RECORDING VOICE:	This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you, Alan. This is Brenda speaking for the record. Good day everyone and welcome to the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team Plenary Call #12, on November 20, 2017 at 14:30 UTC. In attendance today we have Alan, Dmitry, Susan, Thomas, Chris, Lili, and Cathrin. In the observer's Adobe room we have Osvaldo and Vignesh. And from ICANN Organization we have Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, Amy, Alice, Trang and myself. We do have apologies from Volker today.
	I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcript. This call is being recorded. I'll turn the meeting over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. First item is statement of interest updates, and more perhaps pointedly, statement of interests. Can we have a report from staff on how we're doing on those?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Yes, Alan, it's Jean-Baptiste for the record. So, so far it looks that we only need statement of interest and the [inaudible] conflict of interest from Erika, Stephanie, and Susan.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright. If I could ask you to send out reminders to those who are not on the call.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Sure.
ALAN GREENBERG:	And those who are on the call, take note. And the next item is subgroup kickoff and next steps. Alice sent out the notices of who is on each team and asking for team leaders. Have we got any responses yet? [AUDIO BREAK]
ALICE JANSEN:	Hi, Alan, this is Alice. [Inaudible] discussions, [inaudible]?
ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm sorry, Alice. Alice, you were very garbled, I couldn't make out what you were saying.
LISA PHIFER:	Alice I think asked me to take this one, Alan. This is Lisa Phifer.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Oh, okay. I'm glad you heard that.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa Phifer for the record. So, Jean-Baptiste, could you please share -- what we've done is captured the responses that we've received thus far and update to the spreadsheet we're been working on. Perhaps you could make that a little bigger, Jean-Baptiste.

So, what you'll see, this is the same spreadsheet that we used to assign review team members to subgroups based on their expressions of interest. And so now what I've done is updated the spreadsheet. The yellow cells indicate individuals that are on each subgroup, and in the columns you'll see some numbers. Those are areas where people expressed some interest in leading or serving as rapporteur for that subgroup.

For example, Carlton indicated that his first choice would be recommendation to the single WHOIS policy. His second choice would be strategic priority. So you'll see the answers from Carlton, Dmitry, Lili, Stephanie and Thomas Walden. We do not yet have answers from those that aren't shaded. So, the leadership team, I believe, intended to go last, but we would be looking for input on this call from Chris, Erika and Volker, I believe are not on the call yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker will not be. Erika should be. [AUDIO BREAK]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is Susan. I thought I saw a response from Volker on this. Let me see if I can find it.

EN

CHRIS DISSPAIN:	I think I saw a response from Volker as well, Susan. This is Chris. I thought I'd seen something from him. [AUDIO BREAK]
LISA PHIFER:	I know we received a response regarding his apologies for the call. I may have overlooked --
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	What it says, "I would like to..." It's the 14th of November, "I would like to lead Rec 10 or Rec 11."
ALAN GREENBERG:	And Louis says he volunteered for 7 or 8 in the chat.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	I don't know about that but his email certainly says 10 or -- maybe just give it all to Volker. Ten and 11 were his responses by email.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, Louis was giving topic numbers which are different from the recommendation numbers.
LISA PHIFER:	So, that would have been -- because I'm not looking at the email; this is Lisa again. Was Volker's first choice REC 10 and his second REC 11?

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone who has the email in front of them?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: He hasn't expressed it that way. He said he'd like to lead 10 and 11. So he mentions 10 first, so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's assume that's an order.

LISA PHIFER: Okay, so then Jean-Baptiste is live editing, so Jean-Baptiste, if you would in column 11 put number 1 under 10, and number 2 under 11, under Volker's name.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so we remove one pink name and one pink category. And, Chris, do you want to commit to anything at this point?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, I have an issue with that, Alan, which is that I'm slightly concerned about leading a group. I don't mind participating, but I think leading is probably not sensible from the basis that I'm going to have a vote in deciding what happens with these recommendations at the end.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, then we'll take the pink off your name then.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I'll happily put the work in, but I just don't think it's [CROSSTALK].

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's quite reasonable. I hate to let you off the hook, but I think it's quite reasonable.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, you'll find another way of getting me on the hooK, Alan. Don't you worry about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll work on it. Alright, so if Steph CAN follow up with -- I guess it is just Erika and Susan; and Susan, do you want to comment? Or no, Susan is one of the leadership teams, so it's just Erika who is missing. And then, Cathrin, Susan, and I will see what we'll volunteer for and then assign things to other people if necessary. Alright.

LISA PHIFER: Alan, this is Lisa. Given the relatively short timeframe for beginning to work in subgroup mode, did you want to try to volunteer from the leadership team to fill in those gaps on this call?

ALAN GREENBERG: If Cathrin and Susan are willing to find -- if they want to defer right now, I'm happy to defer until just after the call. I have faith they'll contribute

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Hi, this is Cathrin. Just to say that in this Sudoku wave that is shaping up, I think recommendation on the one with Carlton number 2 and Volker has already expressed his desire to be leading other things, so I could lead recommendation number 1 to start out with.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: And then I think we're also still looking if Erika has expressed a preference. But put me down for this and then see how things shape up. Also, in terms of Erika weighing in with a few number of others that still require leadership.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa Phifer, just to kind of recap where we are. So, at this point we have five teams that are a gap. We have Erika, and then the three members of the leadership team to express their preferences. If we were to give everyone their first choice, we would need to assign, I had calculated three, but now with Chris not leading a team, that would be - - we need to assign four team members a second choice as well, in order to have coverage for everything.

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan, can I assume you're going to be leading on the two compliance ones, or do you have preference to not do that?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, I put that in the chat. So yeah, I would be happy to lead on both [inaudible] compliance, and then if there's something left over at the end, I don't mind taking that also.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly put me in at Safeguard Registrant Data. It's a pretty trivial item, but let's get it covered. I don't think that really covers my requirement to do some work, but let's make sure it's covered. And Consumer Trust is another one which is a pretty light one. Who do we have on that one? We have Stephanie, Susan, Erika, and Dmitry. Let's presume that Erika will do one of those.

And what else is not covered? We have Susan for compliance now and outreach. And I'll do outreach. That's a more substantive one, also. Alright, we're getting close to…

LISA PHIFER: And Jean-Baptiste, that would be Erika maybe with a question mark for Consumer Trust.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. [AUDIO BREAK]

	Alright, we're getting close at this point. I think we have everything covered with one question mark. Now, time frame. Alice, what is the time frame we put in for these to be done?
ALICE JANSEN:	Hi, Alan. I hope you can hear me now. So the time frame we have for all the subgroups to complete the planning document is December 5th. That's the deadline we established. It's up for discussion of course.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Essentially, two weeks from now. Can we get some quick feedback from people on this call? I see Lisa has her hand up. I'm not sure if that's an old or a new one. Can we get some quick feedback? Is two weeks from now reasonable given people's other time commitments?
LISA PHIFER:	And Alan, that is a new hand.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Then please, go ahead.
LISA PHIFER:	Thank you; Lisa Phifer. I suggest in the interest of having one individual responsible for scheduling calls, deciding agendas and so forth, which is where the leader will at least begin their role, that for every one of the items that we have on screen, we have somebody, almost all of them -- any place we have more than one person, we have a first and second

choice. So my suggestion was going to be to pick the person who chose that topic as their first choice and then we're down to one person for each topic, if Erika accepts that.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is not the case for Privacy Proxy.

LISA PHIFER: Ah, Stephanie and Volker. I see.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's the only one. We have some as a second choice. Now, the only question is at that point, is the load reasonably spread over people? If we look, one -- let's see, how many people do we have more than one number 1?

LISA PHIFER: That would end up with four team members taking on leadership for two groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, at this point, we've now identified a leader for each one of the groups, assuming Erika accepts the Consumer Trust. And that's a pretty light one, so I assume she's going to work on one of the more heavier

ones also. She's also on the compliance ones, so I'm going to assume that's going to occupy a fair amount of her time.

Alright, so coming out of this meeting, we will have a team leader identified for each of these groups, and is two weeks reasonable? If we're going to have even a single conference call and then some drafting time, two weeks is getting pretty tight. I would suggest that we push it on to the 12th, which essentially says three weeks of calls. Anyone disagree? Or anyone want to comment on that? [AUDIO BREAK]

Then let's update that which essentially says that we'll have everything well in hand well before the Christmas break for those who take time off. Anything further on work teams? Yes, go ahead, whoever that was. Yes Alice, go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN: Just to clarify, so all the subgroups are expected to complete and return their work statement and work plan by December 12th, correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct. That is correct.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then, hearing nothing else, we'll go on to the next items: Scope review. Unless anyone has an explicit comment, I think we can defer that till we go into the terms of reference. Because it's an integrated part of the terms of reference. Now, I did a moderately thorough review of the terms of reference yesterday and I've put in updates or comments which I think address most of the issues, and I'd like to spend a fair amount of today's call going through it and seeing if we can tie this up.

Our target was in fact to have this approved at the next week's meeting and we don't quite know when next week's meeting is going to be because that's one of the items on our agenda, but if it was to be held next Monday, then we said we would be submitting this to the board on the following day. Although, I do have a question of that timing. And if anyone has a comment, the document that I sent out last night, you may want to display it directly, which is what I'm going to do in a moment. [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, on page number one the only changes I put in under the terms of reference, the revised date. Because it's still read as if we had to submit this on the 15th of May, which was curious given that in the next line it says we didn't actually have the team selected until two weeks later.

Now, the next thing, I have a significant amount of the discussion on Scope on page two to three commented, and that gives the history of the details of the reduced Scope proposal, what the GNSO said, what the GAC said, and a little bit on the discussion. I question whether we really need all of that, and I would suggest that we replace that with a relatively short paragraph saying, "Reduced scope was proposed

following SO/AC input and discussion of the review team. We decided not to reduce scope but to consider all of the Bylaw mandated areas and others that deemed to be of importance."

Is there anyone who feels strongly that we should be documenting this in the terms of reference? We certainly can document it in an appendix or something of the final report. And I see Susan has her hand up. Please, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks Alan. I actually have a question on the first page on the date, and really, just sort of putting this toward Chris. I'm curious to know how that process is going to change that date. And also, to make it a more relevant date, I'm also wondering if that date had been selected that was accurate for our team, what date would it have been? I mean, how many --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, that'd be nice. Absolutely not a clue. This is Chris. If I may, Alan, the board will write to confirm that that date is not obviously the right date because [inaudible] didn't, and we'll send a note. I'm just dealing with it. I've got a draft and I'm going to get it approved, etc. But fundamentally, I'm [inaudible] the date has gone and past etc., so we'll be fixing that. Is that what you wanted to hear?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. That is what I wanted to hear, partly. But, is there a new date going to be inserted or…?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I don't think so. I think probably just -- we look forward to getting it from you within a reasonable period of time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan, if they don't like what we're doing, they can always dismiss us and form a new group.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm not even going to dignify that with a response. Except of course by not dignifying it with a response, I've dignified it with a response, so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Notice I didn't ask for volunteers of who's willing to leave if the board wants us to.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. So, I am aware of the issue, Susan. You mentioned it to me and I've dealt with it. I'm just waiting to get a confirmation to send a note to confirm that everything is fine.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: And maybe the board will be more realistic next time. They passed it through motion.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, now come on. Now you've way overstepped the mark. That's not going to happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Yeah. I'm presuming if the board chooses to disagree with anything in our terms of reference, they will say so coming back to us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I imagine so, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Back on the question of do we need the whole history here of how the scope evolved or is a quick summary sufficient at this point. Does anyone feel strongly? Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. I apologize that I missed the last leadership call, but I had understood your target date was the 28th of November, not December.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did I type December instead of …?

LISA PHIFER: You did in these.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did it late at night. Pretend that reads the 28th of November.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't plan to be working on the 28th of December, I'm not sure about staff.

LISA PHIFER: And to answer the question that you just raised, I could make a suggestion to help provide the context and background for the community who might want to know what happened to their input and what happened to the limited scope proposal, you could move the text that you highlighted to an appendix and not have it interfere with the body of the draft where you'll focus on your actual objectives agreed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm fine with that. The actual short paragraph I suggested does cover it without going into gory details of what their statements were. I'm happy if it goes into an appendix or just replaced by that. I'm willing to leave it to staff at this point. I'm just trying to get the terms of reference down to a document that is not 30 pages long as the original was and it's now getting down to a size that someone might actually

want to look at. That was my real concern, to make this a usable document and not too exhaustive. So, I'm happy at this point to leave it to staff to somehow integrate what I suggested or just move it to an appendix as appropriate; if there's no other comments. [AUDIO BREAK]

The next item is currently on the middle of page five, and it was asking whether the original text had said that we had decided to not cover the OECD guidelines and was questioning whether it was a strong consensus or unanimous. Everywhere else in the document where we mention consensus, that consensus was reached on some issue; we simply say consensus and I think that's sufficient here as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Alan, it's Chris. Can I just make a point about that? I've got no issue with it, but the OECD stuff, have I got this right, is actually mentioned in the Bylaws, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: In the Bylaws, it is.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, I just want to make sure that -- like I said, I've got no issue with the decision of the review team, I just want to make sure that if we're going to say it, we should make sure we say it clearly, that even though it's in the Bylaw, we talked it through and we think the following.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, in that case --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just so that everyone knows we haven't missed it, is really my point, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I have no problem. I believe it was unanimous. I do not recall anyone saying they disagree.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I'm sure that's true.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, since we are saying we will not do something which is in the Bylaws, then I back off and say let us say unanimous consensus so that there was no question that it was something that we all agreed to. If staff can take note then.

And my last question is on the last two items where we decide not to do RDAP or review the WHOIS protocol. These were both items that were not in the Bylaws. They were raised during discussion of the team, and I'm not sure we need to note that we're not doing them since it was not required. Again, this can be part of the larger dialogue describing how the evolved, but I don't think it needs to be mentioned in the Scope section explicitly. Unless anyone has an objection, we can move it to what is now the appendix.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is Susan. So, I think RDAP was listed in the GNSO Scope.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, it is one group community that requested that we focus on it, and we decided not to, so...

ALAN GREENBERG: That's why I'm suggesting that it can go into the appendix, where it goes into both details of what the GNSO suggested and what we decided to do. I don't feel strongly, I'm just trying to, again, make this flow a little bit better. Susan, if you'd like to keep these two items there, then it's a done deal. Either way.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. I think we should just leave it here. It's not that long.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Alright, then those two items will stay there ignoring my comment.

Next comment is, the review team is called RDS. I'm suggesting we define RDS and just say Registration Directory Service, which is what the

title of this whole document is, and simply say it's a shortened form of RDPS. I haven't heard a better explanation of what it is other than that.

Spelling mistake corrected on page eight. And I'm adding under the recommendation that we prioritize; it starts off by saying, "Shall attempt to prioritize each recommendation and provide a rationale for the prioritization." Then it says we will put all of the recommendations in priority order.

My experience in previous groups like this is that the recommendations, we may group a bunch of parts of a recommendation together, some of which have high priority, and some of which are low, but they fit together as a single group and therefore, ordering everything in priority order is somewhat problematic, and so I'm just suggesting we say, "To the extent practical, proposed recommendations should be provided in priority order." Since it's only an attempt anyway, we may not have prioritization for some of them. Comments? [AUDIO BREAK]

Later bullet point, again on page nine, says, "We should identify whether things are short term, medium term, long term," and it identifies short term is within six months. Now, the last review team was criticized for saying things have to be done within six months of submission of the report, when the board did not act for six months, so I just made it clear that we're talking about time frames after acceptance, not after delivery of report.

The end of page nine says, "We're encouraged to interact with the board caucus group for things such as the scope." Oh no, I'm sorry, I'm getting ahead of myself. This is just asking a note. Chris, can we have

the names of the people who are on the current board caucus group? I assume they may have changed with the new board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yep. No idea off the top of my head, but yes it was.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once it's convened, can we have the names?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, of course you can.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm suggesting that in our list of members since there's a note afterwards saying the ccNSO has reserved the right to appoint three team members or up to three, that we remove numbers 11 to 13 from this list and add them back if necessary. They're not currently named and we don't know if there ever will be any, or certainly don't know if there will be three.

I removed interim from the various chairs and vice chairs, and where is the next change? We're now towards the bottom of page 12, and it says we should consider discussing with the board caucus group various things including when we have an agreed on scope.

Chris, do you agree we should be doing this before submitting to the board? Which would of course change the date, but maybe there's

some merit in actually having a discussion on it before we have [inaudible] concrete.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think there probably is. So the caucus group is the group of board members who have said they're up to speed and interested, as opposed to just generally. And so yes, because I think there is merit in having the caucus group go to the board and say, "We're fine with this."

ALAN GREENBERG: So that would defer the date of submission, but clearly people would be aware of it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: But not by necessarily [CROSSTALK] long.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then let us update the date and can you consider this a formal request to convene the group and indicate whether you simply want us to transmit the draft scope to the group or whether you want to meet?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, I will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and give us a time frame so we can adjust the overall schedule.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I'll discuss it with the relevant [inaudible] people and get it sorted out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent, thank you. Alright, then we come into how we decide on consensus. You will recall in Brussels we had a discussion saying we need to quantify or be more specific on how we decide on consensus. The draft document, terms of reference, and the draft operating procedures manual, provides a relatively extensive complex and convoluted method for determining consensus and appealing it at multiple levels if anyone disagrees with it. And, either we use that method or we put specific quantifications. I don't think we can do both.

The official words also say we rarely take polls, so I'm a little uncomfortable scraping that whole thing and replacing it with something that simply puts some numbers in or another methodology since this is the methodology we've been using for quite some time in ICANN or close to it.

So, I tried to merge the two concepts and the document that Susan had produced, which I thought identified some interesting ways of looking at things. So, what I did was I added for consensus a rule of thumb, saying consensus is supported by 80% of the review team, which is what we -- you know, what I said had been used in other groups I had participated in, and it seemed to be a good rule of thumb; but it's not a hard rule.

And then I added in the categories of how people could be standing that Susan had put together, which I thought added a nuance that was missing from this, and I've added in, "Judging the extent to which consensus may be useful for each team member to consider which of the following categories," and there's a typo there. It should be "applies to them" without the word "they".

And then we have "disagree", which says they're not happy with it, and several of those would result in not having consensus. Stand aside, which says I can't support it but I'm not going to stop the group from going ahead. Reservations and agreement.

So this doesn't commit us to counting how many of each of these, as was suggested in Susan's original draft, but it does give us a new set of terminology, which I think will be useful going forward. The question is, are people happy with these changes and we can accept this. It still keeps in the whole appeal process where we appeal to various people, including the board liaison and going all the way up, I believe, to the organizational affect of this committee.

Comments? Anyone feel uncomfortable with this? Obviously, as not everyone is on this call, but if people on this call feel comfortable, I think we can send out a call for consensus on the email, but we'll see where people stand. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Lisa Phifer for the record. I just wondered in the last item in the set of that it's the definition of agreement. What do you mean by, "I am willing to implement it?"

ALAN GREENBERG: I just copied the words that Susan had. I'm happy to leave off that phrase and just put the period after proposal. Unless Susan felt there was some strong meaning in what she wrote. I seem to recall she said she dashed this off pretty quickly. I'm not sure there was great meaning.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, no. I'm fine with deleting that and to stop it at proposal.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Stop it at proposal. Thank you, Lisa. Any further comments? [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, there is a section on reporting saying we still need to agree or refine this section. I read it over and I'm moderately happy with it. I don't think it says anything too controversial and my only level of uncomfort with this is we are now talking about the work plan as a living document that will change as necessary, and this sort of implies that the time frame we're committing to is rather more fixed. But, I can certainly live with it understanding that the work plan is going to be something that changes and not really worry about it.

And again, I'm looking for a nod of the head from Chris that says they understand that in the same context. If not, we may need to add a phrase here saying the work plan is a moving document, but it will reflect at any given time our best concept of where we're going.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think we understand it, but I don't think it does any help to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, could I ask Lisa to draft something, Lisa or Alice? I think it fits here. It may fit somewhere else if the work plan is mentioned earlier, just to make it clear that the work plan is a living document.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Alan, this is Alice. I'm happy to draft the language.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And the last thing is I have a suggestion for a new section. This is premised on a number of discussions we've had but including discussions with regard to the SSR review team where they have claimed that at least part of their problem is that they have not been provided with the staff support they believe is necessary. And without commenting on whether that's appropriate or not, or whether it's true or not, I think a reasonable -- since the review team is making significant commitments in this document, I think it is reasonable to say this presumes we will get appropriate staff support, and if not we have an escalation process under which we can make that known.

Does anyone have any thoughts on this? This is in my comment on page 18 of the document. The text I'm proposing is, "The commitments in this document presume appropriate staff support from ICANN organization. Should that in the review of review team leadership

become an issue, this will be communicated first to the ICANN organization staff member designated as the team leader, and then if necessary, to the board liaison." Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. I just wanted to direct your attention to page 12 where there is a section Support from ICANN Organization, which indicates what you can expect from the organization. I was wondering if the addition that you proposed might belong in that section.

ALAN GREENBERG: It certainly does. Thank you. That says, "Support from ICANN Organization. Members of ICANN organization assigned a review team will support its work including project management needing support, document drafting if/when requested, document editing and distribution, data and information gathering, and other substantive contributions were deemed appropriate." I think it's quite appropriate. Perhaps a slight wording change to add it as a paragraph in that section. [AUDIO BREAK]

Thank you for noting that. And Chris, you're happy to act as the conduit if we need to escalate?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, absolutely, no problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just figure, if we're going to make mistakes, we should make different ones from the last review team.

Anything else on this document? I think, with the appropriate changes made and reviewed by this group, I'm moderately comfortable that we now have a document ready to submit first to the caucus group and then to the board. And we will say that in the email when this goes out.

And with that, I think we have completed that item. Thank you. Work plan. Alice, are you going to show us the work plan again and tell us how late we are on things?

ALICE JANSEN: Sure, happy to. Jean-Baptiste, could you connect the work plan to me, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I assume, by the way, that the edits that will be done coming out of this meeting on the terms of reference will be done with mark up so we can see the changes?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

ALICE JANSEN:

Okay, so this looks funnier than the usual version. This will work for now. This is the most recent version of the work plan. We've adjusted some of the completion percentages to reflect recent developments, and the key updates to this document are November 28th as the new deadline for the submission of the terms of reference and work plan to the ICANN board, and now we have December 12th as the deadline for subgroups to adopt their statement of work and to, you know, fill in the planning document that we discussed earlier. So, this will be adjusted right after this call.

So this document was first presented to you in October, and I know Alan wants a deep dive of this document before it is associated with the terms of reference. So, as you may have seen in the agenda, there was a call for volunteers to run a sanity check and deep dive analysis of the document, so they can report back to the group any concerns they may have, so I'm looking for a couple of work plan experts among you who are willing to work with me on this. I hope some of you are really excited about this and cannot wait to hold a chair. So Alan, unless you have any other...

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're starting to understand this group, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:

Right. So there we go. I'm putting a call out there for anyone who's interested in working on this with me and going through this in detail, and relaying any concerns to the group. Alan, is there anything else you would like to add here?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, other than I think there should be at least one leadership person on it and probably not me, because I've already expressed my overall concerns. Cathrin or Susan, can we have a volunteer and then we'll volunteer someone else as well? Either of the two Susan's we have on the call could volunteer. I'm just looking at Adobe Connect, sorry. [AUDIO BREAK]

Do we have any volunteers to go over this document?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sure, this is Susan. I'll volunteer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Susan. And anyone else, either who considers themselves an organized person who understands timed schedules, or is simply willing to do it anyway? [AUDIO BREAK]

Nobody is willing to volunteer?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, Alan, my apologies. I missed what you were asking for. What were you asking for?

ALAN GREENBERG: We just wished for someone to go over the schedule in some detail, other than Alice who we know has written it, and go over it and make

sure that it makes some level of sense given the amount of work that we have to do.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'll happily do that with Susan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much.

CHRIS GREENBERG: That's fine. Not a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Done. Anything else, Alice? Are you happy with that? I trust you will ride them and get something done on that quickly.

ALICE JANSEN: I'm very happy with this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, next item on our agenda is scheduling, and I presume that means scheduling of this meeting, and potentially scheduling of any other calls associated with the subgroups. Now, the problem with this meeting, we decided that this time of day is probably the best time of day which allows virtually all team members to participate outside of the midnight to 6am black out window, and we selected Monday because it was available as far as we knew for everyone.

Volker has now said he cannot make this on Mondays, and the question is, is there any other day that all team members and staff can make it on this time?

BRENDA BREWER: Excuse me, this is Brenda. I just want to advise the review team that at that time, the 14 -- [inaudible] area, 100% of our team is available. The staff is not available on Tuesday, Wednesday, and I believe there is a conflict at that time with Alan on Thursday, so we can consider another day or specifically another time.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, the only other day left is Friday, since I presume we're not doing weekends, and that puts Lili into very late Friday night. ICANN normally does not schedule many meetings on Fridays, so I'm presuming staff will be available. And the question is, is that an acceptable time for everyone else? We obviously have a couple of people not on this call right now. I notice we do have Erika and Stephanie, so the only people not on this call are Volker and Carlton.

Is there anyone on this call who cannot make it or would prefer not to make it on Friday. If the answer is yes, then we do have a problem, that is we've run out of days.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry to rain on the party. This is Cathrin. I actually just agreed with my employers that I'm off on Friday afternoons to hang out with my children and with them it's literally 100% them, so there's no way they

can quietly play in the background while I'm on the phone. It just does not fly, so I'm very sorry, but I cannot possibly make it on Friday afternoons.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have any suggestions then? I've run out. Either we go into the blackout hours for somebody, or we go into the blackout hours for a number of people and rotate calls so on any given call there's one or two or three people who are doing this in the middle of their night and the rest who are better accommodated. I don't think there's any other choice. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. I'm just calling your attention to chat that we have three people think Friday would be difficult for them. I also wanted to clarify; I think we have one person who cannot make the Monday standing call time, and we have one person, that being yourself, who cannot make the Thursday standing call time. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: As far as I know, that is correct. I'm not sure if there's anyone else on the Thursday call, but I've got in every week one meeting, and in some weeks, two meetings at that time, so I really can't make it and I'm willing to cancel a call or I'm willing to have a call going out with one of the vice chairs covering it if that's the appropriate selection, but it means I will be missing a fair number of the calls which I don't think is appropriate. I don't think it's appropriate for any member to say they

are going to miss a significant number of the calls. Sorry, was that Cathrin?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, it was me. I [inaudible] has a standard weekly meeting with his employers and just to see if there's no other options, that he might potentially go back and check with his colleagues if there is some time, some possibility of moving his standing meeting by an hour or so.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can certainly ask him, but we're now in a situation where we need to schedule next week's meeting and I'm reluctant to tell Volker. Let me get a hold of Volker and see quickly if we can determine it. If not, we need a fall back plan.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Alan, this is Chris. I think it seems that there's two variables. One is the day, and the second is the hour. Now, we've settled on 14:30. The person who it's the latest for I believe is, Lili, right? Where it is -- currently, we're an hour...

ALAN GREENBERG: It goes up to midnight.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It goes up to midnight, yes. And it also -- because assuming even if we were able to move it by an hour, we'd still have a problem in respects to

your calls or Volker's call, if they go on any longer. So, sorry, I was just trying to be helpful there, but not being helpful at all other than to say certainly next week's call should probably remain the same time, and then we can work it out from there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, then we will do that and hope Volker forgives us. Does anyone have a preference? It looks like if Volker cannot move his call, then it looks like we do not have a single time when everyone can meet regularly. And the only alternative at that point is to select two times, which means some modest number of people are going to have to meet at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning.

BRENDA BREWER: If I may interrupt.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please if you have a good idea.

BRENDA BREWER: Well, I'm actually chatting with Volker right at this moment. He's advising me that he is only available on Mondays in a half hour from now. So at the end of this call is when he becomes available, which I don't have my UTC chart in front of me.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's within reasonable hours for everyone except Lili and that puts her ending the call at 2am.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And also it's a conflict for Susan and Lisa. I'm going through the chatroom right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm not looking at the chat.

BRENDA BREWER: On Monday, that's a conflict, Lisa? Okay. So Volker tells me that he is not able to move his meetings to an earlier time. Okay, I'm asking if he is... just a moment. [AUDIO BREAK]

Thank you for standing by. It appears that he is not available earlier and he is not able to move his meetings. So, we're again at a standstill. Unless, if you want to communicate with him, Alan, about…

ALAN GREENBERG: No, if he says he can't do it, I'm not going to try to grill him and convince him that he can.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, what about Fridays, Allan? Would that be okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, several people said they can't make it Fridays.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, that's right, you're quite right about Fridays. Sorry. My apologies. All we need is another day in the week.

ALAN GREENBERG: The two people who are at our extremes are Lili and Susan. If one of them is willing to move into their black out hours, then we have some other options that we might be able to select either on a Monday or a Thursday.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, Alan, it's Chris again. It might be easier to ask to take this offline and get Brenda to actually do a chart and see where we end up. I've already lost track of where we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I'm going to follow Chris's suggestion, unless Lisa is suggesting something different. She has her hand up.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. Lisa for the record. I just wanted to inquire as to whether Susan and I are the only people who have a conflict for an hour later on Mondays? There's a real possibility that we could try to move. It's an RDS PDP leadership call. There's a remote possibility that we could encourage them to move their call an hour later, but I don't want to

even pursue that path if it's not an option for this group to move this call one hour later.

ALAN GREENBERG: That pushes Lili into a 1am ending and we need confirmation that that's okay. Let's handle this offline. I like Chris's idea, not to put people on the spot right now. So either we will try to move the meeting and keep it on a Monday or Thursday if we can move it somewhat and not a lot, or we will rotate and probably either Susan or Lili will be inconvenienced because of it, or perhaps both of them depending on where we rotate.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: And I'm fine with it being earlier for me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we may be able to do that and even keep it on Monday. And although I begrudge anyone who forces me to be up for a 7am meeting, I will gladly do it. Alright, the only other item is AOB and I have one item on the AOB and that is the email that I sent out last night on a draft of the request for written documentation on the WHOIS1 Review Team Recommendation Implementation. Is it possible to take the email and perhaps put it in the chatbox or something? Just so we can take a look at it. I can try to find it, if I can.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan, let me look into that. [AUDIO BREAK]

ALICE JANSEN: Alan, this is Alice. I've posted the link in the chatbox.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Thank you. If everyone could pull that up. What I wrote is the WHOIS Review Team RDS, who is the review team, formally requests written detailed implementation reports for the recommendations of the first WHOIS review team. Such reports should include: to what extent the recommendation was implemented as it is written, if the implementation is written from that request of the rationale, details of the implementation, results of the implementation, and to the extent applicable, metrics/measurements indicating the degree of success or change as a result of the implementation to the degree practical and assessment of whether the implementation met is desired goals.

Then I ask a number of other questions that whether or not we want to include, do we want to set a deadline for this, and if so what is a reasonable deadline, and Trang may have some input on that. Do we want to ask for an assessment of whether the implementation was an effective use of ICANN organization resources?

That's an interesting question because one of the things we were asked to do was make sure that we're asking for things that essentially make sense, not just make work efforts and to the extent that ICANN org believes that they implemented what was requested, but it was a waste of time, I think that's an interesting assessment. Perhaps difficult to make, but interesting.

So the question is, do we go ahead with the original request? Is there any changes that people are suggesting and do we add the other two items and if so what? There's the document displayed. Do I have any comments? [AUDIO BREAK]

My preference is we do add a deadline, and I'll suggest that we negotiate with Trang about what a reasonable deadline is, and that we do ask for whether this was an effective use of resources. And obviously they may choose not to answer that, but that's fine. Yes, Trang, please go ahead.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you Allen. As I was reading through some of these questions, I think they are going to be a bit of a challenge in answering some of the questions that the review team may want to ask. One of them being, as you mentioned, the effective use of the ICANN org resources. Right off the top of my head right now, I can't think of how we would go about doing that sort of an assessment. It seems a bit of an objective, an opinion type of a write up if that was the question, and I don't know how useful that would be to review teams.

Another item I wanted to flag that maybe a bit difficult would be, I think, the last point in your original email, which says to the degree practical an assessment of whether the implementation met its desired goals. I wonder if that's best done after the review team has had some opportunity to discuss how the recommendations have been implemented in the first place. Because again, as I mentioned, that may be a bit of staff opinion, which will be kind of difficult for us to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I have Susan next, but just to respond to that. I don't mind staff opinions, but I respect that if Trang feels uncomfortable doing it, then I'm willing to delete both of those. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'm just wondering whether we should take this back to the list first because I think this came out of the -- and correct me if I'm wrong, the meeting we had in Abu Dhabi which didn't include all of the review team members. So, I'm wondering whether or not we should discuss this on the email list and maybe come up with questions that staff do feel comfortable answering. Just a thought.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm working under the assumption that this will not be finalized until next week, in any case, so, yes I think we are just by the fact of doing that. For the record, the only people not on this call were at the meeting in Abu Dhabi, so this has been exposed to everyone. But, I'm happy to take what Trang has said into consideration. Trang, would you offer what you might think would be a reasonable deadline for completing this?

TRAN NGUYEN: Thanks, Alan. I think the factual information, that's a lot easier for us to get to and depending on how the couple of items that I have flagged may be rewritten, say for example, the first one, effective use of ICANN resources that the way that that's written is sort of an opinion, a staff

opinion, but if you were to ask us to let you know what were the ICANN org resources required to implement it, for example, that's part of an actual thing that we could provide, and then you can use that information to assess whether or not that's an effective use of resources or not, based on the recommendation and the outcome of the recommendation. That certianly will be a lot faster and easier for us to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, I would have hesitated doing that because I wouldn't have wanted a multi-faceted review of staff time used in all these things, if it wasn't something already reasonably at hand. Again, I wouldn't want answering this questions to be a make work exercise, but that's fine. I would have no trouble changing the assessment to a simple asking for resources used.

Alright, I'm going to take Susan's suggestion to hand and put it to the list, and Trang, if you don't feel comfortable now, if you can get back to me with some target date. Is January 5th or something like that a reasonable date, or do you need more time than that.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Alan. Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, in that case, I think we are, at this point, finished with the agenda, unless anyone else has any other business. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, and I may have missed this on the email thread, but I just did a quick search in my Gmail box and I have not found a response. But I did have on the last call, or maybe it was leadership call, I expressed quite a concern on the facts sheet. I was wondering where we were with that?

Several of us objected to it being published and the publication date was supposed to be the 13th, so there may be people out there in the community that are looking for it, so I'd like to know where we are and how we're going to move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I did send out a message last night asking the same question, and I wasn't going to put staff on the spot today, asking for answers, but if anyone would like to volunteer an answer, then please go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Well, sure. I'm happy to [inaudible] on that. So, I just wanted to advise that your comments received on the last call were related to experts and we have been working on compiling all the additional data and contacts requested. This also includes the one on travel costs, related requests and as soon as we have all this data compiled we can present that on to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, and I'll leave it up to you whether to post a comment where the facts sheet would be saying it is pending for review and will

be posted as soon as possible, if you think that's advisable based on the date being slipped, then please do so. [AUDIO BREAK]

And we see we now have Carlton on the call as we are about to adjourn. Carlton, do you want to weigh in on anything we might have talked about even though you weren't here. You have seen the agenda. [AUDIO BREAK]

Lisa, your hand is up. Please go ahead. And Carlton did note he's had ISB problems today. Our sympathies. Go ahead, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. I had two items of other business. One is now that we have Erika on the call, perhaps we could confirm that she is willing to serve as rapporteur for the consumer trust group, and if she had a second choice for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if Erika either cannot speak, we'll get back to her shortly after this call. We would appreciate it.

LISA PHIFER: Erika says in chat that she would be happy to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I'm also assuming that Erika was going to be taking a significant role in the consumer compliance ones.

LISA PHIFER: The other item of other business is actually just clarifying when we left the terms of reference edits. You had suggested that the scope table not be included in the appendix. I wasn't sure we actually reached closure on that suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. Well, is the scope table significantly different from what ended up being the scope section of the document?

LISA PHIFER: The additional information in the table is actually in the prioritization column, and because it is expected that the terms of reference will indicate a prioritization of objectives, you might not want to lose that information, even if you take the table itself out.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem including the table, and that can be added as part of the other texts that we moved into the appendix, the process followed in determining the scope. [AUDIO BREAK]

LISA PHIFER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else before we adjourn? Jean-Baptiste, your hand is up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan. Thank you. I just wanted to flag that a set of documents were circulated to inform the plan of discussion. First one [inaudible] of contractors that was sent to leadership. And the second one is the confidential disclosure framework and NDA that was sent to the review team, and just wanted to flag that these were sent for information only at this stage. And something I wanted to ask you is if you were able to review the decisions to reach an action item on this call?

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, thank you, before we do that, two things to note. Number one. the deadline is coming up rather quickly, on whether we want to engage any experts or any external studies, so as people are going over, review their work in preparation for the documents the work groups are preparing, keep that in mind, because we will have a decision pretty close as to whether we are going out for any external contracts, and the other item I would want to flag, is we have asked for a briefing from ICANN org on the GDRP actions that are going on within ICANN and that seems to have slipped through the cracks. So we would like to know where this going and exactly what has been done so we have some idea, thank you. And please, go ahead with the review action items. This seems to be a rather extensive list.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Hi, Alan. This is Cathrin, if I may

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Just to say that we can try [inaudible] and it gets back to everyone that there was actually quite some action following the November 2nd announcement that ICANN was [inaudible] policy in the contracts if registrars and registries submitted alternate models of how they intend to move forward. ICANN reposted a blog post on Friday I think, there's a [inaudible] showing how this would work and it doesn't provide that many details.

It basically [inaudible] that ICANN has created an email address where people can submit models of how they want to run the WHOIS for their registry or registrar to an email address and then the [inaudible] will review that model and ICANN welcomes efforts to sort of find a common model across several registries and registrars, but of course this raises the challenge of a [inaudible] going forward as people are now free to come up with their own model, so that's a major concern for the GAC.   [Inaudible] everyone that there are a number of interesting developments right now and it's worth closely following what's happening on the GAC [inaudible] into the chat so everybody who's interested in reviewing them also.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If I could ask staff to distribute via email a point to the blog entry, because I hadn't seen that. Just as a point of interest, the board in its meetings with all ACs and SOs did ask if there was any input from the ACs and SOs on how to mitigate the issues related to enforcement

that we're looking at. The ALAC perhaps among other groups, but the ALAC did say, "Yes. We do have some suggestion on what ICANN can do to mitigate the impact and there was no interest in follow up on it so, rather curious I thought. In any case, can we go on to the review of action items, please. We have 14 minutes before the end of the call.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks, Alan. So on decisions reached, we had also put [inaudible] statement of work [inaudible] by December 12th, 2017. On action items under statement of interest, I cannot send a reminder to Stephanie and Erika [inaudible] statement of interest and conflict of interest, but [inaudible] Stephanie and Erika replied on that in the chat.

On the terms of reference we asked first to change the revised due date to November 28th, 2017. Second to move [inaudible] to appendix and replace with summary paragraphs. Third, accept content to edit on page 5. Column 84 [inaudible] to remain. Number 5, add [inaudible] to page 7. Item 6, edit pages 9 and 10 accepted with note. Seven, accept edits to page 13 and 14 [inaudible] willing to implement it. Item 8, disclaimer of [inaudible] living documents. Adjust language. And then 9, take [inaudible] 8-11, which was included on page 12 under [inaudible] organization. Ten, retain updated Scope table in appendix and [inaudible] members and to provide information on submission of terms of reference plus work plan.

On the work plan, that will be [inaudible] increased and Erika to review the work plan and provide input and comments. We got in the scheduling [inaudible]. Next Monday's call is going to be at the standard

call time.   Request for briefing to review [inaudible] and some suggestions [inaudible].   And on the briefing on GDPR [inaudible] to provide an update on this request.

And for [inaudible] and this was just done by Cathrin.   Thank you, Cathrin.   And on subgroups, please [inaudible] up at your earliest convenience and reach out to [inaudible] a call to be scheduled.   Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and there was one item missed under the terms of reference that is under the OECD decision, it should say unanimous consensus. [AUDIO BREAK]

LISA PHIFER: Alan, I believe that is the intent of the pages moving edit number 3. To accept the consensus edit.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, I thought that was the consensus.   Okay, sorry, I thought that was the edits on definition of how to reach consensus.   Sorry, I don't have the document in front of me right now.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, that was the removing the unanimous or the second word.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh okay. I thought it was the extensive changes that we made on how consensus was reached.

LISA PHIFER: That's I think pages nine and ten.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I withdraw my comment and we can withdraw that item. Any further comments? And Jean-Baptiste has his hand up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Old hand, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Old hand. Seeing no more hands. Oh, we have a hand from Lisa Phifer.

LISA PHIFER: I apologize. I'll make it quick. Just to call everyone's attention to that very last action item that the subgroups do need to kick off very soon in order to begin working on that first [inaudible] work plannig activity. And the subgroup leaders that were identified on today's call will send something back out to the list to reiterate who has each team but the other subgroup leaders really need to carry the ball to kick off each subgroup. If you need a call scheduled, staff can help you with doodles and scheduling the calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Lisa. May I suggest just one email to the whole group with the whole list of teams and who's the leader on each? If you choose to do reminders to each of them individually, that's fine, but we should have in one place a quick list of who each of the leaders is.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Alan, this is Alice. Yes, we're happy to send this recap and we'll include the planning doc as well, as well as the work plan that's being refined on this call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all, appreciate it. I think it's been a productive call. And I will give you another nine minutes of your life back. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]