BRENDA BREWER:	Thank you. This is Brenda speaking for the record. Good day and welcome, everyone, to the RDS WHOIS2 Review Team Plenary Call #15 on January 8, 2018 at 14:30 UTC.
	In attendance today, we have Alan Greenberg, Dmitry Belyavsky, Chris Disspain, Erika Mann, Susan Kawaguchi, Lili Sun. We do not have any observers joining us. We do have an apology from Volker Greimann. From ICANN Org we have Alice Jansen, Jean-Baptise Deroulez, Amy Creamer, Lisa Phifer, and myself, Brenda Brewer.
	I'd like to remind everyone today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the transcript. I'll turn the meeting over to you, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. We have an agenda that was planned and I have one question. I'm not quite sure what item number three is. Jean-Baptiste? Is Jean-Baptiste with us?
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Hi, Alan. Yes, item number three, that was something identified on the last call on Friday that you wanted to [inaudible] details into the first item of the [inaudible].
ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright. I'm having a complete blank on that, but when we get to it, I'm sure we'll figure out what it is. I suggest that we flip the items and put

three at the end – number two, rather, subgroup status because the others are items we didn't get to on Friday, so I'd suggest that we do 3, 4, 5 and then go back to 2 and then AOB unless there's any objection.

Any further comments on the agenda before we adopt it? Then we'll adopt it as modified and proceed.

The first item, therefore, is – actually, I neglected to mention that if anyone has any statement of interest changes has an opportunity to tell us now. And no hands. Therefore, we'll go on to what was item number 3, outreach plan. If you can put the slide up, maybe I'll remember or someone else will remember exactly what it is we're going to be talking about.

I know on the outreach plan overall we decided we're going to need more thought on it because of the need for clarity as to when we go out for public comments, if we do or do not have substantive changes after the first comment. I must admit …

Lisa, please go ahead. You seem to remember what we're talking about and I'm having a complete blank on this particular item. So, Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. This is Lisa Phifer for the transcript. Alan, this was the first milestone in the outreach plan. I know that the leadership team and in our Friday plenary call there were some questions on the final steps of the outreach plan. We discussed those being based on the

operating standards and the possibility of providing comments on the operating standards themselves.

But, then we noted that in the outreach plan, the very first milestone actually is outreach that occurs at the time that the Terms of Reference in the workplan are adopted. And since we are hopefully approaching that point, it's time to start thinking about who will actually carry out the actions needed here and put into place any steps necessary to do that or any planning necessary to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa, and that conversation does now sound familiar now that you've actually said it. Thank you. I guess the first step is to what extent are items there ones that staff considered they take the lead on, at least for drafting, and what parts of it do you believe the review team itself should be doing. I do recall on Friday there was a discussion of some of it would be initially drafted in any case by staff. Anyone? Or do you believe it's all review team work? Lisa or Jean-Baptiste?

LISA PHIFER: I'll take a stab at answering that, which is ultimately the actions fall to the review team leadership, but if you wish to share some guidance on what you would like in the communications, staff can certainly take a first crack at putting your thoughts on paper.

ALAN GREENBERG: Mind reading, of course, is useful. Thank you. Lisa, go ahead again.

LISA PHIFER: Sorry, that was an [inaudible] hand.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alan, if I can just answer that. [inaudible] remember, but staff drafting was about preparing slides for the webinar that the leadership or review team would approve afterwards.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Well, I would certainly appreciate, given my workload, and I know Susan's at the moment, I would certainly appreciate at least a draft or a set of bullet points of what you believe should be in these types of documents and then we can discuss on the leadership calls exactly how we orchestrate getting something done to a larger extent.

Social media is mentioned there and I'm not quite sure what social media one normally uses for review teams to publicize activities.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible] mainly by Twitter, LinkedIn.

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika says she's not convinced. Do you want the floor, Erika? Please, yes, go ahead.

EN

ERIKA MANN: Yeah, very short. Twitter I think makes sense. Keep it short, but Twitter yes. LinkedIn one can do, but if you do LinkedIn or not, it doesn't matter really because nobody reads LinkedIn.

The other sources not really helpful. I don't think it would make sense to post it, for example, on Facebook because you never know who [inaudible] even see it. I think just keep it to Twitter I think would make sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other thoughts? Question for the other members, non-leadership members, on the group. In terms of notification of ACs, SOs, is that something you believe should be drafted communally and everyone sends it out or do you believe we should be personalizing it to meet the needs of your specific constituency?

My personal preference is I think we should draft some bullet points, that everyone draft – every group of people from a given AC/SO draft their own document for distribution.

Erika, is that a new hand? Maybe not.

Does that sound reasonable in terms of AC/SO communication?

Yes, please, Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, it might be me. It almost certainly is me that's confused. Are you … We need to make sure that all messaging is consistent.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not worried about consistent as much as making sure it's inclusive, that it includes the salient points, but I suspect that based on the constituency, the GNSO reps may want to give things to the GNSO that are not necessarily relevant to one of the other groups just because of their interest in the subject, for instance.

I know, for instance, that the NomCom and the distributions that are sent out by members, those are essentially orchestrated and people just distribute the text. I think in this case there may well be a need for more tailoring.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get that and I appreciate what you're trying to achieve. My only concern would be the possibility of having – again, I may have misunderstood, but doesn't that lead to the possibility of having some people informed to a different level or about different things than others?

ALAN GREENBERG: Which is why I suggested bullet points or some basic outline to start with. I don't have particularly strong feelings on this. We could certainly draft something final and any members of the group could enhance it to the extent they felt is appropriate.

EN

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I'm not [inaudible]. I just wanted to make sure I understood correctly. I just want to make sure that we don't lay ourselves open to comments suggesting that we haven't … I note that the GNSO has been told – the following [masses] have been stressed to the GNSO but do not appear in the stuff sent out to the ccNSO, for example.

ALAN GREENBERG: My answer to that would be that's up to the individuals. That's why we each appoint people.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fair enough.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't feel particularly upset about that. On the other hand, I'm somewhat aware that if we don't provide anything, then that may be the exact communication we get in some cases.

Alright. So, if I could ask staff to do a first cut, either at bullet points or text as appropriate for each of those items and we will take it further up in the next leadership call.

I note that this happens after the Terms of Reference. I'm assuming this should be done after the board approves them, not prior to that, because in theory they may well change. Does that sound reasonable to anyone? Is anyone awake on this call? Ah, we have two yesses – three yesses. Or something close to yes. Okay, thank you. Then we'll take that

as an action item for staff, and following that for the leadership team and go on to the next agenda item, please.

The next agenda item is GDPR. We had been asking for a briefing on GDPR for I guess a month or more at this point. My thought at this point is I'm not sure that there's a lot of merit in a briefing at this point. We have a lot more information than we did. At the time we started asking GDPR was essentially something that was coming in the future and ICANN essentially had said absolutely nothing about how it was really going to be addressing it other than having put together the use cases and initially chartered some legal opinions.

We now have significant legal opinion having come in. We have a plan under which we are going to propose a number of implementations or presumably interim implementations to meet the initial deadline of the end of May, and there would be I believe a community comment on those implementations and then something selected.

Since we now have a moderately good idea of how we're going to get there, but we're really in a position where until the plans – the prototypes are proposed and comments are in, we really don't have a lot to discuss at this point.

I am assuming once the three scenarios are proposed there will be a webinar or something like that to discuss them, go into them in some detail with the wider community. If there isn't, I could see that we might request one, but if there is something that is generally made available at that point, I'm not sure we need a specific briefing.

I see Erika has her hand up. Please go ahead, Erika.

EN

ERIKA MANN: Alan, thank you. I agree with you. We have more clarity, and in general the domain name constituencies I think they have more clarity as well and we have the second opinion from the law firm.

But, I would still recommendation, Alan, particular because we need to do some operational work obviously [inaudible] to the WHOIS and this relates to some of the GDPR functions. I think it would be good to ask actually the law firm to do a simple checklist for us based on their leader evaluation they have done.

By the way, I don't agree with all of the [legal] recommendations, but that's a different issue and we'll need to talk about it. But nonetheless, it would be good for them to do for us a simple evaluation.

What I mean would be really simple based on what they have done. Wouldn't cost ICANN much more, a lot more money. But it would be just saying this is the current status of the US, this is the changes insofar as GDPR is impacting the current status. This is our analysis. And based on this analysis, I don't know if we need this, but in an ideal scenario they should say we would recommend to following this regards to WHOIS, and if you don't want this you can leave this aside.

But just simple overview would be maybe one page or two pages. It doesn't have to be very long. I would appreciate it, since we have Chris on the call, I would appreciate it if the law firm, if [he] would talk to ICANN management and probably to the board if they would request such [kind of thing] from the law firm.

I wouldn't want us to wait until all these procedures are done because the composition of what needs to be done is already clear now, [inaudible] consultation processes will have minor impact on [inaudible] what needs to be done and where the major concerns are. I would love to see something like this. I don't think it should be us doing this, but it should come, a template, from the law firm.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm going to start another sentence with I may be confused. I'm not clear why we would do that. It's not the review team's job to decide what steps need to be taken in respect to UPR and it's not our job. I may misunderstood again, but I don't understand why we would be that immersed in it. The situation is that the registries and the registrars, that which is governed by the contract, needs to be agreed between the registries and registrars and that which is governed by policy – of which there is currently none, by the way – needs to be dealt with by the policy mechanism.

So, what this review team would be doing in respect to steps to be taken to comply with GDPR is a little beyond me. Erika, I apologize if I misunderstood what you were saying.

ERIKA MANN: Maybe I wasn't clear. Not interested in understanding [inaudible]. Totally agree with you, Chris. I only want to have an answer as far as the

impact of our work. So the WHOIS review and our work, this I would love to see from them. I mean, we can do it ourselves, but I would rather [inaudible] to get a neutral checklist, nothing complicated, just a very quick one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. Chris, before you go ahead, I think we need to recap the discussion we had last week when Erika wasn't on the call. The question was: to what extent are we reviewing WHOIS at the time that we convened? In other words, frozen in time at that point. Or are we reviewing it essentially in real-time, things changing?

I think the conclusion we came to is that it would be somewhat of a waste of our time if we were to focus on WHOIS as it was at the moment we convened when there are issues such as GDPR, which clearly have changed the environment with respect to some aspects of our work and particularly safeguarding registrant data is one of those areas.

On the other hand, it is still a work in progress and it is likely to be an interim measure, whatever we do, and it's not clear whether we need to focus a lot of effort on it, but we can't bury our heads in the sand and ignore it.

That being said, we are commenting on whatever the situation is at the time that we're freezing our recommendations and our comments, and that is an unknown right now.

Although I can appreciate, Erika, what you are suggesting be done, I'm not sure it is either within our domain to ask for it, or to be honest, whether we even care about it. It may well be a useful thing for ICANN to do, but I don't see how it falls under the auspices of this review team. So, if you perhaps can elaborate, or if Chris wants to go first.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You go ahead, Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Let me think about it some more. I still think we need to do it, because it will impact definitely the future composition of WHOIS and it will impact the way the review and how we do our work. There must be something that relates to our work. I don't think we can totally ignore it. But, give me a little bit more time to figure this out. I'm working in this [inaudible] company, so I would be surprised if we just can ignore it and can say because the process is now going on and review is done, recommendation will come out and registrars and registries will [inaudible]. There is no [inaudible]. I'm doubtful about this, but let me have a look at it because I don't want to do any guesswork. I sent you by e-mail, I sent you what I would recommend us to do. If you think you could support, it would be great. If not, we just skip it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. I do remember we decided in our Terms of Reference that we are not commenting on things that are in the [inaudible] of happening right now. Now, to the extent something will have happened

by the time we get closer to having a report and recommendations, then that is what we are going to have to comment on. But, as things are in flux, we are explicitly not commenting, for instance, on the PDP and projecting or predicting whether it will be successful or what its outcomes will be. So, I think we have to be very careful. We do have to comment on things that are actually changed in the environment, but it's not clear that we should be commenting or it's less clear to me that we should be commenting on things as they are changing.

In any case, Chris and then Susan.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I actually agree with Erika, to some extent. I just think it's a timing issue and I think what you said is right, Alan. I think there may well come a time in the life of this review team where decisions are made in respect to UPR and it is appropriate for this review team to ask for an analysis – one page, two page, whatever analysis – of what effect the decisions that have been made have on the things that we're looking at. That I agree with, but we're not at that stage yet because we haven't noticed [inaudible] been made. So, if they are – when they are – then I think that what Erika says makes sense to me.

I just wanted to flag one thing, Alan, which has nothing to do – well, not really [inaudible] with what we just talked about. But, just so that we don't forget, I do have a small amount of input to give you on the caucus group's discussion on the Terms of Reference. If we could just make a note to put that under any other business, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I didn't realize it would be ready today. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's not ready. I just have some comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have some comments, got it. Alright. Then, please, Susan, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I didn't want to completely comment on getting an update or analysis from ICANN on the GDPR, but I do think under that same topic, the review team should create sort of a framework of where we are – how we limit our reach into the GDPR because every discussion we do will bring us to the GDPR, any sort of review – for example, working on compliance, so anything we're reviewing for compliance, the whole change in what ICANN will require registrars to provide in the WHOIS will change drastically or somewhat, depending on your viewpoint.

So, I do think as a team we should agree to we will – it is okay to look at the GDPR up to this point, but we shouldn't go any further than this. I don't have a framework in mind, but I can see different teams delving in at different levels, which would make for an inconsistent report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm just trying to figure out what that really means. There are significant parts of our review, which have nothing to do with GDPR.

Certainly, the evaluation of all the old recommendations is just that – a post-mortem evaluation of whether the work was done and whether further work on those recommendations need to be done. So, although there could be some reference to GDPR, I think it's going to be minimal.

The new items protecting registrant data, law enforcement, maybe even compliance, may well have issues related to that. But, I'm not quite sure how we start trying to analyze the impact without knowing what the scenarios are that we're looking at in specific. It sounds to me as if it's something we need to keep our finger on, but I don't feel comfortable in trying to build a plan at this point or even a framework of how we look at that. Maybe I'm missing something, though.

The real question at this point is: do we believe we need a briefing? I think we have agreed that we don't need a briefing right now, but clearly there may be a need once the three scenarios or three models are announced if there isn't going to be some wider discussion of them, so we can try to understand the impact.

Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Just reflecting a little bit on business suggestion and your response. Possibly one way to approach this – I don't know that this is a framework – is to not make an assumption during the review of WHOIS as it exists today. That's something that will become unimportant because of the new model, but rather both do your fact-finding on today's implementation and any observations that the subgroup wishes to make about that. Then, maybe keep separate in the

fact-finding, but still address anything that you think may become less important in the future as a result of GDPR or more important. Just assessing what the potential impact of GDPR is.

The reason that I suggest that is that I've seen, for example on accuracy, there have been some thoughts both in last week's call and on e-mail that perhaps it's not important to look at accuracy of contact data because contact data may not be published anymore. But, to not look at how accuracy has been performed on contact data makes an assumption that it will be unimportant in the future. So, both conducting the review of what exists and making any observations that you may have on how important it will be in the future or in what way it will change in the future might be a way of trying to straddle that and not leapfrog into making assumptions about GDPR and how it will affect WHOIS in the future.

The other thing with regard to the timing of the briefing is if the team has specific questions about the Hamilton memo and how it effects WHOIS today, the compliance of the GDPR in WHOIS today, those specific comments can certainly be forwarded through the process that's going on now. I see that Trang has posted a link in chat for the vehicle where any questions could be sent through right now, if you wish to have Hamilton addressed in the next response pass.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Just one comment. You mentioned that, as an example, accuracy may not be relevant if the information is not published, but accuracy might still be very relevant if the information is collected. I

don't think publishing may be the only criteria under which we want to look at things.

LISA PHIFER: I certainly agree. That was just echoing a comment that was made on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I just wanted to make sure we're not just looking at the public WHOIS, we're looking at WHOIS in general.

Alright. At this point, it sounds like we are not going to take any specific action regarding GDPR other than watching brief. But, we are not looking for a briefing at this point. That may change once some specific announcements are made.

Next item on our agenda is face-to-face meeting discussion. We chose not to meet at ICANN 61 in Puerto Rico. The question is when do we believe we are likely to be ready for a face-to-face meeting? I would think if we're going to meet outside of an ICANN venue we want to make it a meeting that will be really worthwhile. So we're probably talking two to three days, but at what point are we going to have something substantive to discuss? I open the floor for any thoughts.

Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Alan. What I'm about to say is based purely – doesn't have any budget considerations built into it at the moment. Obviously that's something that we're going to need to look at. It strikes me that this

EN

review team might sensibly spend a little time either on a call or on a list working out whether in fact it would be an efficient use of time for the review team to have, as you say, perhaps a three-day face-to-face meeting, and perhaps have the groups gather on one of those days staggered over time to try to nail down all of the work that needs to be done. I have no idea whether that's an efficient and useful way forward, but I am slightly concerned about the timing of matters and I think timing is something that I suspect that the caucus groups can respond in respect to as well.

But, given that there is a decision to have a face-to-face meeting, I just wonder whether we should think carefully about what is the best use of that time, and that in itself will then dictate when it's best to have it because it depends on what one is going to do in it.

I hope I made sense. I know what I meant to say. I'm not entirely sure it was clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I understand you. I have some thoughts, but I'd like any input from anyone else first. I'll put Susan on the spot. At what point is it going to be useful? My experience is a face-to-face meeting is I won't say infinitely more productive than a teleconference, but in terms of really coming to decisions and getting everyone to provide input, I think it's a far more effective way of doing things than this, but there is a cost both in terms of actual dollars, and more important, perhaps people's time. I'm reluctant to say we want to do it every month, although in

reality that would probably be a very effective way of running the review.

Erika, please go ahead.

ERIKA MANN: I mean, it's always typical [inaudible] not to make this ad hoc, but I will say we should definitely meet when we're ready to take decisions or when we know we have to … We can finalize some of our work and there's still some outstanding issues because to do it like we do now it remains slow. And I think we need to be together to be effective. My recommendation – Alan, you know this much better. You can judge this – and Susan – much better than I can. Definitely in spring I would say. I don't know when, what's the good time, but maybe March I'm guessing, but definitely in spring we should meet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else? Spring implies … Really, the question is how much time do we need to get enough material so we can have useful discussions? At this point, we are essentially at the very beginning. A few of our projects can come to closure or almost closure quickly. Others I see significant work has to be done first.

Dmitry?

EN

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Well, I think that we need the first thing is, as much as possible, in our subgroup work and [inaudible] face-to-face meeting only after that. Do make that [inaudible] all sorts of subgroups [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I would agree with Dmitry. I think we need to finish some of our work, our reviews, each of the topics and then meet. I would [inaudible] total gap and the hope is that by May we would have quite a bit of information for the whole team to review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have Lisa next. But the question I have, perhaps we need to focus on, is my recollection is we need at least six weeks, probably more, to lock in one of these meetings and make the arrangements. Therefore, when are we going to be in a position to predict that six or eight weeks? I guess I'd like the right number from staff is the time that we feel comfortable in locking it in.

Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. I'll let Jean-Baptiste reply to the how much lead time is needed to actually schedule a meeting.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

LISA PHIFER: But, I just wanted to observe that the original timing of potentially meeting at ICANN 61 was actually an item in the work plan and it occurred at the point after fact-finding was done. There was all the fact-finding had been reviewed in the full review team, and then subgroups had started to draft their recommendations so that ICANN 61 timeframe would've been a timeframe at which all recommendations would have been drafted and ready for the full review team to look at.

Now, that was in advance of – that was the workplan timeline as of the beginning of December. So we're roughly a month off of that, if that's helpful to you in trying to think about when in the series of steps it would be helpful to have that face-to-face.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible] is that we meet between [inaudible] before the meeting date to start planning the face-to-face meeting, so that's the deadline [inaudible] Meetings team. Also, what I wanted to suggest is that, based on what you just said, that we revise the work plan in [inaudible] date based on the progress and the Meeting team requirement situation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. So, between 90 and 120 days says we should be planning right now scheduling the main meeting right now. If we don't schedule a main meeting, the next one is June. And we do have a face-to-face meeting somewhere already scheduled for an ICANN, which again may be problematic in terms of scheduling our own work.

Lisa, please go ahead unless that was an old hand.

LISA PHIFER: I'm sorry, that was an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: An old hand, and Jean-Baptiste is also an old hand?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, sorry about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess in our next agenda item we'll be talking about the subgroups. I think at this point we're going to have to get from the subgroup leaders some sort of measure of when they practically and realistically think they're going to have something close to ready for presentation to the entire group. I don't see any other way of going forward other than that and predicting three months out is rather difficult in this business. But, it sounds like we don't have any other alternative and that we have to put something on paper, plan, and then use that as the target and that may indeed be the next way of doing it,

of setting a target and then knowing we have to work towards it, and therefore hopefully meeting the deadline because of the target of a meeting setup.

Now, if that's the case, then I would suggest we might want to look at scheduling a tentative meeting in May and start looking at doing timelines going backwards on how we're going to actually get there.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Alan, it's Chris.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm fine with that, but I wonder whether … I mean, Jean-Baptiste said 90 to 120 days. I think frankly 90 days is enough. I just wonder whether leaving it until May is a sensitive idea and whether we wouldn't be better using the deadline of a face-to-face meeting in April. It would give us 90 days without a problem and use that as a deadline to push things along.

If you look at what Lisa said, she's suggesting [inaudible] timing done in February, draft recommendations in April. So, that's the sort of thing I'd be suggesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: If staff feels comfortable with 90 days, then I have no problem with it. Then I ask staff to start investigating alternatives for where such a meeting would be held and which week would be optimal for it. I would suggest that we … Pardon me?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Carlton's house.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton's house. I see Carlton has joined us. That's fine with me. It'll be warm. I would suggest that we target a three-day meeting at this point. Is that a reasonable action item for staff to take forward? Anyone disagree with the target roughly middle of April, which gives us three full months from now? Alright, done deal.

Now we're back to agenda item number 2, subgroup status and next steps. We did a brief review, although not everyone was on the call the other day. Is it worthwhile trying to repeat where we were on that one? I would think it probably is, to the extent that we can go forward.

The timing right now is we have another 45 minutes in the call. Chris, can I ask you to do your AOB right now? I know we're doing the meeting somewhat out of order. But, let's get that out of the way to make sure we don't miss it and don't run out of time.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Happy to do so. All I really wanted to tell you was that I am expecting to come back to you with some input from the caucus group later this

week. I don't have anything specific at this stage, but I wanted to flag – I noted there's been some discussion about resources, timing, and we are likely to come back to you by the end of the week with some comments about those things. That was all I wanted to say, just so that everybody knew that things were happening and that there will be some comments and some suggestions.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're not planning on canceling the whole review, though?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, I think [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That may make our life a lot easier.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Whilst personally, I'd be delighted, I suspect that wouldn't go down particularly well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can't fault me for trying.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely, 100%, but no. But, we will come back – there will be some suggestions and some constructive comments hopefully by the end of the week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Chris. Alright, back at the workgroup summary, if we could put that back on the chart on Adobe Connect. I cannot read that one at all on my screen and I have a large screen. I don't think that's going to be useful. Perhaps can we have a link to that document so we can look at it privately and then just do the overall one-page summary on the screen.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Alan. We haven't [inaudible], so you can zoom as you wish. Also, it was included in my e-mail in preparation of the general meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In that case, let me find it, while I give everyone else a moment to find it. That's the resource matrix? Is that the one we're looking at? Is that the one? Yes, okay. Alright, Catherine is not on this call, on the strategic priority. She said she had not worked on it. She would be working on it.

There was another document that we had which had the status on the page. It was up on the screen a moment ago, the one that had green ticks and things like that. I was talking about the one-page document, which I think we had on the screen a moment ago. Did we not? Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Alan, just to let you know the extended matrix that Jean-Baptiste just had displayed does also show the status. The items that you see on the

screen right now, I believe this is the simplified table. Any item that has a document is in progress. Any item that has not had anything floated out to the subgroup, you see under the status column is blank.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. You're just changing the form. It's confusing me. Okay. Strategic priority. Catherine didn't think it was going to be a lot more work to be done on that. Single WHOIS policy, Carlton, do you have any comments on that? We haven't had that one reviewed at all. Can Carlton speak? Carlton is typing. It's hard getting on. Well, if we could connect Carlton, perhaps dial out to him, it'll go back to him in a moment.

Outreach. I did the summary. The actual work involved I don't believe is going to be very large. It will require careful reading of a number of documents and both a comparison to see whether they're consistent and to what extent they are useful documents.

There's a fair amount being published on WHOIS for registrants. It has been largely created independently by different groups and the largest single question is does it make sense when viewed as a whole or do we have multiple confusing positions that are not going to really help?

Any comments on outreach?

Carlton says, "I have a first pass done. Sent to team members for comments. Awaiting their response." Then I would guess we should ask anyone who is on Carlton's team to respond, so we can get that one closed.

Next one is a significant one and it is compliance. I believe that we decided on our last call that we were going to ensure that the team working on WHOIS Recommendation #4 and the new compliance item be the same team so that we can make sure they are consistent and not duplicate work. Susan, any comments?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: No, I haven't done anything to reach out to both teams, so there's a lot of overlap. I need to review – I sent out a template, draft template, but did not get to that this week. We'll try to do it later today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I think you also mentioned on the last call that certainly with regards to number six compliance that we probably should have another call of the team again.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, we need some planning.

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably worthwhile scheduling that sooner rather than later.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, will do.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG:	The next item is data accuracy. That's Recommendations 5 through 9, a significant number of recommendations. Lili was doing that one. Lili, do you have any comments on that?
LILI SUN:	Yes. I put forward some questions to be answered for this topic's review and I received Dmitry's comment today. I'm still waiting for Catherine's comment. Once I collect all the questions from the sub-members, I will start drafting the key findings on this topic and [inaudible] subgroups to go forward.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. How much effort do you believe actually doing the final work is going to be? It strikes me that this is perhaps one of the more significant efforts in our overall review of assessing to what extent we really have done effective things in implementing these recommendations.
LILI SUN:	Yes, you are right. Actually, in the [inaudible] document I put the four questions to be answered. The first two questions is to assess the implementation progress of the WHOIS accuracy. I believe this topic is relatively complex.
	Also, the WHOIS accuracy reporting system project about the progress of this project. I believe the first two questions need relatively significant workload to deal with. So, for the last two questions, maybe just a conclusion drawn for the two questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That implies that that work … Our discussion about a face-to-face meeting implies that this work has to be largely done well before April. Does that sound viable to you?

LILI SUN: By April. Yes. I understand, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you think that is viable, okay. Next is privacy proxy. Volker is on leave and I believe Susan has reported on that one. Again, just for the people who weren't on the last call, if you could give us a quick update.

[SUSAN KAWAGUCHI]: I [inaudible] that recommendation, just pulling from the IRT – [PPSA IRT] a lot of the work that's been done there – and there's definitely some questions. I haven't, with Volker out and Stephanie … Volker and Stephanie I think are sharing the leadership on that. I haven't heard back from them at all. I really think we need input from Volker at least. He's one of the leaders. Well, from both of them, but I'm assuming if Volker is coming back this week we may get some input from him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Common interface was also Volker. I don't know who is secondary on that one. Who else was on that team? Jean-Baptiste or Lisa? Or me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That was Alan, you, Susan and Volker.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We're expecting Volker back the end of this week. Is that correct?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: If I recollect, on the 12th.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the 12th, okay. He's going to be rather busy at that point, but let's try to get that going at that point. IDNs, Dmitry, if we could have a summary of where you believe you are and what kind of work has to be done.

DMITRY BALYAVSKY: Well, I agree with Alan's analysis of that for [inaudible] recommendations. We could just check that much and [inaudible] recommendations and result of their fulfillment. There is only one thing in point because work on [inaudible] is not finished yet and expected to be finished, if I'm not mistaken, I'll collect the briefing in summer this year. So, I don't expect much problems here besides the [situation question]. I think that more or less soon I will provide the matrix of comparison of recommendations [that are completed]. Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dmitry. It strikes me that an awful lot of the IDN work – and suddenly internationalized domain names. In fact, most of those recommendations are on internationalized data, not necessarily the domain names themselves. it strikes me that most of the implementation, we did a lot of work as a result of the review and several other groups chartered and reported. But, the actual implementation is all going to be pending the new RDS system.

It may be worthwhile checking with the PDP to make sure that they in fact recognize and consider those tasks as part of their overall job. I think it's obvious to me that any new RDS has to be completely internationalized, both in terms of IDN names and internationalized data. But, it is not clear to me based on discussions that that has been something that has been factored in in their discussions and I don't really recall if it is clearly within – listed in the charter or not.

I think perhaps the first task is to make sure it is the charter and to make sure the group is well aware of it. Lisa, you're the lead staff person on that and I see you had some comments in the chat. Do you want to … Please go ahead. I see your hand is up.

LISA PHIFER: Yes. IDNs are in fact part of the PDP's charter, both a requirement for support for internationalized domain names and translation, transliteration of registration data. That would be part of phase one, what the PDP is currently working on. Then, of course, policies and implementation guidance in future phases of the PDP.

EN

The PDP Working Group has also been reminded by the board, I believe at least once, that IDNs are in fact part of our charter. I think what you're observing, Alan, though, is that we have not yet discussed that in the PDP Working Group to any great extent. When the PDP Working Group began, we did some input summarization and the documents that were produced, both for IDNs and for translation and for transliteration, were in fact part of the documents to be summarized. But, the working group has not yet gotten to the stage of discussing specific requirements related to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Lisa. That is comforting at some level. I probably should've remembered it all myself, but I didn't. Alright, next item is an item for Lili and it's whether – in fact, it is the requirement that ICANN produce a plan to implement these recommendations and provide reporting. As Lili has pointed out, the existence of that is reflected in the fact that we have documents to look at here. So, I'm assuming this is going to be a pretty easy one to comment on, and clearly how well the other recommendations have been implemented. Is that reflected in ICANN's green check marks on all of them will be part of the judgment call of whether the reporting was done properly. I think that's going to pretty well fall out of the other items we have. So, I don't think this is one of the more onerous ones.

Anything new? Who do we have working on that? Stephanie was the lead on that. We have Alan, Stephanie, and Susan. Certainly I have not done any work on that and I don't think Susan has.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:	No. That could be [inaudible], could be GDPR, though.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Well, I think anything new – the question was things that have been implemented to date, but clearly as GDPR unfolds, it will be part of that.

I think one of the assessments we're going to have to do pretty quickly, however, on this one is which of those items – and there was a long list created by staff of things that have changed and I think the first part is a quick assessment of which ones do we actually tackle? There is no obligation for us to comment on everything that has possibly happened and I think we're going to have to pick judiciously for where our efforts will be best used. I'm going to reach out to Susan – to Stephanie – on that one and find out what's going on.

Law enforcement needs is Thomas. Thomas is not on this call. We have Chris and Catherine on the other people. To anyone's understanding, has anything happened on this item?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Not as far as I know.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright. I will reach out to them, too. Consumer trust, Erika?

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Alan. I have finished the work. There is still a discussion going on between me and John [Baton] concerning the question is it completely finalized? I haven't received back comments on everyone who was part of the group. [Just enough] from Stephanie. I have [inaudible] Susan [inaudible] the outline I did. Definitely have an all clear from [Dmitry]. So, I might have to go and you might have to go back to Stephanie. But, anyhow, you have a draft in the attached document in the link in case you want to have a look at it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you foresee this one as being a major effort to work on or is this a quick summary that's going to have to be written near the end?

ERIKA MANN: I think we need to do a little bit of work. Let me see and open the document, but it's not really much – at least not in my eyes. Let me have a quick look. I identified the questions which we have to look into. They're all in alignment with the document which we should take into consideration. I did an assessment of level four. We can downgrade this to level three if we like to. I wouldn't want to go much below. Estimate of workload I put in level three. The rest is probably not relevant.

I made a recommendation to have a check, but if I'm not – let me check if I'm right. Yeah. No, I think these are the key points. No, not super much work. Not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to point out that the members of this subgroup in addition to Erika are Dmitry, Stephanie, and Susan. Carlton has indicated that he'd be willing to help this subgroup out to complete the work planning path. Of course subgroups and their composition may be revisited after the work planning is done as well.

But, Erika, you may want to reach out on the subgroup e-mail list to Dmitry, Susan, Stephanie when she rejoins and if you wish to have Carlton added, that would be the way to bring that document to closure.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah, that's fine. If Carlton would like to join, I would enjoy it. But, go and have a look first. The questions are there what we need to look at it, because of the crazy Christmastime and the difficulty of scheduling calls. I just did it myself. I sent it out in time. You have it all there and you can review it. Dmitry said already, "Okay." My memory is Susan did as well. I never heard back from Stephanie. I reached out to her separately as well, but haven't heard back. I will do this again. Carlton, welcome to have you here. But, please, the document is there so we don't have to work on the document but you might want to change things, so feel free to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. Lisa, is that a new hand?

LISA PHIFER:
It is. One quick follow-up. I realize with the number of subgroups that we have it may be a bit confusing, but only the subgroup members actually see the document that's distributed. In this case, only Dmitry, Stephanie, and Susan would have received the e-mail with the document attached. I think, Erika, you might be recalling some response received on other subgroups from Dmitry and Susan because we haven't actually seen traffic on that subgroup e-mail list for this specific topic, consumer trust.

ALAN GREENBERG:
Alright. I'll ask anyone to please take a look at it and make sure you've looked at it. I assume I'm on all of the lists.

LISA PHIFER:
Yes, Alan, you asked to be on all the mailing lists.

ALAN GREENBERG:
Alright. I would say anyone who's not on a group, if you choose to take a few minutes and review some of these, that will be useful, whether you just contribute a, "Yes, that seems okay," or have any specific comments, that will help progress the work.

Next item is safeguard registrant data. That one, in today's world, is a very simple one. We don't do any of that. Clearly, this is one of the ones that will be affected as ICANN implements any changes associated with GDPR and I think we're going to have to track that one.

Again, I'm not sure ICANN is in the position to say we do it properly or not, since clearly from a European context, the data commissioners who one day may in fact rule on this who will give their input, but I think we need to update or at least make sure the report reflects what the current status is.

Lastly, we have compliance. I think we already talked about that one briefly with the intent to reconvene the working group for the first summary. In our last call we talked about this a fair amount and this is probably going to be one of the topics that's going to require the most amount of work and probably the largest amount in terms of interviews and discussions with ICANN staff. So, clearly, it's one of the key ones along with data accuracy that we're going to have to make sure is progressed very well if we're going to meet in April.

Alright, we have any other further comments on the first path? I find it a little bit disturbing that we're having such a hard time getting people at these meetings. Similarly, the work is progressing very, very slowly but I'm going to work on the assumption that the holiday break has caused this to be somewhat interrupted and we're going to start seeing some better progress going forward.

Any further comments on this? Seeing none, hearing none, is there anything else or any other business? Jean-Baptiste, please go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan. I just wanted to add to what you just said that if anyone needs any help setting up a call or any other help, just let us know. We are here to support you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other business? Then, if I could ask Jean-Baptiste to summarize decisions reached and action items.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. On this [inaudible] the review team [is meeting] for a briefing on GDPR on this stage. In terms of action items, we have ICANN [inaudible] to prepare [inaudible] on the outreach plan, to prepare [inaudible] points to be submitted for review to the leadership on the next leadership call. ICANN to look into possible weeks for a three-day face-to-face meeting during mid-April with a possible location.

Under subgroups, Recommendation 2, single WHOIS policy, the group members to comment [inaudible] document sent by Carlton. Alan to reach out to Stephanie and Thomas to inquire about the status of anything new in law enforcement [inaudible] documents. And also on consumer trust, ICANN Org to send the links to the document and the subgroup in [inaudible] for him to provide any comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any further comments before we adjourn? Give you each 15 minutes back. Thank you very much. We'll meet again in roughly two weeks from now. Wish you a good next two weeks in January and hope to have a lot of progress for the next meeting. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]