EN

BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you. Good day, and welcome everyone to the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team Plenary Call #14 on January 5, 2018 at 13:30 UTC.
	In attendance today we have Alan Greenberg, Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, Chris Disspain, Susan Kawaguchi, Lili Sun. From – excuse me, we have no observers joining us at this time. From ICANN Organization, we have Alice Jansen, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, Lisa Phifer, and myself, Brenda Brewer. We have apologies from Dimitry, Volker, Thomas, Carlton, and Trang.
	I'd like to remind everyone to please 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. And next slide. Thank you. You have on the screen the agenda, and it was sent out. Does anyone have any updates to the agenda or Any Other Business they'd like to add? Nothing? Then we will accept the agenda as presented and go on to the first item. And that's the review of terms of reference and work plan. The terms of reference are currently with the Board caucus group, and I'm told we will have answers by Tuesday, I believe.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	In time for the next call I think, Alan, is the answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh. Well, next call is Monday.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, I'm sorry, in time for the [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Since that's two weeks away, I'm hoping that you'll perhaps send something by e-mail in the interim.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, sorry. Yes. Sorry. My apologies. Yes. I had asked to get the feedback from the caucus group by – oh, I can't remember now – next Wednesday or Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think you had said Tuesday, but maybe Wednesday.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. Whatever. And I will then put it together in some semblance of – if there is any – sense and get it back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That implies the answer to my next question of, "Do you have any preliminary input you can provide at this point?" Unofficial, off the record, whatever.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Let me see if I can – yes, let me see. Off the record, on the basis that this call is recorded.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you're not committed to standing by it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, that's very true. No, I don't. I have some input from some Board members which appears to be perhaps best described as not particularly useful, on the basis that it is based on a misunderstanding of what their [inaudible] is supposed to be commenting on. So no [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That gives us a warm and fuzzy feeling. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Exactly. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And the work plan clearly is out of date based on what we're going to be talking about later on today. Jean-Baptiste, is there anything else, or at least anything else to add on either of these items? I'll take silence as being no.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, I was on mute. Not on my side, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then we will go on to the next agenda item, subgroup status and next steps. We have – I guess we should get up the next slide, please, so we can look at where we are today. Now, at this point – and this is on the first pass which was just trying to summarize what the work was going to be involved, not doing the work, of the 14 projects. I think the number is 14.

We have four of them that are marked as complete, that is a document was created, the other people on the team either updated it or have said that they're happy with it as it is. We have another six of them that have had some level of work done on them but are not complete, and we have four that we have heard nothing on.

What I'd like to do is, to the extent that we can, have people go over their – the ones they're responsible for, and just briefly outline where we are on them. And we have a relatively complex chart, which I'm sure [one] is not able to read, but it has been sent via e-mail. And I see Cathrin has her hand up. Sorry, I didn't notice. Go ahead, Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Alan. And I just put it up. I'm one of the delinquent ones, because I have to deliver a legislative project by tonight, but I have started, and I should be able to share mine with the group by this weekend, probably end of the weekend. The complexity for mine – [a few] will not be surprised to hear – is fairly low, so I'm estimating that there won't be much work to follow after the first pass, in fact, and that one person is probably enough to complete that.

But in any case, I'm hoping to share it for comments with Carlton and Volker by the end of the weekend, and then once Volker comes back from his parental leave, he can comment and then we can finalize. But my apologies for the delay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cathrin. Well, I'll go first, I guess. The first item that is completed – for someone who's on the call, or at least [in work for] someone's on the call, is the outreach one. There's been a lot of work done on that, and there are numerous somewhat overlapping ICANN documents, and I think our task at this point really is to look at all those documents and comment to what extent they meet the goals of the original recommendation, that is we should reach out to registrants and others and make sure that they have the ability to understand what the policies are since the policies are not grouped in a single place at this point, nor are they particularly clear.

This task was, "Can we put in plain language things that registrants need to know?" And my gut feel is we're going to find out, A, there's a lot of overlap and not necessarily a lot of cohesiveness in how these have been produced, but there's lots of information out there. So that's where I think we're going, and I don't see it as a huge task to do the work, but really, we're going to need a number of people to read all the documents and think about them, and decide that if you were a plain registrant, are you in a good position to understand what's going on? And I'm not quite sure what the answer is going to be, but I think that's the summary of where we are right now. It's not going to be a particularly onerous task. Perhaps slightly tedious, however.

Lisa – Cathrin, is that a new hand or an old? I'll assume it's an old hand. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Two questions, Alan. One is in the outreach document that you provided, you listed materials that you intended to review. I noticed that one thing that wasn't listed there was the WHOIS portal, which I believe a big section of that portal was created to provide a basic description of WHOIS that would be suitable for registrants as well as others. So you may consider that as one of your inputs.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will consider it as input. I will ask you, if you can edit, then please do.

LISA PHIFER: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: It wasn't intentional. I put together the list of what I remembered, and you're right, I forgot perhaps one of the most obvious ones, that I think will yield some more overlap.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, no doubt. But in terms of encompassing all the efforts for outreach, that was a significant one. And then the other question I had for you was under briefings requested and interviews and independent experts. Your document simply didn't have anything there. Does that mean you

don't envision a need for briefings or interviews or an outside expert to look into this, or just that you haven't considered that yet?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we're going to need any outside experts. I think we have enough people in this group who are not domain professionals that we should be able to do the work ourselves. We may well end up asking some questions and stuff, but there was nothing that was definitive at this point.

One of the problems that I'm foreseeing – not problems with difficulty but problems with the content – is they have effectively been created by three different groups, and it's quite unclear just how much consultation and cooperation there has been between these different groups. That's what makes it more interesting, I think. But I don't think there is particularly a challenge. It's highlighted by the RAA having two different documents it points to with very similar titles and content.

Alright. Next item is Susan and compliance. Susan, when you're doing this, if you could identify to the extent possible how this part of compliance relates to the major one at the end, topic number six – are you foreseeing that we will have follow-on recommendations in this one, or do you think any group will fall under the new compliance item?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'm having a hard time finding my document, as usual. But we haven't completed the template for the WHOIS Recommendation 4 yet. So your question was – state your question again, I'm sorry. It's [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: The question you can answer at the end, and maybe when we talk about six at the bottom. I was just curious, are you envisioning that we might have follow-on recommendations to the specific items listed here, or that they would end up being put into the envelope item at the end of anything we're talking about compliance? It's not important, I was just curious.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. I would imagine – I can't really say at this point, but if we see a large gap with Recommendation 4 in the implementation of that and the results that may have been expected by the first WHOIS Review Team, then I could see us doing a follow-on recommendation.

Some of the questions that we have in our draft template is if the current reports provide the details described above in the scope objectives, and are the records transparent? Any other details we should recommend including in our report? I would think that right there, if Compliance isn't being transparent enough, or things have changed enough that additional details need to be included, that might be a new recommendation.

"Is the current appointment of a senior executive appropriate? Who does this person report to? There's a lot of controversy about that. And then which Board members are currently on the subcommittee? Do the Board members have the relevant experience? Interview Board members to ensure they do have the relevant experience." I'm sure they would love that.

This is the draft. "Any conflicts of interest? Does the Compliance team have all the necessary resources to continue to implement Recommendation 4?" I think this is a really important one: "What processes and technology have been implemented since 2012?" I think a lot has changed for Compliance since 2012 in that area, so I envision quite a bit of work done around that. And then how the gTLD program has impacted Compliance. So we have a list of questions in there.

And let me see. I'm just trying to remind myself of what we did in December. So we would want to review all the relevant reports provided by the staff, and then interviews to be conducted, senior executives for compliance, interview all management on Compliance team who manage WHOIS-related actions, and then interview team members who work on WHOIS-related actions, and interview the Board subcommittee.

So we don't see a need for independent experts, but until we conduct our investigation, we don't really know. It's really sitting down and looking at the scope of Recommendation 4 and talking to the Compliance team, several members of management on the Compliance team.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you've outlined what sounds like our first really major amount of work that we're talking about so far in this project.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, but I also feel like because I think I also have subgroup seven, which is Compliance, that I can get – I'm not sure that we match up completely with numbers, but some of this is overlapped. So investigating Recommendation 4, we could also get some of the answers for compliance for subgroup seven.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any comments on this? Thank you, Susan, for that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: No problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Susan, I'd like to thank you for outlining some of the briefings that you might need and some of the interviews that you envision, because that does help ICANN Org understand what follow-up actions will be needed to support this group. So I just wanted to really acknowledge that, and hope that we can seek that kind of input from other groups that have meaty work to do.

I was wondering, based on your initial discussions about this recommendation and also about the topic on compliance, if you see it useful to have them as distinctly separate or would suggest that there is

enough overlap that they should be possibly handled by a single subgroup.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's a good question, and I think we sort of talked about that in Brussels, didn't we? Or did we not? I feel like maybe I thought about that. I think – I'm just looking at the numbers too, and I'm also using those wrong. I guess I'm topic seven and subgroup six.

I don't know. We could give that some thought. There are definitely different members between the team. Some overlap. Look like Erika Mann [inaudible]. So Thomas Walden is on Compliance Recommendation 4, and Erika Mann and I. So there's overlap, Thomas is the only one that does not overlap, it looks like.

But I think we will be interviewing some of the same Compliance management team. the difference – and sort of going out of order here, if I speak to just the subgroup six topic seven – is that we'd also be reaching out to the community and asking questions, and then taking action or investigating farther, reviewing more in-depth based on that community input, and maybe that's appropriate also for Recommendation 4. I'm not sure. So I don't know, what would you recommend?

LISA PHIFER: I think when we put together these subgroups, they were specifically for the first pass work planning, and knowing that we might adjust group size and composition based on some of that planning. And just listening

to you go through that, my impression would be that it would be helpful to have a single subgroup responsible for both of those items that are within scope of the review team so that you don't duplicate efforts, and maximize the time that you have available from team members. Even if the outputs for those two scope items are distinctly separate, having the same set of people work on them together just sounds like it makes sense.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. And just in reviewing both of these documents now, that does make a lot of sense. I would be fine if that's what the review team thinks we should do. I would be fine merging those two.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess when I look at most of the work we're doing, a fair number of them are going to be relatively cursory. They'll require some reading. And recall, for everything in the past recommendations, ICANN Org has said – they've all ticked them off with a green tick mark that everything is done. So hopefully, we're going to find for a fair number of those that indeed, the work is done. And I suspect for the compliance parts as well.

But there are relatively few items that we know at this point are going to be really substantive and take significant effort to do, and compliance both in the evaluation of Rec 4 and the new item I think fall in that category. So I think it's quite reasonable if we end up exceeding the size of the team that you're suggesting right now, because right now you're suggesting three people. And I think this is going to be a fair amount of

the meat of what we're doing in this overall review. And we may well want a larger group and try to figure out how we use these people effectively.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, that makes sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments on this item? Lisa points out the five is identify for the Compliance topic subgroup. So if indeed we have the same group, then we've just effectively done what I just said. But we also are going to have to make sure that the other work goes to other people to make sure we're balancing the workload to at least some extent. Susan, I'm not sure we'll be able to balance the workload for you at all.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lili, are you in a position to tell us where you are on the data accuracy ones?

LILI SUN: First of all, I apologize, I only submitted the first part planning document today, so I'm not sure whether Cathrin had a chance to review it yet. And actually, the data accuracy I found this topic very interesting. Yes, I agree with you, Alan. According to ICANN Org, all the recommendations

have been implemented, but when it comes to the term accuracy, when I read through the final report of the first WHOIS Review Team, I found there are two [progressive] meaning of the accuracy, [inaudible] is accurate, and the other is about the reliable.

I understand that a lot of effort has been put to improve the accuracy, including the syntax accuracy and the operability accuracy. My impression is that a lot of efforts [or] we are mainly focused on the syntax accuracy, but I'm not sure whether this is what we are really looking for. So I put the question in the first part planning document about the implementation progress of the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification in 2013 RAA, and I remember during the ICANN57 in Hyderabad, there is actually this specification, the implementation of this specification is still ongoing. And during that time, [inaudible] discussing about a strawman proposal how to cross-validate with a postal address. So I will go through the briefing report to [inaudible] the implementation progress to answer this question.

The second question I've put in the planning document is about progress of the WHOIS accuracy reporting system. I understand that this project is to take [proactive] [inaudible] to identify the potentially inaccurate WHOIS data. So I'm curious about how this project can validate the operability accuracy of the WHOIS data.

And also, I've put the [third] question as [accurate range] of the WHOIS data, which under privacy and proxy services. I didn't see any like conclusions in the briefing reports about this topic.

And the fourth question is the final conclusion about [inaudible], which have been taken effectively and achieved the objectives of the Recommendations 5-9.

So I've put the four questions to answer in this topic review, and I've put the complexity of this topic as [gray,] and the workload at four, and I think we should put – the ideal subteam five is [five,] we should put registrar, registry, registrant, and the ICANN Implementation team, and also law enforcement agencies, [inaudible] in the review. So that's all from my side. Yes, I'll be waiting for the other subgroup members' comments on this first part planning document, and to identify the way forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lili, and –

LILI SUN: That's it, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Clearly, this is the other one that has real substance in it and will require a fair amount of work. How many people did you estimate to work on this project?

LILI SUN: I identified five so far.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Good, we potentially therefore have taken the team of ten and divided them in five and five between the substantive projects. I suspect there is a significant amount of overlap between those perhaps. Any comments? Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. Lili, thanks for that overview. You mentioned that you looked at the implementation briefing and identified a potential gap. I was wondering if you looked at the materials that were listed on the subgroup page and also determined whether you might need additional materials. The reason that I ask this is the sooner that we know what materials you need and when there are gaps, the better prepared we can be to support that request.

LILI SUN: Yes. So far, I need to go through the report, the PDF document, carefully, and to identify whether I need further materials. But at present, I couldn't come up with any requests from ICANN Org for that topic.

LISA PHIFER: And a follow-up, you may find if you visit the subgroup wiki page there are hyperlinks to at least the key documents that were referenced in the [inaudible].

LILI SUN: Yes. I understand.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, and that may provide you a quick way to navigate to all of those when you get to that point. Thank you.

LILI SUN: Okay. I'll keep on updating this first part planning document. Once I identified any further materials I need, I will let ICANN staff know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any further comments? Alright, who is the next one? I've lost track of where we are, and I can't find the right document.

                        Data accuracy. Volker is the next one, he is not here.

LILI SUN: Volker is not here.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Dimitry is not here, and the next one is Lili. WHOIS Recommendations 15, 16, plan and annual reports.

LILI SUN: Okay. Yes, Alan, I received your comments on the first part planning document, and I agree with you. And yes, actually, for this topic it's really summarized [all] the conclusions of other subgroups. So I would defer this topic work until we have some conclusions from other subgroups.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: And indeed this one will be an interesting one. To the extent that we find there are things that we do not believe are complete, it's interesting to think about, what are we going to recommend to the ICANN Board to address the issue? Assuming it happens. We haven't decided that yet, that there are items that ICANN staff deemed to be complete and we believe are not complete. So it'd be interesting as we go forward to think about just what we're going to recommend and how do we phrase it, and what action can one take. But maybe it won't happen.

Next item is – anything new, Stephanie? And Stephanie is not with us. Law enforcement needs, Thomas. Thomas is not with us. Consumer trust, Erika. Erika is not with us. Safeguard registrant data, Alan.

This one at the moment is relatively simple. Basically, [isn't] anything safeguarded? And it's an easy conclusion. The more challenging question is going to be an item that we have a little bit later in the agenda, of, exactly what are we reviewing? Are we reviewing WHOIS as it was the day we convened, or are we reviewing WHOIS essentially at the time we finalize our recommendations?

The difference of course being by the time we get there, we will have implemented some sort of interim GDPR. We have taken some action, let us say, in regard to GDPR. And that almost certainly will alter to what extent we safeguard data. So one of the questions we're going to have to determine going forward is, what target are we working towards?

And that will change this item from potentially something which is trivial to do to something which has a fair amount more substance to it. So I'm not sure we can really comment on it, but I see Chris has his hand up, so I'll turn it over to him.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. Thank you, Alan. So you've got to draw a line somewhere, right? I mean anything that you are reviewing that is changing all the time, and aspects of WHOIS is changing all the time, including for example new data coming in and so on. You could continue to review. I don't see how we as a review team could possibly hope to review GDPR, nor do I think there's a huge amount of value in reviewing what we all accept is highly likely to be an interim measure in respect to GDPR.

If it wasn't an interim measure, if it was a final measure, then it would need to be in place for a while before you could sensibly review it. It's a bit like saying, "Can we review where the current PDP is?" The answer is no, not really, because what's the use of that? It doesn't achieve anything.

So I suppose what I'm saying is I think the adjustment that might need to be made in respect to the review would be to exclude things because they are changing, possibly, and to caveat everything that needs to be caveated with a sort of overarching point that these things may change. But I can't see how we as a team could successfully hope to review what happens in GDPR. But maybe others have a different view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Chris. Let me give you the counter version. If we're going to be reviewing purely what things were prior to any GDPR action, then why are we wasting the ink to print [this]? Even if it's digitally, because clearly, it has no merit whatsoever. And doesn't –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: What an exceptionally good question.

ALAN GREENBERG: One could ask that about the whole report, but I'm not doing that today.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, I agree. I don't really know what else to say, I agree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not knowing what the interim solutions are, I think it will be safe to say that we will be doing a better job at protecting people's data, i.e. protecting their privacy, because I think the two map together. With an interim solution than we are today with the current WHOIS.

I'm not sure that we're going to need to go into it in a lot more detail than that, because it is an interim solution, number one, or it almost surely will be an interim solution. And number two, it's the privacy commissioners who actually at some level have to say, "Is that sufficient or not?"

So I don't think we can ignore the fact that there are changes going on, but I'm not sure how substantive we want to do an analysis of whether they're effective or not, because it almost surely will change again before anything [happens.]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Which I think is my point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. So I think the answer is we can't be ostriches and stick our heads in the sand and pretend nothing is happening. On the other hand, I don't think there's going to be a huge amount to substantively analyze at that point. And Cathrin has a +1. Thank you, Cathrin. But to simply say, "No, everything is frozen," I've got better things to do with my life than review something which has absolutely no merit whatsoever.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Next item is compliance. I'm not sure there's really a lot to add. Clearly, it's a different work, and one of my concerns in the compliance area is this potentially could be an unending amount of work with a lot of physical in-person time in Los Angeles. And I'm a little bit concerned about the resources that we're going to have to put into this to do it property. But I'll turn it over to Susan who's our expert.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Not sure I'm an expert in this area, but I definitely have experience with compliance.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're the leader, not the expert.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, exactly. So I do envision a face-to-face meeting with Compliance. A subgroup did that on the first review team, and it was very enlightening. So I haven't given that a whole lot of thought, and it could be that maybe we look at this… members of the group can figure out who's going to be… we have several counselors, and so we'll be in L.A. at the end of the month. Maybe we can start some of our findings there with some interviews without the whole subgroup team flying in. Maybe we could do some on the ground in L.A. and then some remote on the phone. So I haven't really figured that out. For this compliance work, I do think we need another call maybe, subgroup call to flesh out exactly how we're going to answer some of the questions we had posed.

But in general, the Compliance team obviously manages all kinds of compliance issues. We're just looking at a subset of that, just the WHOIS, and now that could fall into – may result in other compliance issues. But like a current one that just came up recently, [inaudible] that GoDaddy and port [inaudible] does not provide access to Port 43 in the way that I read the requirement, and it's severely limited. And if you don't switch IP addresses continually, then you're blocked. And so it

would be interesting to use that as a question to the Compliance team and ask why is this allowed, especially with such a large registrar and a member of the community. I mean, GoDaddy usually does the right thing in my opinion, so I was a little surprised by running into this roadblock. But we could use actual examples of real life situations going on in the WHOIS world and ask specific questions, maybe they couldn't address the GoDaddy situation itself, but we could broaden that and make that a generic question, "What do you do when this happens?" and review that.

So I think we have a little bit more work to do on a plan, but definitely some face-to-face time will be necessary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris said, "Just checking who is going to be in L.A. at the end of January." I would assume it is Susan, Stephanie, Volker. I'm not sure who is still on Council this year and who isn't, so I'm not quite sure.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, Volker is not on Council.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Erika I think is though.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Erika. So Stephanie and I and Erika will be there. And then I'm not sure. Then it goes into the non-contracted parties house intersessional. They may have some others there also at the second part of the week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'm not sure about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, okay. So off list I'll send you my dates that I'll be there, Susan, and if we can catch up, that would be great.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: When is that? Which week is that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get in on the 31st of January. You guys [inaudible].

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, I think I fly in on the 28th.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so it's the first half.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: But then I'm there all week.

ALAN GREENBERG: So it's the first half and then second half of that week?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Mm-hmm.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, let's keep in touch as that goes on. We may have one or two other people, and I may be among them, who if there's going to be substantive discussions with Compliance, it might be worthwhile adding one or two people if that's appropriate.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, thank you. Any further questions for Susan on this item? This is the last item in the review.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Well, actually, I don't know. Did anybody have questions? I'm not looking at the…

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. I've been sort of watching.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Oh, Lisa has her hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Just quickly: Susan, one of the things that staff did to prepare for today's call was look at the requested materials and make sure that they're all on the wiki for each subgroup. But I felt that under this item maybe one or two of these were not already on your wiki. The CCT review report, of course, is available at least in draft form and a number of Compliance reports are linked to your subgroup's wiki.

Do you feel that there are [inaccuracy] reports that have not been provided to you? And could you give us a little bit more description of what you want that's not there? As well as I think that your last item reviewing registrars that have failed to adhere to the process you may be looking for something more than is currently available. But basically

I'm looking for feedback on what here do you think is not available to you already.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'd love to go back over it on the inaccuracy reports, but I just get the – I have an issue with the Compliance reports often in that they're not granular enough to really make an assessment of anything. From a high level, they're great. They provide input. But I think in an interview situation, we could drill down and ask more in-depth questions which would result in other data being surfaced. So the reports, I'm not expecting the published reports to provide all the data that we need to do our job here.

And then also with the registrar, the last time I looked definitely when they review a registrar and if they are compliant, it's pretty high level and general. Like this GoDaddy issue that I hit recently, that's a prime example. Is that happening all the time? I know they do a cursory check of Port 43, but in their check for example would GoDaddy pass? Because, yes, you can look up one domain name via Port 43, but if you went back with the same IP address, you're going to get blocked. Is that kind of evaluation being done by Compliance?

So I'm not sure any of the published reports or I'm not aware of any published reports that would be more helpful. So I guess that would be a question: are there other reports we should be looking at?

LISA PHIFER: So would it be fair to maybe qualify those last two bullets, that the specifics of that request would be fleshed out during interviews?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. That's a good point.

LISA PHIFER: That helps us in planning how to organize the next steps, but interviews need to come first before additional materials are developed. So thank you for that clarification.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'm just making a note of that. And if we're through on Compliance, I could give a real brief overview – if I can find my document again – on the proxy/privacy recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: All right. That would mean I'd have to find it. There it is. Just to help out because [inaudible] was busy and Volker was out on parental leave, I took a first stab at drafting the template work statement and work plan and simply took all of the components of the proxy/privacy recommendation and popped them into the template and then gave my assessment or added questions.

A lot of this work is still ongoing in the Proxy/Privacy IRT. Some of this has been addressed in the PPSAI working group report, but there are definitely some things that are still being debated. This is an area where GDPR is going to impact this work, I think, because even if we finish this, then we're going to have to look at it. I think the implementation will have to be reviewed to see if it violates GDPR.

I'm not sure exactly. I've not asked the IRT leaders what they envision but ICANN staff that's leading the IRT, but it just seems like a logical step because the whole process of the proxy/privacy is to create a [reveal] process and ensure that the registrars or whomever is providing this service is responsive.

I have not gone back. I don't know if there was any input from the other team members on this draft template. But one of our major places to start with interviewing is to talk to Jen Gore and Caitlin, who are the staff leading the IRT, and get their input on where the challenges are of actual implementation.

And then also to me, this is a Compliance issue, to discuss with the Compliance team how they'll ramp up to manage the Compliance because I can imagine that once this is a required implementation by the registrars that there will be a lot of Compliance issues because there are very few registrars in the ecosystem that actually will respond, like GoDaddy and a few others. So this is going to require a strong hand by Compliance to make sure this works.

ALAN GREENBERG: What is the timeline for implementation of the full privacy/proxy recommendations? Not the WHOIS recommendations, but the original [TDP]?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: For the [TDP]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: We're going to have – the IRT is issuing a report. Obviously, we were trying to aim for prior to this January, but the specification has been extended. I would hope that if GDPR doesn't derail this completely – and I think that is something that should not happen – then by the end of the year we should have or really in the next six months we should have a fleshed out implementation guide. I'm not even sure what you would call it. And then I'm not sure how much time is given to the registrars to actually implement this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's not really the registrars. It's the privacy/proxy providers who obviously overlap in many cases.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. I'm sort of using registrars as a shortcut. One of the issues right now with this is the law enforcement relay and reveal processes are still

being debated. I don't think those have been nailed down completely. I think there's still some argument there, some pushback from the proxy providers.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that, of course, may well change with GDPR.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Well, this is all based on [purchases], and GDPR [regards purchases]. But you're right.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, that would be my argument.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, any further comments on the review of the current progress? Okay, I think we have an action later on – maybe not. Lisa, do we have an item on next steps and how do we get actual things moving? I thought that was on the agenda, but I don't see it right now.

LISA PHIFER: That is actually where we are now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay, fine. Since I had asked you if you have any bright ideas during the last leadership call, I will turn it over to you.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. Jean-Baptiste has stepped us back to Slide 6. We've just completed, at least for those rapporteurs that were on the call, the status of the first pass planning document. We haven't actually talked about specific targets for getting the output done. I suppose that's one item that we could do with possibly a larger set of team members in Monday's call.

But what you're asking about, Alan, is how will we address the next steps that are identified in the work plan. The thought had been to ask each rapporteur to talk about how they envisioned identifying the resources and briefings needed, analyzing documentation, conducting interviews, drafting a summary of key findings. And then just to be clear, the findings of each subgroup is to come back to the full review team for approval, and then the review team itself would begin drafting recommendations based on those research findings.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm assuming that the sub team will also put together any prototype recommendations that they feel may be necessary though.

LISA PHIFER: They can certainly do that in findings, but the goal is really to focus on fact finding as opposed to developing recommendations for what additional could be done or what gaps maybe you may have found.

Flagging the gaps is one thing. Recommending how to address them, I think, is where the full review team comes in if I understand the process correctly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Comments? We seem to have significant problem both getting people on these calls and getting people to respond to e-mails quickly or effectively. If anyone has any suggestions on how we do that – or do we simply acknowledge that much of the work is going to be done by a subset, which I find rather unfortunate for us to acknowledge at this point in the process – input is welcome. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: One thing occurred to me just in watching the regrets for this call come in, which is that we shouldn't adopt a mode of operation where we simply skip over a subgroup because the rapporteur is missing. If a rapporteur isn't available for a call, and I realize we're very early on in the planning process and some subgroups haven't actually spoken as a subgroup, but I think we should set an expectation that if the rapporteur is unable to make a call, they will designate someone in their subgroup that will in fact present the work of the subgroup and field any questions or actions. If we don't set that expectation, I think you're right, Alan, that we'll continue to just have people missing and be unable to make progress on those items because one person is missing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I would certainly support that. We can try. Any other thoughts? Yes, go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: One of the things that we might find too is that some subgroups will move forward in a timely manner somewhat and others won't, and then we'll just have to bring them up to speed. As some of the work gets done, then we may have to add participants as people are freed up so that we can encourage and urge people to work on things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. And to be honest, if I decide to put a lot of my time into the Compliance areas and the Outreach Recommendation 3 project lags, I don't think there's anything going to be hurt by it. It has to be done before we finish, but the amount of work in Outreach or Safeguarding Registrant Data to use the other one with my name on it is so small compared to some of the more substantive issues that I really don't mind if those lag if we're really accomplishing significant work on other areas. That's probably true on other ones as well.

Now it would be problematic if something lags and the person isn't putting their time into some other critical area. But I don't think there's a necessity for all of these to progress in lockstep. That's an easy management technique to try to make sure everything is working, but I don't think it will necessarily change the end product. But there's a significant judgment call in deciding which is which. Lisa says, "Perhaps this is where priority comes into play." I can't argue with that.

All right, we are going to eventually before the end of this call, which is in another 20 minutes or no later than 20 minutes, have to decide: are we holding a meeting on Monday? If we are going to do that on Monday, and I think that would be worthwhile, we really need to have staff reach out today and try to make a good assessment of who is going to be here on Monday and who isn't. If we have another call with only half the people, I think that's not going to be a good use of our time. So I would ask if that could be done essentially today.

Yes, please go ahead, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm more than happy to send a reminder that there is a call on Monday just after this call. I just wanted to say that so far only Volker who is on the parental leave is the only one who has not accepted the invitation on Monday, just as an FYI. But I'll send a reminder to all.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you can send a reminder asking for positive acknowledgement that they will be there.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: If that's done really near the top of the reminder, people may notice it. Assuming we're not at the point where all of your messages get ignored altogether.

Lisa says, "Could leadership perhaps review the status matrix and flag any priority subgroups may need help getting started?" Let's do that after Monday.

What is the next item on our agenda then? I think we have a plan going forward, and at this point we'll hopefully see it unfolds and adjust as necessary. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: One quick item. I noticed that in all of the subgroup outputs there's a table that lists the next steps. They were drawn from the work plan, but of course the dates on the work plan changed in December. I would like to suggest that we pull that table from the work plan documents rather than try to keep all the documents updated with the next steps and their dates in the work plan.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're saying merge that into the subgroup report?

LISA PHIFER: Actually, the opposite. Each of the subgroup outputs have exactly the same table with old dates. I'm suggesting there are two ways. We could update the subgroup documents, all of them, to have the current dates or we could remove that table from the subgroup outputs. And at the

time that we move on to the next step, we could reincorporate a current snapshot of the work plan and next steps.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy with that.

LISA PHIFER: So I suggest that staff take an action to do that quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, anything that says replicate data from one place into another and keep it up to date is bound to have problems.

LISA PHIFER: Agreed.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I would support not replicating data, even if it's a little bit harder to find. However, you might want to have in place of the data a link to the current work plan. I'm presuming the current work plan is not a changing document but the current one always has the same name. That may not be how we structure it, but it would be useful if it always points to the right document. To that end, I'll note that for instance – it's not the only case but it's an example on my screen at the moment – in the current slide deck for this meeting the hyperlinks don't work. I've seen that regularly and I'm not quite sure why that is. But if we can try to make sure…

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan, on that I can provide some input. I've seen that issue, and in fact it's only with PowerPoint being converted to PDF. And there is currently no straightforward way to solve that, just to let you know. If you convert an Excel to PDF, it's usually working properly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, in that case can we also distribute these things as PowerPoints?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Most of us have PowerPoint on our machines, and then at least we have working links. Lisa, please go ahead if that's a new hand.

LISA PHIFER: It is a new hand. The PowerPoint to PDF limitation is only on the Apple version of PowerPoint. So as long as we export to PDF from a PC, we can always preserve those hyperlinks. We can distribute PowerPoint as well, but with the caveat that sometimes there are [spot] conversion problems when reading a PowerPoint that's developed on [inaudible] when reading it from either a mobile device or a PC. So having both formats will optimize your chances of having something that is both readable and hyperlinkable.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, so what you're saying is we need an action item that all ICANN staff have to covert to PCs from Macs.

LISA PHIFER:	[laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG:	Good luck with that. All right, yeah, if we do both, then we have a running chance that we might be able to find the documents. In theory, the documents are all findable on the wiki also, although that sometimes is a bit of a challenge.

Next item on our agenda: Outreach Plan. We're starting to run out of time, so we may not actually complete this. Outreach Plan, who is taking that one? I think it is Jean-Baptiste, but I'm not sure.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Yes. I'm more than happy to do so, Alan, and I will do that quickly. We have been preparing a draft of the Outreach plan that [needs to be adopted] by the review team as per its Terms of Reference. The review team [inaudible] Outreach to the ICANN community to support its mandate. I'm going to just put that quickly on screen and explain how the current Outreach plan is organized. Just one second. I'm going to unsync it so that you can zoom at your convenience.

So the document is divided in four milestones: adopted Terms of Reference and work plan, initial findings, draft recommendations, and draft final recommendations with tentative requirement based on

substantive changes. At the request of the leadership, we updated the [inaudible] with changes in red in this document, including a fifth Outreach step just before the final report is sent to the Board. This fifth Outreach step would be communication on final report.

Looking into the document, you will see that each of these milestones is divided in three sections. The first one is the objective of this milestone, the actions needed to achieve the objective, and the communication tools to complete these actions.

I just would like to [inaudible] that for this Outreach plan any Outreach activities must happen prior to the official submission of the final report.

Looking at the first one, adopted Terms of Reference and work plan…

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Jean-Baptiste, are you going to elaborate on that? Because that doesn't sound right to me. Or we can wait until we get to number five if you wish.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure, we can [inaudible]. On the first one, adopted Terms of Reference and work plan, the objective would be to provide community with details on adopted Terms of Reference and work plan once they have been adopted. Here a draft communication would be reviewed and approved by the review team leadership. Here you have a list of all the different communication tools to communication on that.

The second one, initial findings, this is to provide the community with an overview of data received/requested and the purpose of this data, seek input on potential additional data points, present results of data analysis and set of initial findings. So there would be remote engagement sessions that would be scheduled with ICANN SOs and ACs, constituency and stakeholder groups; send a note to SOs and ACs, Board Caucus Group, constituency and stakeholder groups to suggest face-to-face update; rapporteurs deliver an overview of findings to ICANN org for slides; and leadership to approve those slides. And again, a list of the different communication tools for those actions.

The third one, draft communications, the objectives here are to seek community input on draft recommendations, seek input and guidance from the Board Caucus Group and ICANN Subject Matter Experts on implementability of draft recommendations. Potential actions needed would be to organize an engagement session at ICANN 62; send a note to SOs and ACs, Board Caucus Group, constituency and stakeholder groups to suggest face-to-face update; and also to have slides prepared and approved for that; issue a draft report for public comment; and organize two webinars to accommodate all time zones. And [inaudible] [tools] after the draft report has been published to communicate on that and present the draft recommendations. So again, you have the different communication tools that have been listed to support those actions.

The fourth one, the draft final recommendations with a tentative requirement based on substantive changes, here the objective is to request input and guidance from the community on implantability of draft final recommendations prior to submission to the ICANN Board. In

terms of actions needed, that would be to organize an engagement session at ICANN 63; suggest face-to-face updates with SOs and ACs, Board Caucus Group, constituency and stakeholder groups; and have slides prepared and approved for that. And again, the different communication tools are listed here.

The fifth step was added at the suggestion of the leadership, which is the communication on the final report (pre-Board submission) with the objective to provide the community with an overview of findings and final recommendations and sharing information on next steps once the report is sent to the Board. Actions needed would be to send a note to SOs and ACs, Board Caucus Group, constituency and stakeholder groups to provide an update; and ICANN org to prepare slides for approval; and possibly to organize webinars around that. And you have the communication tools listed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm presuming you are saying that the communication in step five has to be prior to the submission because in theory the team is dissolved on submission. Is that the rationale?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The review team gets dissolved, but there will be review team members who will still be involved in helping with the implementation. So to answer your question, yes, the review team will be dissolved after the final report has been sent to the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, I would suggest – and this may well be in the current operating standards that are under discussion – but I would suggest that that makes no sense whatsoever. Once the report is finalized, I believe it should be in parallel sent to the Board and some community communication be done to tell people what is in our final report. Now I understand previous review teams have not done that, but I think that makes little sense because I'm presuming the Board sends the report out for public comment before the take any action. I think that is part of the current process, so it would make sense to have a communication program, at least a set of webinars and if there is an ICANN meeting coming up in a reasonable timeframe, to make that kind of information available.

Now clearly that doesn't get done by the whole review team, but that seems to make sense. There doesn't seem to be any reason to delay issuing the report which implicitly delays any implementation waiting for the communication to be done. Now if that requires a change in the Terms of Reference or the operating standards for reviews, then I would think so be it. But that seems to make more sense than delaying things.

Chris, if you have any thoughts, you can weigh in. If anyone has any thoughts, please weigh in. Jean-Baptiste, go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Originally, the reason why there was no step five was because under step four you would have [inaudible] possibility to communicate on those final recommendations and still get some input from the community. This is also the reason why it was organized this way.

As you mentioned, I think the operating standards are still under public comment, so any input on that is always welcome. So I could only encourage you to help on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I certainly will. Yes, you're right. If we have done step four because there is substantive change between the preliminary recommendations and the final recommendations, then there may be much less need for communication as part of step five. But if there is no step four, then I think it's absolutely mandatory. So maybe what we're talking about is there should be something in the step four place either because of change or to simply well communicate what's going on.

If nothing else, there's likely to be a four- or five-month time gap between the two. So maybe it needs to have a little bit more thinking on it instead of just adding a fifth step. But I think one way or another, when with come up with our report assuming the year or year and a half we spent doing it is not a waste of time, I think there's a communication plan that has to go out at that point saying what it is that we've said. So you may be right. It may be subsumed by four in some cases.

Lisa, is that comment relevant to this?

LISA PHIFER: Yes. Just an observation that this Outreach plan actually tracks the draft operating standards. So I think if you're struggling a bit with the organization of the plan, the final steps, the most effective way to make

that comment is actually to make it on the draft operating standards so that it can be adjusted and then applied to all reviews, including this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, what's the deadline for that?

LISA PHIFER: Hmm, wish I knew. Alice or Jean-Baptiste?

ALICE JANSEN: The 15th.

ALAN GREENBERG: God, there's a lot of [inaudible] deadlines at the 15th now.

ALICE JANSEN: Yeah, but the GNSO just received an extension so you can comment, so I could actually see if we could add that to the GNSO Council comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, I think this is going to require a little bit more thought, but I think it's a good start. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:	Thanks. To make it brief, I think we may want to focus a little bit of time, not on this call, on the first step of this Outreach plan and put into place some thoughts about who will enact those actions as the Terms of Reference and work plan get close to being adopted.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, may I suggest we add that to Monday's agenda. We're just about out of time, so I would suggest we carry over the GDPR and the face-to-face meeting discussion also to Monday's agenda. Had there been any other A.O.Business on this call?
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Alan, it's Chris. Sorry to bother you. Just to interrupt you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Oh, sorry.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Just a question for you: when will we know for sure that Monday's call is happening?
ALAN GREENBERG:	It sounds like we have enough items for it to happen.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Okay, cool. I thought we were waiting to make sure people could be on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: We were, but since we didn't finish today's agenda.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay, no problem. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will certainly try to have Monday's. It sounds worthwhile.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Super. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Were there any other items? Was there anything in any other business that I'm not aware of?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, in that case, can we have a brief recap of any action items or decisions made today? And then we'll adjourn.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan. On the decisions reached, we have the subgroup on WHOIS1 Recommendation 4 and Compliance subgroup which are now merging

to one group. We will have the rapporteur to appoint a deputy if the rapporteur is unable to join a call and has to report on the subgroup.

On subgroup status, under Outreach, we'll add a reference to WHOIS information portal and consolidated WHOIS lookup tool and registrant's benefits and responsibilities. There will also be an update to reflect that no independent expert is needed.

On Compliance, add request to be fleshed out during interviews to the last two items listed in requested materials. On the subgroup first pass template, there is on Lisa's suggestion we will modify the template and add a link to the work plan.

For Monday's plenary call, I'll be sending just after this meeting a reminder to the review team to ask for a positive acknowledgement that they will participate on Monday's call and also will add to Monday's agenda the Item 1 of the Outreach plan and add GDPR and I believe I'm not sure I heard but also the face-to-face meeting discussion, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And in the notice, also note the second decision that rapporteurs who can't make the call should identify who will be reporting for their group.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, sure. And would you like me to add the Outreach document so that those who were not on the call can [inaudible] comments or just review it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, certainly.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, sounds good.

ALAN GREENBERG: And there was one more thing I was going to suggest, but I can't remember what it is anymore now. So I guess it will come back up when I remember.

All right, thank you very much for this call. I think it has been productive. Let's see how many people we can get to come to the Monday meeting. Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]