erika's agreeing on that. I certainly don't think I could agree to the concept that Susan has presented, which says, "any given member has a complete veto" over consensus, unless we do, as you just pointed out, have something to revert to, in lieu of consensus.

But that does go against all of the --you know, there's about a page and a half on appeals and escalation processes, but you're saying, essentially, says we will replace with a majority or super-majority or something vote. And again, I'm happy with that -- I just think we need clarity and need to agree on it.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah. Sorry, Alan, just to come back. I'm thinking I'm not very clear of it. I don't think I'm saying we have to replace everything by a vote, or

---

by a majority. What I'm trying to say is that there should be consensus first off, which is sort of a more informal idea, where if, you know, there's not a significant minority that significantly objects, then we're fine, and only if that is unclear whether we can get to consensus would we have to look at taking a vote. I think you misunderstood me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I understood completely. What you're suggesting is we attempt some definition of consensus, be it the 80 percent rule or something else, and if we cannot achieve that, then we revert to a vote, as opposed to what the terms of reference currently say of we revert an iteration and iteratively going back to discussing it again, and trying to come to consensus with a different proposal, and barring that, to escalate up to the board liaison, and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

And I think what you're saying is, if we cannot reach consensus that we use, essentially, a vote of some sort with some threshold, in lieu of consensus. Did I get that right?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Right.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So, that is a departure from the -- what is in the terms of reference. I think that's within our scope to do, but we have to decide to do that. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that I think, and the way I read Susan's email, and I saw it for the first time when you did last night, is that she's describing how individuals might test for their own agreement, and then coming down to the point where 80% of the individuals actually having agreement, meeting consensus, but again, she meant this as input to a discussion, not to be taken at face value, so I'm not sure that the interpretation that one person could block a recommendation is what she, in fact, meant.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I based that statement -- and I agree that -- I like her concept of stands aside, and reservations, and agreement, but my concern was with the definition of block and her definition of consensus as no blocks. That was the point that I have concern with. Because that seems to be at odds with 80% or 90%, or whatever it is, implying consensus.

LISA PHIFER: Yeah, I agree. This terminology --

ALAN GREENBERG: So anyway, we really can't have discussion without her, so I'm happy to say we've gone as far as we can, and we need to continue this discussion when Susan is with us. So, we are starting to run out of time. We have six more minutes. We're going to go implementation-briefing questions. They have been distributed. If anyone has any concerns that



---

we have got the questions wrong, please speak up. And I'll turn it over to Jean-Baptiste to confirm items and decisions on this meeting.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, the different actions listed were first on the statement of interest, ICANN Org. to clarify what is meant by submitting electronically. On scope and objectives, Susan to lead discussion on the framework to measure and assess the effectiveness of review team 1 recommendations. ICANN Org. to inventory changes made to WHOIS policies, since the first review team completed.

Lisa, Alan, and Erika to work together on wording for OECD guidelines, version to be shared ahead of the next plenary meeting. ICANN Org. to apply [inaudible] to this table for redistribution. Lisa and Alan to adjust test for an item that the review team will reflect the bylaw pertaining to RDS review. ICANN Org. to clean the table to incorporate objectives text into terms of reference. ICANN Org. to send an email to those who are not on the call to confirm assignments. If any changes are needed, ICANN Org. to make the necessary changes. ICANN Org. to update and resend table of assignment to review team, requesting any changes be suggested no later than Monday.

Also, send an email to those who are not on the call to confirm assignments. If any changes are needed, ICANN Org. to make the necessary changes in advance of next call. ICANN Org. to add definition of RDAP; remove text on mission; shorten IDN definition, and our definition of consumer from the CCTRT. And finally, ICANN Org. to address and match timeline in terms of reference to 12 months.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, the second to last one, add consumer, I don't believe, as I said in the chat, I don't believe we can do that if we leave in as a target in that scope item, and I think we have as a target to define consumer. Let me see; part A of the scope item is agreeing on the working definition of consumer, and consumer trust, so I don't think makes sense to have the definition of consumer.

Clearly, we can be informed by what the CCTRT did, and may well adopt it, but I don't think we can do more than that unless we change the scope item. Carlton? I'm reverting the text and make adjustment as appropriately. I'm not sure I know what that means. Are you in a position to speak? While we're waiting for Carlton, does anyone have any AOB items? Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Alan. I just wondered if Jean-Baptiste could, very briefly, display the questions that were raised on briefings, and if we can get a target date for when any further refinements might be needed, so the folks who will answer the questions can go ahead and start working on them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You've now sent them out, I would give people till, let's say, end of Tuesday, if that's okay? Carlton, in the chat, basically says effectively he's withdrawing the add definition of consumer to the terms of

---

reference because it is in our scope. So we can just remove that item.

[AUDIO BREAK]

All right. Anything else before we adjourn the call? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing. Thank you all for your participation, and look forward to seeing you online. We do have to ramp up our use of the mailing list or we're not going to be able to meet our targets here. So, I think we need to start participating and not just wait for the meetings to comment. Thank you, all. Have a good day, whatever's left of it for you, and look for you online. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]