
AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Alan. This is Brenda speaking, for the record. Good day, welcome, to the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team plenary call 13, on December 8th, 2017, at 13:30 UTC. In attendance today we have Alan, Dmitry, Thomas, Volker, Chris, Lili, and Susan. In the observer room we have Svetlana. From ICANN Org, Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, Steve, and myself, Brenda. We do have apologies from Cathrin, Carlton, and Alice. I'd like to remind everyone to state your name before speaking for the transcript - today's call is being recorded. I'll turn the meeting over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Welcome, and as I said, we have a moderately short agenda. Is there anyone who has any comments on the agenda, or would like to add anything? I see no hands, and hearing no-one, I will presume we're accepting the agenda as displayed. The first item is any SOI inputs - at this point, I believe we have received SOIs and conflict of interest statements from everyone, with one possible exception that we're aware of, but if there are any changes, this is an opportunity. I will presume there are none at this point.

The first substantive item is a review of terms of reference. We were due to have approved the terms of reference at the meeting that we cancelled last week, or two weeks ago - whenever it was - due to lack of potential attendance, so that is being deferred. We will look at it right

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.

now to incorporate any future changes, or changes that have been proposed, have one last chance, and we have another meeting scheduled on Monday, and we will formally approve the meeting, approve the terms of reference. Formally approving means it is then passed to Chris, and the Board caucus group for any comments from them, and if there aren't any comments, or following any responses from us, then it will, essentially, I presume, go to the - is it the OEC, Chris? I'm not sure. But anyway, it'll go through whatever approval process, or rejection process, that goes along with us proceeding in our work.

If we could have the document displayed. What was on the screen as I was speaking was just noting that Chris had come back to us with acknowledgement from the Board that the deadline they had sent, clearly, was unreasonable, in that we had not convened at the time we were supposed to have submitted the terms of reference, and acknowledging that we would be submitting it in the early December time frame.

Alright. The only changes from the last version that we've made, are some relatively small changes. I realised last night that there were references in the document to the limited scope proposal, and I realised, among other things, the wrong version was being pointed to. It was a previous version, which had a rather critical typo, which negated something which shouldn't be negated. Currently, I presume with the changes - I haven't had a chance to look at them, but - I presume the changes that I suggested last night, at least my last night, that that part of the document is now accurate.

Jean-Baptiste, I haven't had the chance to look at this document since yesterday - can you take us through the changes right now? That have been made from the last version we viewed - essentially, the changes that are now incorporated that we decided on last time, plus the one you changed, I believe. So, if we can scroll down... Are they accepted, or are they still showing as red lines?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You actually have a clean version and the one with red lines, so I'm just going to [UNKNOWN] the one with red lines.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you could scroll down, just so we can make sure we've captured it correctly.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure. So, the revised [UNKNOWN] changed.

ALAN GREENBERG: And presumably will be changed again once we actually-

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Again. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Part of the objective questions that you can see here. I just hope that everyone can see here, otherwise I'm more than happy to give screen rights to everyone, and I can just mention on which page I am. Maybe that would be easier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Either way.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, okay. So, moving on to page 4 - just a minor on the date change at the bottom of the page. Page 5 - the date. Page 6 - The terms RDDDS (Registration Data Directory Service) and RDS (Registration Directory Service) are often used interchangeably. That's at the bottom, just on top of Deliverable and Timeframes. And - The work-plan is a roadmap towards reaching milestones, and is subject to adjustments as the Review Team progresses through work. This appears at the end of Deliverable and Timeframes on page 6. The timeline, we added subject to change, and if there are any changes in the work-plan, it needs to be reflected here. Data retained by ICANN - deleted on page 7.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that was a sentence that I asked what does it mean, and apparently nobody could figure it out, so we deleted it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. So, I believe before the ccNSO, the members were appearing [UNKNOWN]. Then on page 11 - under Support from ICANN Organisation, the following sentence was added: The commitment in this documents presume appropriate staff support from ICANN Organisation. Should that support, in the view of Review Team Leadership, become an issue, this will be communicated first to the ICANN Organisation staff member designated as the team leader, and then if necessary, to the Board Member participating in this Review team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, for both the review team members and staff - that was not put in in reaction to a known deficiency of our staff support. That was put in as acknowledgement of the fact that the SSR review team has made comments that the specific services they wanted were not being provided - by management decision had not been provided - and I thought that should that ever happen with us, we should have a formal path by which we can ask for something, and not wait for the world to blow up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: In the chat there is a question from Lisa to you, Alan, on one of the comments - Note proposal in Draft Operating Standards, page 22, regarding the replacement and removal of members. Does that still need to be addressed or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, where is that?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That is on the same page, so that's page 11. At the top, there is a comment from you - Note proposal in Draft Operating Standards, page 22, regarding the replacement and removal of members. Lisa is asking whether that still needs to be addressed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm trying to figure out what that means. Hold on. The proposal... I honestly have no idea what that means without going to look at exactly what is on page 22 of the Operating Standards, of the proposed operating standards. Does anyone remember them enough to know what that might be in reference to?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm having a look now...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I try not to write cryptic comments, but that one apparently is. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Lisa Phifer for the transcript. There is a clause that I think you're citing in the Draft Operating Standards, on the removal of review team members, which is very similar to the clause that we have

in the terms of reference. You could have been suggesting that we pick up the draft language from the Operating Standards.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there any substantive difference? Other than perhaps a wording difference?

LISA PHIFER: On a quick look, I do not see a substantive difference, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: [LAUGHTER] Then let's not worry about it.

LISA PHIFER: So we can remove your comment then?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: At least until such time as someone can figure out what it meant, if it meant anything. Alright.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Moving on, page 12, no date... Page 13, where you have this request on the side of Reservations and Agreements. Just after I support the proposal, I'm willing to implement it was deleted.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct. [UNKNOWN] identified, I think.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. On page 14, the last section, which is Reporting - still needs to be agreed/refined by this RT. Then there was some formatting, and on... Just checking on the pages... Under Appendix 1, which is page 18-

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that whole index was added - removed. Removed from the document.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Correct. And then the Scope Table was added for Appendix number 2. That's page 20. Lisa, please?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. Lisa again. So, Alan, I've quickly looked at that section of the Draft Operating Standards we just touched on, and there is one additional sentence which I've put in the chat, which essentially notes that the SO/AC may choose not to nominate a replacement, depending on where you are in your review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. I have no problem adding that. Anyone have any issue with that? It's rather moot, because if the AC or SO chooses not to do something, there's nothing we can do to stop them from doing it, so. But acknowledging it, I have no problem with.

LISA PHIFER: Then, if I might - one other point which is, I know that Appendix 2 has been filled in with the scope table, but the scope table actually has two references to action items that probably need to be deleted as a final version of that scope table.

ALAN GREENBERG: As well as all the [UNKNOWN] reviews.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Now let's go back up to Scope and Mission, which is somewhere, and the changes I made last night. Where is Scope... Anyone know where the reference is to... Did that get moved to the appendix also?

LISA PHIFER: Alan, it's in the appendix, page 18.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. That's right - the version I was looking at was before the move. Correct.

LISA PHIFER: So, I believe you had suggested removing the reference to ICANN Organisation?

ALAN GREENBERG: Right, and also the pointer to the correct proposed reduced scope. And that same document, same reduced scope, was pointed to in the RDS Guidance Document, and I assume that document will have been changed as well.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Oh, and we have Lisa and Susan in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Who goes first? It doesn't matter to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa's hand was up first, we'll honour the queue. [LAUGHTER]

LISA PHIFER: Okay. Thank you - Lisa again. I think we actually need to find a link to where that final version you relayed to us was posted-

ALAN GREENBERG: I put that in the email.

LISA PHIFER: The actual link, not the document itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think- it was an attachment to a page that doesn't seem to have a pointer to it. At least, I couldn't see the pointer on that page, but it is attached at that page. I did go through the process of finding where it was pointing to on the wiki.

LISA PHIFER: Great. We'll find that and make sure we use that link, since that would have been what the GAC and GNSO responded to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I hope- it may or may not, but it did have a typo in it. The version you're pointing to. The version I included in my email had that typo corrected - it was just the word 'not' had to be deleted, because it was a double negative in a sentence.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, I saw that.

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case, I strongly doubt that anyone's going to go back and read these, but should someone pursue them at some point in the future, we should have the correct document. I suspect that even if the people responded to version 3, they would have in their minds made the correction, anyway. The sentence didn't read very well otherwise.

Alright, Susan - please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. Thank you - sorry, it's a little early here, but. So, in the very first sentence - A limited Scope Proposal... developed by ICANN Organisation... at the request of SO/AC leaders. Is that accurate? Because the GNSO basically opposed the limited scope, so, was there a formal call for a limited scope?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, there in fact was, but the words 'by ICANN Organisation' should have been deleted in this version. I see it's still there in that first sentence. Yes, Susan - the sequence was there was a discussion, and I can't remember whether it was just AC/SO Leaders, or the larger Leadership Team, and there was general agreement on that call that the limited scope proposal had merit. It was then- I had originally made that limited scope proposal, and it was then fleshed out in the form we now see, with Margie holding the pen, and I was essentially the one who was working to craft it. That was then presented back the ACs and SOs formally, and that is the time that James presented it to the council, and

there were - and the same with the GAC, and other groups - and there were comments that were against it, but yes. There was general agreement on a teleconference prior to that, that we should consider a reduced scope, and the proposal was developed at that point, after a request to the Chairs.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments on this? At this point, I would rather request anyone who has sufficient time and cares enough to please review the document again. If you find any other details, then please let us know over the weekend, and the intent is to formally approve this at next Monday's meeting. If anyone is not going to be at the meeting - and I'll ask staff to send out a message to that effect, for those that are not on this call - please let us know ahead of time, whether you support or do not support approval of this document.

We are approving it with the full understanding that as we proceed in the review, things may change. We may decide that something we're committed to becomes not a useful use of our time, or conceivably we add something, and obviously, one of the sections is we will add things as appropriate, based on changes that have occurred in the last five years. This will be, to the extent necessary, a living document. We're not foreseeing changes, but that may well happen, so, we're not committing to it in an absolute sense, but this is our best estimate of where we are going, and how we will get there.

I see we have hands from Susan and Lili. Susan, is that an new one?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sorry, old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Lili? Please go ahead.

LILI SUN: Yes. I noticed on the new version of the terms of reference, on (page 9), the nomination from [UNKNOWN] is still absent. Will that have an impact for the new team? I'm not quite sure will [UNKNOWN] be challenged, [UNKNOWN] represented by the whole community?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no requirement that we be fully represented, it's a decision of each AC and SO whether to put people on this group or not. Clearly we don't have people, in this instance, from SSAC or RSSAC on the group, and that's a decision that they made. The ccNSO was aware of our situation, that the terms- we told them what the terms of reference is. There was a misunderstanding - they thought we had already submitted it to the Board, but that was corrected, and we have told them that should they choose to appoint someone, they are welcome to do so. Obviously, the longer they delay, the harder it's going to be to integrate those people, but that's a consideration they have to make.

I recall that all of our work is about gTLD WHOIS, and gTLD RDS, so although ccTLD people may have valid input, or wisdom they can share on the issue, they're not directly affected by our decisions. It's quite reasonable for them not to participate should they chose to. It's their call.

LILI SUN: Okay, I understand. So, we can confirm that there are [UNKNOWN] 11 members in our group here? [UNKNOWN] under work-plans for subgroups, so, please confirm that we only have 11 members?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have 11 members, with Chris Disspain as Board Liaison, taking a lesser role. So, we have 10 regular members, plus the Board Liaison. If a ccNSO chooses to add people, that number will increase, but that will depend on whether they do or not.

LILI SUN: Okay, I understand. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The only change made in the Terms of Reference, was to omit lines showing to be appointed, because there was a statement at the end of the table that essentially said we may add them, we may not. There was a conflict there, because 'to be appointed' implied that they were going to do it, and that was a decision that hadn't been made yet.

Any further comments? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing... Jean-Baptiste.
Please go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, thank you, Alan. I just on your action item to send emails to community members that did not attend Monday's call to find if they approve the new Terms of Reference - I just wanted to point out that they should also confirm whether they approve of the work-plan, or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: At the same time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Now, we had asked, I believe it was Susan, Erika, and Chris to look at the work-plan. Susan - is there anything that we need to review, or, have you made any changes, or Jean-Baptiste, has Alice made any significant changes that require us to look at it at this point, or should we just assume it is basically as previously presented, and we will approve it, again, with the understanding that it could change - it's a living document.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, I haven't made any changes, and I don't think they have. Not that I know of, they haven't.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Chris, in the chat you asked - aren't the ccNSO going to consider appointing? I'm not quite sure when you asked the question, but at this point Katrina knows about our situation, and she has not gotten back yet as to whether a decision has been made or not. I was never actually aware of, I mean, they had said until the scope is decided - and at that point there was still a decision about whether it would be a limited scope or not - I was not really aware of what the decision point was, that is, they would contribute someone if it was limited, but not if it was larger, or visa-versa. I'm not quite sure where we stand right now, other than knowing they haven't made a formal decision, or at least, haven't told us about one.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Alan, it's Chris. I just - my understanding is that they are wanting to appoint, but they are waiting to see the scope so they could, quote, 'find the right people', but I will chase that up and see.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Certainly if they are going to appoint someone, sooner rather than later would be better, because diving in, once we're in the middle of the work, they're going to be less effective.

Alright, next item is subgroup kick-off, and next steps. Jean-Baptiste, I see you have a hand up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, I just want to understand now the plan is [UNKNOWN], do you want us to circulate it as well? Just before the Monday plenary call?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think so. If you're going to send out a reminder to tell people, ask people, if they have any final comments, and to say whether they accept it - distribute it in the same message. It probably makes sense.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, sounds good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we have the matrix up? I'd like to go around the table, and see where we are on each of these. If we could... Yeah, thank you very much. Now I need to enlarge it so I can see it. I believe we have made a decision on Recommendation 10 - Privacy/Proxy Services.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. I'm sorry, I just needed [UNKNOWN] version. Let me check.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I believe Stephanie said she's busy, let Volker do it. I don't know if we had an acknowledgement from Volker that he was willing to take on another one, and this was not a particularly trivial one.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Well, my main problem is that I'm going to be out of [UNKNOWN] for the next month or so, so, depending on how timely you want this to be done, I would not be able to start work before mid-January next year.

ALAN GREENBERG: And, when you say start this, you mean even the preliminary document we're talking about at this point?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Correct. I'll be travelling this weekend, I'll be at the Brussels conference - at the Brussels conference till Monday - have my last day at work here to finish stuff up on Tuesday, then travelling to Japan on Wednesday, then after that I'm travelling [UNKNOWN].

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess we can live with it. I recognise we're going to have to play catch up on that one, and I'm a little worried, because the Privacy/Proxy one is a non-trivial one, but it's also one that you have been heavily involved in, and I don't think you're going to have to do a lot of studying to actually get the work done, and I think that is the case with Stephanie as well. I'm willing to accept that.

VOLKER GREIMANN: [UNKNOWN] maybe Stephanie can do some preparatory work, and I can take over when I'm back.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll convey- okay, Volker's voice is very faint, but I think he said they had agreed to, somehow between the two of them, make sure it was Chaired, and perhaps Stephanie can do some preliminary work before Volker gets back. We'll extend that message to Stephanie, so. Jean-Baptiste, I forgot I was going to ask you this - send a message to Stephanie, pointing out that Volker will not, because of other commitments and because of being on leave, will not be able to address this till - I think you said mid-January? But, to the extent that she can do any work ahead of time - who else is on that team? We also have Cathrin on that also, so if you could send it to all three of them, just so everyone understands, and we'll do our best to recover. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. I was just going to ask - I'm not on that team, but - if you would like me to help just get the ball rolling on the template, I'd be happy to step in and do that, so that we at least get that first pass done, and then we can look at the data gathering and everything, so. I don't know if that's helpful or not, but I'd be willing. I mean, I'm pretty familiar with Privacy/Proxy, and could help on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd certainly be delighted to have you do that, and I'm not going to say no, don't volunteer your time on one additional project, so thank you, Susan, and it'll be duly noted in the matrix, and we will tell the other three members that you are stepping in.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. I'll get something out as a template late today, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Susan. Jean-Baptiste, your hand is up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It's an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa in the chat says to please remember to use the subgroup email list for communications, for transparency. Good idea. Okay, if we can go through the projects one by one, to the extent that we have people on these groups, and I will tell you right now - for the ones that I am leading, I have not done anything yet, but I'm hoping that you'll see something by the end of the weekend.

So, let's go through. The first one we have is Recommendation 1, and that is Cathrin, Carlton, and Volker. Neither Cathrin or Carlton are on the call, so Volker, are you aware of any work that's been done on this one yet?

VOLKER GREIMANN: No, I'm not. There has been no communication [UNKNOWN].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so if we could - Jean-Baptiste, I think probably the easiest way to go through this, is as we're going through them one by one, you can just

put the status, and flag this one as no work done yet. Then, once we've finished it, you can send out a summary to the whole group as to what the status is of each of the proposals.

The next one is being led by - Recommendation 2: Single WHOIS Policy - it's being led by Carlton, and with Cathrin and Thomas on this one. Thomas is the only one on this call - has there been any progress on this one at all?

THOMAS WALDEN: To my knowledge, no. I have to catch up on some emails - I was travelling earlier this week, and I got a little behind, so I haven't really observed anything. Let me review back through all my emails, and I'll get back to you on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm assuming if either Lisa or Jean-Baptiste are aware of anything, they'll speak up, and I don't see a hand up from them, so I'm assuming you're analysis is probably correct.

THOMAS WALDEN: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next one is Outreach. That's one of mine, and as I said, nothing has been done at this point, but it will be done soon. Compliance - is being led by Susan, and where are we on this one?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I sent [UNKNOWN] a draft template, with lots of questions, actually, to I think it's Thomas and Erika also on that - this chart is a little small for my eyes - and so I'm expecting edits and comments back, and hopefully, we may be able to hit the December 12th deadline.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm also on the mailing list - I haven't responded to it either.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I will be, hopefully, trying to catch up on RDS work over the weekend. Data Accuracy - Lili is the lead on that, with Cathrin and Dmitry working on it as well. Lili, where are we on this one?

LILI SUN: Yes, I'm sorry, currently there aren't any updates on this. Yeah, I'll be working on it, and hopefully [UNKNOWN] by next Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent, thank you, Lili. Next one is Privacy/Proxy services - we've already talked about that one, and there is no progress, and Susan has volunteered to do an initial cut at the template. Common Interface is led

by Dmitry, with- Sorry, led by Volker, with me and Susan on that. Volker, where are we on this one?

VOLKER GREIMANN: I've not done anything yet. I think I was waiting for the work to see where we would go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. No work yet. Next one is IDNs, led by Dmitry. Dmitry has said he's sent out emails to Lili and me, who have not responded. Do you have anything further to say?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Yeah, I sent them initially - [UNKNOWN] I hope they'll get the responses from both of you, if possible, and [UNKNOWN] sent a very useful link to, I hope [UNKNOWN], to more or less [UNKNOWN]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Dmitry. Next one is Recommendations 15/16: Plan and Annual Report. The lead on that is Lili again, with Chris and me working on it, and I assume, Lili this is also one that you will be working on, but there has been no progress at this point?

LILI SUN: Yes. For this topic, I believe I will heavily rely on others' templates.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LILI SUN: This is a topic that [UNKNOWN] for the annual report, I would like to speak to [UNKNOWN]. [UNKNOWN] find a way forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Understood. Next one is Topic 2 - Anything New. Stephanie is the lead on that, who is not on this- Oh, Stephanie is on this call now, I see. That one, we are first depending on a report from ICANN Organisation on what is new in terms of policy and processes, and Jean-Baptiste - do we have a report on when we're likely to get that?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Alan, thank you. So, the request is currently being worked on terms, and I've received [UNKNOWN] that they're still working on it, so, I expect that by next week, we should be able to provide you with it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, I assume you're not doing any work on that until you get the document? Or, is that incorrect? I'm not sure if Stephanie can talk or not.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, it's Stephanie. Thanks. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very well.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Good, wonderful. Yes, I have been thinking about it, but I haven't done anything yet. I'm waiting for that report. I must say, for those of us who are watching the continuing story on GDPR, I guess that classifies as something new, we could certainly come up with something on that, because I've just come back from the Berlin group in Paris, from the meeting that they had where ICANN is still on the agenda, and a letter from the Article 29 group has arrived, discussing their views on ICANN's situation, so. That is kind-of what I was thinking was new, that and, of course, the ongoing evolution of what the registrars and registries are putting forward as their compliance models for GDPR. So, I hope that's what you had in mind for the scope for this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, GDPR is an awkward one. We have decided that we are not going to be commenting on things that are in process at the moment, so, you know, the RDS PDP is completely out of our scope, as is GDPR today, but the problem of course is by the time we complete the GDPR will have been, if not addressed, we'll understand it a bit more, so. I think we need to reserve the right to comment on GDPR, but I wouldn't think it should be a focus while things are in flux. I think that- [OVERLAP] I think that goes along with what we had previously decided.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yeah. The problem is that it's a bit of a fast moving train, so, we are stuck on whether or not our work is going to be seen as irrelevant, or we just have a perfunctory note on it. Believe me, I'm not signing up to run a play-by-play commentary on this, that's not what I'm proposing, but, like I said - well, we'll wait and see what ICANN staff proposes as the report on this, but that's what I've been thinking about at the moment. How to distil that down into a [UNKNOWN], not a TV series.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think the expression is a 'running brief' on this, that is, we're going to keep an eye on it - or 'watching brief', sorry - we're going to keep an eye on it, but I don't think that we can do anything, or plan to do anything as the world is moving around us, but since our timeframe overlaps at least with the deadline for fines being invoked, and therefore we can expect things to be changing day by day, at this point. Other than that, remember we're commenting on current, existing RDS WHOIS, and we know the answer to that one, with regards to GDPR is, according to the formal rules, it just doesn't meet the criteria, therefore people are doing ad-hoc things, and I think watching is all we can do at this point. I am expecting a number of non-trivial other things to be identified, partly in response to the earlier WHOIS recommendations, where there was a lot of data gathering, but there's also been a lot of other things that have happened, so. Once we get the summary, I think we'll be in a better state to decide how much work is actually involved in this or not.

Next one is Law Enforcement Needs, and Thomas is running that one. Thomas, where are we on it?

THOMAS WALDEN: As I said, I was travelling earlier this week, so now I'm just starting to sit down and work on this having never done this before. I'm just trying to get my bearings on how to complete this task, and I hope [UNKNOWN], I'll have something out by Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, excellent. Yeah, I think we're all novices at this, so. I don't think there's anything unique in your position.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [LAUGHTER]

ALAN GREENBERG: Consumer Trust is Erika. Erika has not joined on the call - other people who are involved are Dmitry, Stephanie, and Susan. Is anyone in a position to say where we are on it? Nobody? Jean-Baptiste, has there been any email traffic on this one? Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: You're asking about Topic 3: Law Enforcement Needs?

[OVERLAP]

ALAN GREENBERG: Number 4 - Consumer Trust.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I can [UNKNOWN] on that. On Topic Number 4, Erika has been communicating with subgroups, and she has to schedule a call next Tuesday, but apparently it looks like [UNKNOWN] couldn't make it, so it's maybe re-scheduled to Wednesday. This has been discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Safeguard [UNKNOWN]. Safeguard Registrant Data is mine, and again, nothing has been done on that one. The last one is Compliance, led by Susan - that one, I believe we have done some work on, because I've been participating in it. Susan, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, you have. We had a call last Friday, I think, just for a brain-storm, where there were the questions we wanted to look at. I sent out a draft based on that, and then also updated the draft. I've got a couple of comments, but no major revisions, so, I'll take a look at the email threads, and hopefully we can finalise that by Tuesday also.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That one, I think, there are challenges to make sure that what we do is something we can actually deliver on, because it's such a wide open topic, we could spend the next three years on it with a significant percentage of the review team working on it, and I have just a little bit of fear that we'll take off more than we can actually do, but I have faith Susan will not commit to things she can't deliver on. Any further comments on where we are on this matrix.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan - it's Jean-Baptiste, for the record. I'm not sure [UNKNOWN] coming from Lisa, she and Cathrin indicated yesterday on the call, the leadership call, that she was preparing [UNKNOWN] Outreach, Topic 3.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. Okay, so I presume she will share that with Thomas, who is nominally identified as the lead on that. Dmitry, please go ahead.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: If we see that it's hardly possible to finish [UNKNOWN] estimate [UNKNOWN] for the subgroups, the 12th of December, shouldn't we correct the plans to make them more realistic? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was my next item, thank you! It's quite clear we're not going to have this finished by the 12th of December - some of us will barely have started by then, and I don't think we can presume it'll finish... So, the question for the overall group is - what should our target be that's more reasonable? We have, at this point - let's see where we are - we have two weeks before the holiday break, for many of us, and we will be discussing later when the next call is, but it doesn't look like we'll have another call before the end of the year. To make it more interesting, at least a few of us are going to be in Geneva on the week of the 18th, for the IGF meeting there. So, what is a reasonable target?

My feeling is reasonable, in terms of being moderately complete, should be no later than, essentially, the beginning of January. I'm not sure there's a lot of merit in setting a date like the 22nd or 23rd of December, when people may have time to work on it over the holiday break - if they choose to put their time into ICANN, and we should allow them to do that, so. Does that sound like a reasonable target? To say it should be - they should be tied up and really, really ready to go by the first meeting of the year.

Stephanie says this is a very busy time - I can't disagree with that, but I'm not sure I remember any time that wasn't very busy, you know. We've just gone through - well, not just - gone through summer, and usually summer is the quiet time in ICANN, and I haven't seen that quiet time, so.

Lisa points out that the 5th of January is the tentative date for the first [UNKNOWN] review team meeting, and yes, that is what we're going to be saying. Does anyone feel that setting a hard target of the beginning of January is unreasonable? That does assume some work will be done over the next couple of weeks, and over the holiday break, and that's with the understanding that for the ones that Volker is in charge of, if we can't get work done by someone else, we may see a delay on those projects by a few weeks.

I'm not hearing any people objecting, so I'm going to take that as a tacit acceptance that our target will be advised to be, I would say, the 2nd of January, which means we can get it out in a email at least a few days before the meeting. Not hearing any arguments against that. I will take that as being accepted.

Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Alan. Assuming that is the new date that you shoot for, would you like staff, then, to revise the work-plan to show the impact of that on all the other milestones.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I believe so. Maybe we should talk about meeting schedules right now, seeing as we seem to have gone into it slightly. It was under, I believe, we were going to cover it under AOB, but let's talk about it now. The meeting schedule that we have arrived at tentatively, is to hold meetings on consecutive Fridays and Mondays for two weeks. At this point, there will be a meeting perhaps next Monday - we have to decide if we are in fact going to hold it at this point, and so. Effectively what we have is a three hour meeting with a break - the weekend - in-between, every two weeks. That was the best we could do - we could not find a single time that every member could participate. There were hard problems with at least some people in every single time-frame and day that we could identify, so this allows everyone to participate in at least one out of every second meeting.

There is a potential problem that if we do not have - and that's coming up this week - it's not clear that we have sufficient work to keep us busy for the second hour and a half of the split three hour meeting. That will put at a disadvantage people who can only attend Monday meetings, but I think we're going to have to live with that for at least the next month or two, and see how it works out. I'm assuming once we get past

this first phase of this work plan, we will have more work to do, and if indeed work is proceeding in the background, then if we cancel meetings, so be it. We may choose to, if we know ahead of time that we don't have three hours worth of work, we may choose to cancel the Friday meeting, and hold the Monday meeting instead, so that we give people equal opportunity to participate.

That being said, the next meeting would be, if we look at the schedule - there's really no opportunity to hold another one in December, because the next meeting would be on the 22nd, and then on the 25th, and that's clearly not going to happen. So, the next meeting we're looking at is on January 5th, for the Friday meeting, and the 8th for the corresponding Monday meeting. We'll send - if we haven't already - unless there's any strong objection, we'll send out a message with an invitation for those meetings. Not hearing any comments or complaints, we'll assume that that is agreeable.

The next topic is the face-to-face meeting at ICANN61. At this point, if we're going to add travellers to the ICANN61 schedule, we need to do it pretty soon, and similarly for rooms. My position is there is- I am already doubly committed on the Friday preceding the meeting, and on the Friday following the meeting, I'm committed in the morning at this point, so. If I'm to participate in it, it would have to be on the Thursday prior to ICANN, with a gap in-between the next meeting for most people, or starting on Friday afternoon/Saturday, at the end of the meeting, and I find that a little bit problematic in that at the end of an ICANN meeting is not the best time to get people to have energy and focus, but I'd like to open the floor to other people for comments on whether we schedule something at ICANN61 or not. The alternative is,

based on where we are and the work-plan, where we decided on the work-plan at the beginning of January, to schedule a meeting relatively soon, perhaps towards the end of February, somewhere else, or defer till after the ICANN meeting and hold a face-to-face. There is a cost difference in whether we hold it at an ICANN meeting or somewhere else, in that about four of the travellers, four to five of the travellers, are funded to go to ICANN meetings, and would have to be separately funded if they go to other meetings. Plus, I believe, we have to pay for staff travel in some of the cases. But, the balancing part is where we hold the meeting, the travelling costs may in fact be lower on a per person basis. Comments? Chris, I know you have constraints also, and I wonder if you'd weigh in, but then I'd also like to hear from anyone else on the review team. Do we have Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

You do. I'm sorry, I was just typing into the chat. Look, I get the budget issues - I mean, I'm on the Board, I deal with them every day - but frankly, the useful time of trying to stuff a review team meeting into the beginning or end of an ICANN meeting strikes me as being nonsense. It's very hard to do, if you do it at the end, everybody's pretty much had enough by the time it comes to it, and if you try to do it at the beginning, you're just making life more difficult for those of us who have to stick around for the ICANN meeting. I think we can do it fairly, and well, within a budget, if we choose the right place to have the meeting, and the right time to have the meeting, and I also think we will get a bigger bang for our buck if we actually get together for a concentrated period of, you know, whatever it is, two or three days, without having all

the other stuff that goes on around ICANN meetings on our mind. That's just my personal view.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Chris. The other aspect of it is, from any of us that are actively involved in ICANN - the week, or two weeks, before an ICANN meeting, the prep work, is just horrendous. That means we would not be focusing- well, it means something would lose out - either our prep for the ICANN meeting, or the prep for the face-to-face review team meeting, and that I also find is a negative. What I'm hearing is, when we go over budget, it's Chris who'll be willing to speak on our behalf to increase the budget. [LAUGHTER]

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Is that what you're hearing? Really? [LAUGHTER] I'm very impressed that you heard that, I don't recall saying it.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS:

[LAUGHTER]

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, you didn't, but it was between the lines.

CHRIS DISSPLAIN:

What I said was I think we can do it within our budget, if we can, so. That's what I said.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if we don't, you'll be willing to ask for more money on our behalf! The two clearly go together, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPLAIN: Yes, of course they do, Alan. If you say so.

ALAN GREENBERG: [LAUGHTER] Does anyone else have any thoughts or comments at this point? That doesn't mean we don't necessarily hold one in the June meeting, but I think if we do, we're going to have to plan way ahead of time, and make sure that we can work around the conflicts, if indeed we decided it is warranted. Now, at some point, we are also, however, going to have meet with the ICANN community, once we have something to talk about, and at that point we obviously will have to show up at an ICANN meeting, whether we have a face-to-face associated with it or not. I'm not sure we're allowed to complete our report without ever talking to anyone. [LAUGHTER] That's a joke, for the record. Would anyone like to speak against, or for, trying to hold a meeting at Puerto Rico? Lisa, you've been typing a number of things into the chat - is any of we need to focus on in this discussion, or is it something else? Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: It is something else, Alan. As we jumped over slide 7, I was just referring back to it to make sure people recognised what was on their wiki pages.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. Then we'll go back to slide 7 in a minute, because we can't scroll right now. Okay, then we'll take this as a decision that we will not be holding a face-to-face at the Puerto Rico meeting, and we will reconsider as we go forward how we do this. The leadership team, along with staff, is developing some cost models, so we will have some quantitative numbers to present to the group going forward, as to what relative things will cost.

If we could go back to slide 7, that Lisa is referring to?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, Alan - would it be possible to have a confirmation of who on the review team is receiving funding from other sources? Just that it will help [UNKNOWN].

ALAN GREENBERG: It will... I thought as of the meeting yesterday we know who that is? Was there still some question? For the coming year, I am funded for ICANN meetings, Chris is funded, Susan is funded, Stephanie I believe is funded, and Erika. Is that correct? Susan came up with the names of who was on the GNSO council this coming year, and I think it was Erika, Stephanie, and Susan. That was discussed at the leadership meeting yesterday, I believe.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Pefect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and Thomas does not accept ICANN funds. I'm presuming everyone else will accept ICANN funds, and will require them? If someone else would like to volunteer to self-fund, then that's quite fine, but I don't think we can presume it.

LILI SUN: [UNKNOWN] I remember a [UNKNOWN] mentioned for [UNKNOWN] ICANN meetings were funded by [UNKNOWN] agency.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry - who was that?

LILI SUN: Cathrin.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, you're correct. Cathrin for ICANN meetings is self-funded. You're right. Thank you, Lili, I forgot that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Lili.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Where are we on the agenda? Oh, sorry - we were going to go back to slide 7, and Lisa wanted to talk about that. Please go ahead, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Alan. Just briefly, I want to make sure that all review team members are aware of what they have already on their subgroup wiki page, so. This is just an example here of the first subgroup that is looking at Recommendation 1: Strategic Priority. You'll see the objectives text - that is what you copy into your first work-plan document under objectives, and I believe Jean-Baptiste has already circulated templates with that pre-populated for you. Then you'll see, under Background Documents, we've [UNKNOWN] to assemble hyper-links to documents that were cited in your briefing slides, to make it easier for you to locate at least those resources as you begin to assemble the data needed for your subgroup.

Over on the right, of course, there's the list of members and the leader of the group, as well as any observers that have [UNKNOWN] that they want to follow your particular subgroup, and a link to your mailing list archives - and that is a very quick way to find out whether there has been any discussion in your subgroup, so I do encourage you to follow that link if you're not quite sure if your group got started, or what it's done recently.

Then I just wanted to point out, under subgroup documents - that I where any output that you produce, including however you end up fleshing out your first pass work-plan, will be posted. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Lisa. You've done a significant part of the work that we has assigned to each of these groups - I'm tempted to ask you to simply

complete the rest of the template for us all, but I think that might be not appropriate. [LAUGHTER] That again was an attempt at humour.

It's noted in the chat that when we say people are funded for ICANN meetings, that of course means funded for the formal part of the ICANN meeting. If we are holding a face-to-face meeting, prior to or after a meeting, there will be additional days of hotel and per diem that would have to be covered by the review team.

Is there anything else? I think we are down to any other business. The only other business item is - do we hold the scheduled meeting on Monday? We have been talking about having the GDPR meeting on Monday, however we have now heard back from Theresa Swinehart who will be giving it, saying number one, she doesn't think it's going to be that much longer than a relatively short briefing, because most of the information is already public and on the wiki. She would be prepared to do it, but she believes it would be more effective to do it in January, because things are changing quick enough, that there may be something much more substantive to discuss at that point, rather than trying to do it this coming Monday. If that is indeed the case - number one, if it was held on Monday, it wouldn't be very long, and I don't think, given the status of where we are on the various work-teams, that there's going to be anything significant to discuss. We may well have drafts or templates, but they're going to have to be refined by those subgroups.

At this point I don't have a lot that we would cover on Monday, but I'd like to open the floor to is there any reason that we need to hold the Monday meeting at this point? The down side of holding our meetings on adjacent work-days, is that we may well be in this position on

occasion. Do I see any recommendations that we hold the meeting on Monday, or any items for the agenda? At this point, the agenda is effectively empty.

Lisa says - is the Monday meeting open for the adoption of the work-plan, and Terms of Reference, and the answer is in theory, yes, but if that's the only reason to hold the meeting, I'm willing to do a consensus call via email at this point. I can't see trying to convene a meeting of 15 people, or so, just to have a five minute discussion on 'do we accept it, yes or no', when at this point the documents have been open for discussion for a long time, with relatively little input on them.

I would say that we cancel the meeting, and we change the action item to 'ask people to bring input to the meeting', to instead, I will take on that action item and request that people provide input. I will probably give them another day or two past Monday, but essentially by the middle of next week that we have it approved, or Tuesday of next week, that we have it approved, and can pass it on to Chris for discussion with the Board Causus group. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank, Alan. Lisa again. Just a quick question - so if anyone does raise substantive concern with the Terms of Reference or with the work-plan, how would that be dealt with?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm not expecting it, but I won't be surprised if I have one or two editorial comments, so I will phrase it subject to minor editorial

comments, that... does anyone agree- sorry, I don't draft things well on the fly, but I'll try to come up with some wording that will cover that, and hopefully even if people have substantive changes, that we'll be able to get it done well before the end of next week. I leave for Geneva on Friday, and I don't plan to have anything on my to-do list with respect to that by then. The date that we turn it over to Chris may well be deferred by a few days, but I... Nobody has had any input at this point, in the last month, other than me, so. I'm not foreseeing a significant problem there. I understand it does add a slight amount of potential for a problem, but at this point, I think we'll be able to handle it, one way or another. If you can handle that level of uncertainty, I'm willing to. I haven't heard Chris object to that - Chris, are you going to be in Geneva, by the way?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, Alan, I am, and there's no objection from me towards what you were saying with respect to the [UNKNOWN].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I think I'll send out a message shortly after this meeting, and we'll cover it from there. Any further comments for the any other business? If I could ask Jean-Baptiste to review Decisions and Action Items, please?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, sorry, Alan - I was on mute. So, on the decisions reached - the plenary call agenda, we've agreed to hold meetings on Monday and

Friday every two weeks. If the agenda does not require two plenary calls, one out of two will be cancelled. The next plenary calls are scheduled for January 5th, and 8th, the review team will not be holding a face-to-face at ICANN61, and the plenary next Monday is cancelled.

On action items, so on Terms of Reference, the topic Replacement and Removal of Members, we'll add the text from Operating Standards. On page 18, the first paragraph, we will delete the sentence 'by ICANN Organisation'. We'll update the hyperlink to the final version of Limited Scope Proposal. We'll update the table in Appendix 2 to remove reference to actions and the green highlighted comments in the right-most column. [UNKNOWN] send a message to review team members not on the call today to review the Terms of Reference, and send any last edits or comments to the list. ICANN org to invite review team members not attending Monday's call - well, this will change, naturally - to confirm whether they approve the Terms of Reference and work-plan. ICANN org to send out an email to the Recommendation 10 subgroup, pointing out that Volker will not be able to address the issue until mid-January, and that Susan has volunteered to join the subgroup, and we'll update the subgroup matrix. Also, Susan has been added already to the mailing list.

Then, the subgroup status, I will share via email, together with the updated matrix. The new deadline to submit subgroup first-pass working documents will be January 2nd, 2018, so that's a hard deadline, and ICANN Org will update the Terms of Reference and work-plan, taking into account this new deadline. The Terms of Reference and work-plan is to be approved by Tuesday, via email.

Susan, I see your hand is raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Lisa has a comment in the chat that I'll answer after Susan. Susan, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, so I was just going to suggest that if we're cancelling Monday's meeting, that the subteams who haven't been able to find time to meet - maybe they use that time and, or at least, via email, try to get their first-pass [UNKNOWN].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Susan. We did discuss that at the leadership meeting yesterday, and I forgot about it completely. Why don't we say that the review team plenary call is cancelled, but the time will be held available if any of the subteams indicate they want to use it. So, the subteam teleconference may be held at the same time as the meeting would have been held, if anyone indicates prior to Monday, which doesn't give us an awful lot of time to indicate that it should be held. Does that sound reasonable to Susan, and staff?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. It's just a suggestion, you know, if anybody was looking for time to meet, then, that might be helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, since most people would have hopefully blocked out the time already. Yes, thank you - we did discuss that, but I forgot. Lisa, your question on the chat for a consensus call, in my mind in any case - if someone does not respond, they are agreeing. All they are required to do is indicate their not-agreement if they are disagreeing, or have any changes. In the absence of any disagreement, people are deemed to have agreed. I will make that clear in my message. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sorry, old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any further any other business? Then, 12 minutes ahead of schedule, I'll call this meeting to an end. Thank you, all. To the extent that we're not [UNKNOWN] before the holidays - everyone have a great holiday season, and we'll reconvene at the beginning of the year. But I suspect I will be talking to at least some of you, electronically if not otherwise. Bye!

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [THANK YOUS AND FAREWELLS]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]