
BRENDA BREWER: Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking for the record. I'd like to welcome you to the RDS WHOIS2 Review Team Plenary call #19 on February 9, 2018 at 13:30 UTC.

In attendance today, we have Volker, Alan, Chris, Dmitry, Susan, and Carlton.

We have Vignesh just joined on the observer channel.

We have from ICANN Org, Alice, Lisa, Jean-Baptiste, Amy; myself, Brenda.

We have apologies from Cathrin Bauer-Bulst.

Lily Thomas will be delayed today and Erika.

The call is being recorded. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the transcript. I'll turn the meeting over to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Is there anyone with any statement of interest changes? No hands, no voices. I'll assume the answer is no. Does anyone have any comments on the agenda or any other business items to add? Again, no hands, no voices. We'll assume the answer is no. The agenda is accepted as presented in Adobe Connect and via e-mail.

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

The first item on the agenda is the subgroup status update. I won't try to do a round robin. If we can have the display on that does have the status updates on it. That's the one. Thank you very much.

Now, that is different from the one that is distributed because it said – the distributor [inaudible] did not have a doc from Stephanie. So, that has now come in. I haven't seen it myself. Jean-Baptiste?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Alan. This Alice. No, we have not received the documents from Stephanie. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. So there is nothing. There is no document.

LISA PHIFER: Apologies for interrupting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

LISA PHIFER: I believe that Susan sent something last night trying to move the ball forward with the first draft on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It must've been after I stopped looking at e-mail and I haven't checked it this morning yet. Thank you. Can we have any volunteers of anyone who would like to present what's going on? Perhaps Susan can do that. We do have an echo from someone right now.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I just simply took the list of all the initiatives or policies that have [inaudible] since the 2012 WHOIS Review Team draft and popped that into the template and created a few questions and also addressed GDPR very briefly. So, next steps, what we might do with GDPR. There's actually a lot of new things that have happened since 2002 – I mean, 2012. Probably a lot more since 2002!

I just think ... I'm not sure it's a huge review, but there's definitely a lot that has gone on that has not been reviewed by the previous team. So, I just popped that all in and at least it gives us a start of the first path.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Is it your perception that there is substantive work there ... Is it your belief that there is some substantive work for us to do? There are two questions for any [new] item. If it doesn't impact WHOIS to a large extent or to a significant extent, then it's not really our business. And if it does, we still have the option of deciding is this something we feel there's a compelling reason for us to do a review at this point?

So, given all those with the obvious exception of GDPR which is something in progress, do you see a lot there that really demands our attention at this point? It's a judgment call. I'm asking.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I couldn't make that assessment without really going back and reviewing the document and thinking about what ... All of these things affect WHOIS. They all pertain to WHOIS. But, one of them was the thick WHOIS policy. So, if you take the questions out of the objective, is there a way to make it more effective? Is there measurable steps we could recommend? Would we do any of that with the WHOIS [inaudible] GDPR?

But, I thought it was important to at least put those in the document and then review those at a high level to make those determinations, if it's something we should be looking at now and not ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. That sounds good, or a good start anyway. Anyone else have anything they would like to volunteer at this point? I will again preach my regular line of doom and gloom that we have a few weeks left before we show up in San Juan, those of us who are going. And after San Juan, we have just a few weeks before we are supposed to be in Brussels with documents and work ready to discuss by the whole review team. So, we're really talking a small number of weeks and a small number of plenary meetings between now and then.

Anyone like to volunteer anything?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. I finally got around to looking at the subgroups I have been assigned to as reporter and made a couple of updates. Susan also has a few

things to the group ... Sorry, privacy proxy services, common interface, for the privacy proxy. I felt that the document that we had at the time only referred to the ongoing [PDP IRT] whereas a lot of work had gone into that beforehand with the [REA] specification. I thought we should at least look at that and see how that affected ... What effect the specification had with regard to implementing the recommendation.

For the [common] interface, I've also prepared a first draft. I would like all the members to look at that as well to see if that's the direction we want to move in.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Volker. On the RAA interim policy or whatever, interim privacy proxy, doesn't that have an expiration date that I think is coming up relatively soon?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

It does, but it has recently been voted to be renewed until 2019. The expiration date, just to provide some background on that, has been put in place to make sure that this specification which was always intended as a temporary stopgap policy until the PDP Working Group could get started and do their work would be seen as something temporary and we would provide some motivation for that working group to get underway and do the work quickly, and therefore we put the expiration date there not to bow out of this at a convenient time, but to rather provide an incentive for the [inaudible] to do their work. It has done just that. The registrars in ICANN are agreed that the specification should stay in place until the time that the policy from the PDP Working Group

is implemented and that's what's currently going on ongoing. Expect that to fade into the policy sort of point. When the policy comes into effect, the specification bows out [inaudible] before. That's the intention behind that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. The reason I asked the question is if indeed it is going to disappear whether it's this year or next, is there a value to evaluating how effective it was, given that the terms that we'll be applying going forward are going to be different from that? It's an interesting historical review to say did it work well or was it effective? But, I'm not sure it tells us a lot about how to make changes because of it. That's why I asked when it expires. I guess as we evaluate it, we're going to have to look at it from that perspective. Thank you.

Please go ahead, Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

I think as it is the status quo, at the time we're doing this review, we should look at it, even with the [inaudible] it will at some point fade out of existence. It's the first step that ICANN took to take into account the recommendation to regulate some of these services and we can see how effective that was and has that implementation of the recommendation delivered some progress over the status quo that we had before that time? So, I think it is worthwhile looking at because that's something that has some [inaudible] something. We could touch that. The PDP [IRT] still [inaudible], it's still developing. We will not be able to see before our work is complete any effects coming out of that.

So, that's very fluid, whereas the specification is more substantive and would stand up to some more investigation and review I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That certainly can also be considered as part of the review of recommendation 10, in addition to being ... It's something new because of recommendation 10. It can fit easily under either of those categories, I'm presuming. Anyone else have any comments? Then let us go on to the next item, please. That is also under Volker and it is the first discussion we've had on the common interface recommendation 11.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Like I said, I was a bit delinquent in doing my work due to health issues and my prolonged absence—

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Volker? I don't know if Volker finished speaking or if he disappeared. There were two Volklers on the list. One on telephone. He's not there anymore. Does that mean he was dropped? Brenda?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's on the AC room.

ALAN GREENBERG: He is, but he also had a separate line with the telephone. I suspect we've lost Volker in voice if nothing else.

BRENDA BREWER: To answer your question, you are correct. His audio has dropped.

ALAN GREENBERG: Was it a dial-out or did he dial in?

BRENDA BREWER: No, he dialed in on his own.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I actually heard his reply to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker, I think you may be talking in the background.

VOLKER GREIMANN: The line [inaudible] phone dropped and I just connected my microphone on the laptop hoping it would make a difference.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your voice is a little bit low, but we can hear you now.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah. I'll speak up, then. At which point did you lose me?

ALAN GREENBERG: You said you had been delinquent and then you disappeared.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Oh, so you missed my entire ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Exactly.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I have been a bit delinquent because of illness and my [inaudible] leave in doing that work, but I finally got around to presenting a first pass document to the subgroup members. It's really just a first pass to start off discussions and look at questions that we will need to answer for reviewing whether the objective has been reached. I have concentrated these questions at this time on the ICANN meeting sites, which I believe is the main venue where ICANN has tried to implement the recommendations.

However, if there are any others, please feel free to point them out to the group [inaudible] main focus of the work should be [inaudible] how the ICANN meeting [site] or whether the ICANN meetings [site] is effective in implementing the objective in the recommendation. This is something that has just been sent out, so I think over the course of the next week, the working group members – the subgroup members – will be able to come to a conclusion on that. I hope we'll be able to present more information.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Volker. You may also want to look at the list of web pointers in recommendation 3, outreach, which shows the relatively large number of places that ICANN does talk about WHOIS and that may factor into whether there is indeed a common interface if there are all those other places as well.

Any further comments on any strategic or any other on the comment interface, rather? Yes, please, Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. To your last point, Alan, the common interface recommendation was specifically that there should be one place to query who is, not one place to find all the WHOIS [inaudible] documentation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I'm sorry.

LISA PHIFER: But, I want to make sure. I got lost a little bit. Are we on agenda item two or three?

ALAN GREENBERG: We had no more people who were willing to speak on two. Therefore, we went on to three, which is the specific targeted one for Volker.

LISA PHIFER: I had understood that several people submitted input for agenda item 2, which was going over their work plan for each of the subgroups.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh. Those are the questions, so to speak. Yes, certainly, we can easily do those. I hadn't realized that was included on that item. My mistake. Okay, we have them all one by one. We have, first of all, the single WHOIS policy and that one is ... Whose is that?

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's mine, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's Carlton. I thought so. Carlton, would you like to review what you have there? Thank you for submitting that this morning.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Lisa, for putting it up – or is it Brenda? For putting it up on the screen there. [inaudible]. I don't really see any major deal with the recommendation [inaudible] straightforward. There are a couple of things that we're supposed to look for. We can look at the implementation records to see where that is. I will make a first draft of what the response is and then the team members promised that they will add to it. If we didn't, we will have a call about it, but that's where we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton. Any questions? Then can we go to the next one please? I believe the next two are mine.

LISA PHIFER: Alan, if I might?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead. Sorry, I didn't see your hand.

LISA PHIFER: I did have one question for Carlton, which is in reading your workplan document it looked like you wanted to schedule a couple of interviews. Is that still the case?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Lisa, the others were thinking that maybe we could go without them. So, I'm going to hold those off until we have at least outline of the response framed out and see if they still consider that necessary.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: When I looked at this recommendation going way, way back of did ICANN implement it or not, my take was no they did not, in that the recommendation explicitly asked for a single place to go to find out what the WHOIS policy or the bits of the WHOIS policy are. And what

we ended up with in fact were pointers to other places, some of which were perhaps intelligible to people, some of which might not be.

If indeed that is the conclusion that the subgroup comes to, then one might in fact want to talk to some of the people who implemented this and find out why they didn't go further. This was addressed partly in our verbal briefing we got where we were basically told it would've been too difficult, so this is what they did instead. But, I can see that going towards interviews if indeed that is the conclusion that the subgroup draws is the same one that I drew four years ago or so when I was looking at it for ATRT.

Susan, please go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Alan, this is Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Carlton, go ahead first, then.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Okay, I'm sorry. We did take the view that the major recommendation, which was [inaudible] information, the way it was implemented would not suffice [inaudible], but if one person thought we should at least look at what it is, so [inaudible] going to be at least a lot of conversation about whether or not [inaudible] multiple pointers from the [inaudible] whether that constitutes a single policy. I also have another view that it

is a [inaudible] different positions, but definitely not a single [world] policy. So, that's how [inaudible].

I tend to agree with you that we may want to speak with the implementers to know, or the reasons could be imbedded in the implementation details. So, that's why we have to review what the implementation record.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Carlton. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

You probably have all heard Göran say this, but I have heard him repeatedly in the last month say this would be so much easier on the GDPR if we had a single policy. So, I think that's where it's [inaudible] talking to Göran about to get his impression.

Just some context from when the original WHOIS Review Team made this recommendation, and then [inaudible] shepherd the recommendations through the ICANN process. We repeatedly heard that actually the community has to create a single WHOIS policy, and that in some ways is the RDS Working Group. But, I think it would be interesting to hear staff – whatever parts of the staff are working on WHOIS and policy – to find out, to get their input now on if this could be done differently.

I think one of our obvious [inaudible] is, yes, you need single WHOIS policies. [inaudible] saying it, so let's follow that lead. But, maybe to discover ways of stepping towards that in a more gentle manner than a

[huge] PDP. We do have other opportunities, like a taskforce and things like that, [inaudible]. So, we might want to put more flesh on the recommendations than we did last time.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Susan. I didn't actually get ... if I may for a moment. My sense of the recommendation was not asking for a single policy, but a presentation in a single location all the bits of the policy. The actual WHOIS policy is part policy and a number of different policies, and part heritage essentially of where we came from. And part embodied within agreements.

What I thought was asking for was not to go charter a PDP to create a policy, but to present the policy in a single place that was comprehensible to people.

Carlton or Susan? Go ahead, Carlton. Then Susan.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, Alan. That's exactly how we read it, that it was [inaudible] place to have all those bits and pieces, but as I said, we also believe that there is a further ... We are interpreting a further requirement, and that is to say that the policy should delineate [inaudible] that all of these [inaudible] in the contracts in several other areas [inaudible] comes into play. [inaudible] the recommendation was tending towards that saying you need to have a place where you have all these [inaudible]. So, I'm agreeing with you. That's how we see it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan, were you trying to add something.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. If we go back to the WHOIS Review Team and asked, especially Bill Smith – I don't know if you remember. He's not active anymore in this community as far as I know. But, he was adamant that [inaudible] overarching single WHOIS policy [inaudible]. The pushback from staff at the time was that would be very difficult to do. It's not that ICANN can develop that policy – ICANN staff can develop that policy – on their own and implement it.

So, I can understand how the single WHOIS policy recommendation was communicated, but the intent was a policy that then incorporated all the current policies. If Stephanie was on the phone, that's something that she talked about for years [inaudible] RDS. So, the intent at the time in 2012 was an overall arching single policy then that may be [inaudible] policy, but it was not just a pointer. That was sort of a ... We can't do better than this, so don't ask for more than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Susan, for that perspective. I guess I view a single policy as somewhat unrealistic in that once we call it a policy, it really does have to come from the GNSO as a PDP. The problem of course of just trying to consolidate the information in a single place is you have to worry about which is the authoritative version, and of course the original one is the authoritative one, even if we try to bring bits and pieces of it somewhere else. The single site at best is never going to be a policy, but my understanding was that what our target was, given the difficulties of

coming up with a real policy was to try to represent the policy in a single place in an understandable way.

In any case, it sounds like an interesting [inaudible].

CARLTON SAMUELS: Alan, can I say something?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Please go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I tend to hold that view, too, but I have a slightly different [inaudible]. I actually believe that these options that we [inaudible] considering for WHOIS actually if they are going to articulate in a way that satisfies GDPR, it's actually going to be an expression of policy. How you implement them is going to be a little different [inaudible] GNSO policy making structure.

In my view, this is one of the things that I think the EWG [inaudible] was supposed to articulate a policy position and then have the implementation of the policy, go through the standard policy development process.

I take your view that we wanted one, that this is the overarching vision, but I believe that once we get through these, looking at these options, we will have, for the first time I think, when that option is determined,

we will have something that looks like a policy in place. That's what I feel.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I tend to agree. The RDS PDP, should it ever complete, will end up effectively being the WHOIS policy at that point. I'm not sure what the odds are, but that's a different issue.

Any further discussion on single WHOIS policy? Going once, twice. Alright. Can we go on to the next item? That is outreach. That is one of mine.

I don't see the need for any further briefings other than what we already have received or have asked for. Essentially, we are looking at the multiple documents that exist and trying to understand whether they make any sense, whether they are consistent, whether they're complete. My suggestion has been that each of the members of the group independently review those, independently come to some conclusion, and then we get together in one or more calls and try to merge that into a single position. I don't see the need for further interviews and there will likely be teleconferences – probably more than one – to come to closure. I don't know if anyone has any questions or comments. Lisa does. Thank you. Please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thanks, Alan. I'm curious since the goal of the outreach recommendation was to actually reach some communities with additional information, if you would find it interesting to try to interview

a couple of those target audience to see how well, what was done actually met their needs.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I hadn't considered that. The people in this group I think in fact represent some of those target audiences and some of us have done an awful lot of talking about this subject in the past. So, I hadn't actually considered going and trying to find individuals and ask them, "Can you please go read all these documents and see if you understand what's going on?" I welcome input from other people, though. Anyone else on the group? Jean-Baptiste or Alice, do you have a list in front of you of who's on that group? I should now, but I don't.

LISA PHIFER:

For the outreach group, Alan. It's yourself, Carlton, and Erika.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Carlton in the chat says it's a very important suggestion. Does anyone have any suggestions on who it is, where we might find interview candidates or from Susan from the perspective of making the recommendation, what were the target audiences that you perceived at that point?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Thanks, Alan. Actually, we did a study. The review team had a study commissioned where we interviewed – we had people interviewed that were not part of the ICANN community. So, it was everyone but the

ICANN community that we were targeting. We just thought it was important that anybody who was a registrant or who used – shopped on the Internet, used a commercial site knew how to find the registrant of a domain name.

So, it wasn't the greatest study, in my opinion, but we had people identified that were from different countries and different – it's a little too early for me again. Anyway, we just started different criteria for those interviews and then had them walk through how to find a domain WHOIS record. It wouldn't be anybody within the ICANN community we talked to. It would be those outside that had no reference, didn't even know what ICANN was.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. I think in recognition of the question, the subgroup team will discuss this further and look at whether we want to do interviews or perhaps even charter some external group to do them.

You can leave the new document on the screen. My candid assessment is there are so many different places right now that are being pointed to and some of them reasonably in conflict with each other that I think the conclusion is that this recommendation was not well addressed, regardless of the results of interviews. But, there may be some merit in actually getting that from other people [inaudible].

Any further comments on outreach? Then let's go on to the next one. Data accuracy. Whose is that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that was Lily, wasn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: That may well be Lily. Is there anyone on the team who would care to discuss it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just for information, Cathrin and Dmitry are the other two members of that group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and Dmitry is the only one on the call. Dmitry, have you had any action on [inaudible]?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: As I wrote, the subgroup, their main problem I expect with data accuracy is we lose the sense of [inaudible] significant part of data is given according to GDPR. So, I think that [inaudible] problem this subgroup, with data accuracy [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I don't see that as an issue because you're trying to evaluate to what extent the actions taken by ICANN to improve data accuracy and there have been some very significant ones including ICANN scanning the whole database and new requirements related to accuracy and verification on the responsibility of registrars. I thought one of the issues is to look at whether in fact this has helped or not.

Now, indeed, GDPR may end up hiding some of the information, so if we were to do another study going forward that may be more difficult, but we're looking at the accuracy of information, not whether it's publicly available or not. So, I don't see GDPR as a major impact on this. Maybe I'm missing something.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: I don't understand the who, but in case we find information about private persons from public who accept ICANN itself and [inaudible] the accuracy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It is in fact ICANN or a body controlled by it or not invoked by ICANN that would do it. I think the concern of the recommendation is not whether you as an individual can see the information, but should we need the information for whatever reason, be it law enforcement or IP rights is the information likely to be accurate when we get to it? Visibility I don't see as the issue. Volker, please go ahead. Cannot hear you yet.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Sorry. Better?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Now we can hear you.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Okay. Data accuracy and GDPR, between GDPR [inaudible] more than just visibility of the data. It may also affect in some ways the way that data can actually be collected or transferred to somewhere where it will be stored [inaudible]. However, I don't think it affects the [inaudible] of data accuracy because data accuracy is mainly the question of whether the data that we have is actually accurate.

I do not foresee any [inaudible] will not be able to [inaudible] get some access to that data. However, it will be difficult for ICANN to review whether [inaudible] or not. So, while there may be [inaudible] to data accuracy after GDPR, we probably will not be able to review or grade [inaudible]. We, as members of the public, will probably not have a [wide sweeping] access to all of WHOIS data and be able to test whether that [inaudible] data is [inaudible] ICANN.

There may be zero percent accuracy or 100% accuracy after GDPR, but we might not be able to figure that out [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. But, of course, this review is whether ICANN had implemented what was requested at that point. If it becomes more moot later on, we still have an obligation to review whether in fact the recommendation was implemented or not and to what extent it had an impact. So, it could conceivably be at some level erased by GDPR going forward. But, that doesn't alter our obligation to have to review what was done. Volker, your hand is still up. And it is no longer up.

Any further comments on data accuracy group? Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Alan, apologies if I missed this, but I believe that Lily asked for one additional volunteer for this group.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're right. She did. And that is I believe the next item on our agenda. But, we could do it since it's up on the screen right now. Do we have any volunteers of those who are on this call? Apparently not. So, we have Cathrin, Dmitry, and Lily are the only ones on this group. Let's see. Who else is likely loaded? The person who has the lightest load at this point in Thomas with only three groups that he's a part to and Erika. Neither of them are on this call right now to try to nail. May I ask staff to take it as an action item to send a message out to them, copying the whole group, asking are they willing to take ... is one of them willing to take that on.

We also, I believe, are looking for additional people for the compliance one. Is that correct? Or did the merger of the two compliance groups address that issue? Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Alan. I did not ask for additional people because I agree the merger of the two groups – we had five people. But, maybe ... I do have a recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: You actually have six because I've deemed myself to be active in that group.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. I appreciate that. But, maybe if we can quickly finish one of these subgroups, like common interface or I'm not sure which other one might be easier. I don't know. And then move those people over to data accuracy.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am hoping the safeguard registrant data is going to be a really quick one.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, and there's four on that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, with some overlap already, but not a lot. Alright. It remains to be seen whether that's going to be quicker or not. I think it should be quick, but there may be dissenting opinions on that group. Let's go on to the next item then, IDNs. That is Dmitry, I believe.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Sure. Well, according to the written materials, the only thing [inaudible] is related to [inaudible] date of final report was expected to be February 2018 and the [inaudible]. I think it was [inaudible] in process of preparing the part of the subgroup.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't aware that that group is still ongoing. I thought they had produced their final report. Susan, is your hand up for this one? No.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, is this something you're involved in at all?

LISA PHIFER: No, Alan. However, I think what Dmitry was asking about is not policy development that's underway, but the implementation that's underway.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought the implementation was on hold pending the RDS PDP. That's my recollection.

LISA PHIFER: That would be a good question for the subgroup to delve into.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The report was issued. It addressed a whole bunch of questions saying, "Geez, we don't really know, but we're going to have to consider

it as we implement it.” But, I thought that was pending the PDP. I may be wrong on that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan, you are correct that the RDS PDP was asked to take into consideration this change, but I don’t know that that excludes any parallel efforts to prepare for that [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. So, there may [inaudible] some work going forward.

TRANG NGUYEN: Alan, if I may, just to give an update on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yes, please.

TRANG NGUYEN: So, you may be confusing this current effort which is implementation that the translation transliteration PDP with the previous expert working group on the IDN topic. They’re a similar track of work. That has completed and that was served as an input into the PDP, which we voted in the ... Which is currently being implemented. There is a current effort going on to implement the translation transliteration policy recommendation. That work is going to be completed soon, but as you know, it is going to be dependent upon [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You're right. I think I was thinking of the expert group and not the PDP. Dmitry, any further work? Sorry, not any further work. Any further comments on this or anyone have any further questions on it?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Well, that job [inaudible] that we should just [inaudible] review team recommendation to the documents. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments? I guess the question I will ask all of the people, and I should've done it from the beginning, is do you see any impediments to actually having something ready for Brussels?

Alright. We have 30 minutes left to go on the call. Let us go on to the next item, please. The next one we have, the document. Planning annual reports. Who is taking that one? Planning annual reports is Lily and she is not here with us. Is there anyone else on this group who can speak to it? Seeing no hands, let us go on to the next item. No, we skipped one.

Safeguard registrant data is mine. At a single glance, ignoring GDPR, we do not safeguard any registrant data to the extent other than ICANN safeguards in terms of we try not to lose it by having it safeguarded and multiple copies kept. In terms of safeguarding the information and not making available in terms of privacy, we don't do anything right now. In fact, the policy explicitly says we are not allowed to do anything right now. GDPR obviously will reduce the availability to some extent. We

don't know exactly what. I think from that point of view, it will safeguard and protect data better. It's not clear we're going to know by the time we're coming up with this recommendation the exact details and I think all we can really say is, yes, it will be better with GDPR in terms of restricting access to data which can be considered personal data, but I'm not sure we need to go into a lot more detail than just that, which is why I said I suspect or I hope that this is going to be a relatively easy recommendation.

Certainly, once we know the interim GDPR compliance – not policy, but compliance model we can be more specific on which items will be protected and which items will not be. But, I don't think that changes the substance of the overall report. So, my feeling is this is going to be a relatively quick one.

Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

I was just wondering if this was a ... If the escrow functions was to be reviewed in this substantive [inaudible] reading something where [inaudible] multiple vendors that we can now choose. [inaudible]. It would be interesting to me to know how it ironed out [inaudible] data or how [inaudible] that data considering that every major [inaudible] data breach. It would be curious to know if there had been breaches of the escrow data if additional steps had been taken [inaudible] protect.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is certainly an interesting question. I hadn't considered it from that perspective. My recollection is that the recommendation was really from a privacy perspective, not from an escrow one.

I'm just trying to quickly pull up the bylaw right now. Lisa, you may have the wording out of the Terms of Reference handy. Lisa or Jean-Baptiste. If you can pull it up quickly, that would make it easier. Otherwise, I'm going to try to find it.

LISA PHIFER: I'll let Alice load in the Terms of Reference if you'd like, but this actually wasn't a review team one recommendation. This is one of the additional objectives.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is and it was added during the bylaw revision. That's why I'm making reference to the wording of the bylaws.

LISA PHIFER: Ah, I see. I think Alice is bringing that up directly. And just to remind you that when we discussed this in the face-to-face in Brussels, I believe that part of this objective was actually identifying how data was safeguarded throughout its lifetime and then assessing that. I think that would potentially include how its escrowed to ensure availability in the case of loss.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. If we can try to find the section where the bylaw is being mentioned and it is on page four, I believe. Sorry, I'm having trouble. Here we are. "Consistent with ICANN's mission the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today's WHOIS current gTLD RDS safeguard registrant data by identifying the lifecycle of registrant data, determining if, how data is safeguarded in each phase of the lifecycle identifying the priority gaps and safeguarding registrant data and recommending specific measures."

You're correct. We did widen it significantly from what is actually written in the bylaws. I conveniently forgot all of that, to be honest. I was looking at the original intent. I will revise the document in light of that. It suddenly has become not an easy item. One that [inaudible] be done nearly as quickly. Unless of course the review team chooses to change that.

Any further comments on that? Lisa, I'm not sure I'm going to thank you or reminding me. Are there any other sets of questions that we have to address? I think we have done them all in that case. This is a list of ones that we have not done, looking at originators of Erika, Thomas, Stephanie, Volker, Susan for compliance which I believe Susan started working on that and Cathrin. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Sorry, I forgot [inaudible]. But, I did submit a next steps document. It's a real rough draft. Compliance subgroup. I was just sort of doing a brain dump of some of our conversation with compliance team last week and

some other things that came to mind on what we really need to look at in compliance.

One thing I'm realizing, too, is that there's going to be some overlap. Lily [inaudible] data access. I mentioned to her answers to these questions that they would need to talk to compliance. So, some of this may be [inaudible] subgroups on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Any further items? The next item on the agenda is work plan review and I will turn this over to Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:

Sorry, Alan. I was [inaudible]. Okay, so in terms of work plan, right now the subgroups are supposed to be in their data analysis and assembling findings stage. As you know, the questions that you've been [inaudible] some of you will [inaudible] work plans for your subgroup. And really what would be [inaudible] to set some internal [inaudible] within your subgroup to do all the reading. You've got a number of background materials to read and [inaudible] interviews. Of course, as you know, [inaudible] to help to schedule calls [inaudible] or Google Docs [inaudible].

The objective here is to get findings of [inaudible] February 22nd, and then produce some findings in March with the objective of getting a report with recommendations and findings to the review team for discussion in Brussels. So, it's important now to roll up the sleeves and actually dive into the data analysis space.

So, this is the plan leading up to Brussels and I'll leave that open to comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alice. I don't think there's much to say other than we're going to have a rather boring time in Brussels if we don't manage to do that on a significant number of items. So, I think the onus is on us to in fact try to produce that. Any further comments on the work plan and timing? Volker, please go ahead. We have Volker, then Alice.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Just my apologies for not being able to attend the meeting in Brussels. I'm actually moving house exactly during that week, so it's going to be difficult to attend.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, Alan. Thank you. Since we're on the work plan agenda item, do you want to raise the fact that the Terms of Reference and work plan are going to the board today, will be submitted today?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we decided at the last meeting that if no one had any reasons not to that it could be submitted the middle of the week that has just

ended. So, I don't think any action on our part is needed at this point. I don't believe there were any comments.

ALICE JANSEN: No. No comments. So, we will move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Other than the one I just made saying let's reduce the data protection one, which no one seemed to pick up on. So, I think it's good to go at this point.

ALICE JANSEN: Great. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Volker, in light of the fact you won't be at the meeting in Brussels, I hope you will take whatever pains you can to make sure the topics that you are working on or leading are well represented there.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Indeed. I might even be able to phone in during that time. I just can't travel because there's so much to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understand. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: Old hand. Apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: item number six, draft framework for WHOIS-1 implementation assessment. Who is taking that one? This was a request that Stephanie had originally. Can we go on to the next item? I think there was a document that went along with this. The document on effectiveness. Susan, please go ahead. This was a document that Susan drafted when we were talking about how we judge whether something was effective or not. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Alan. Yes, this is something that Stephanie had recommended that we didn't have time to get to. It's been months since I've looked at this document. But, really, looking at it, I think that [inaudible] drafted, but I found it helpful again to look at it and [inaudible] questions and to [inaudible] the reviews, the compliance reviews for example. I'm hoping other people will also feel it's a path forward in determining effectiveness.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone have any further comments? Clearly, this is going to apply varyingly to the different recommendations because some of them it makes a lot of sense, and other ones I'm not sure that effectiveness is the keyword. But, to the extent this applies, it was designed as ... The term framework might be a bit of overkill for it, but it was intended to

provide some reference questions and some focus in looking at whether things were effective or not.

Further discussion, comments? Lisa, please go ahead. Cannot hear you, Lisa. Lisa, you may be on mute. Or you have decided not to speak. Lisa lost audio. Let's give Lisa a minute to get back in before we go to the next item. Brenda, can you redial Lisa again? It's amazing how frail our telephone communication system is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Clearly no [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: My experience with people who have IP phones is that it doesn't improve. We will patiently wait.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: [inaudible] each of the objectives [inaudible]. So, it's important that [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan, my apropos to our recent discussion, I couldn't understand anything you just said. I'm not sure if anyone else could.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sorry. So, I think what she's alluding to ... Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That in the objective for each of the subgroups, which comes out of the bylaws, we're asked to assess the effectiveness of the implementation. So, that's why [inaudible] document for effectiveness, so we're all using the same milestones or criteria, in other words, to make that assessment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yes, that was my understanding as well. Lisa is back. Would you like to go ahead, Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. Actually, I just heard the tail end of what Susan said and that was the point I was going to raise is the bylaws clause does include a request for assessing effectiveness of the implementation and meeting the identified issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I thought I had said that. I didn't reference the bylaws, but I thought I had made that or implied that, perhaps not well enough. Alright. So, we'll take this as one of our reference documents and presumably be using it as we go forward with each of the analyses.

Next item, please. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN:

Can we go back to the slide deck? Here we go. Okay. So, we wanted to share the latest [inaudible] today, [inaudible] but also a number of other documents to the e-mail that was sent out with the agenda materials. So, fact sheets are [inaudible] mechanisms and tools, if you will. They help the community keep track of the [inaudible] program. The facts sheet is published on a quarterly basis, and as you can see from the slide, it includes a [inaudible] costs associated with [inaudible] services, travel to face-to-face meetings, [inaudible], etc. It's [inaudible]. It keeps track of everything.

Also, on a quarterly basis, we also publish expense sheets that provide more details into the expenses per bucket, if you will. In addition to that, we also publish [inaudible] that go out on a monthly basis. All these documents are posted for public view on the Wiki and we work with the [inaudible] get these approved. Susan is our lead [inaudible] specialist on the [inaudible]. So, we work very closely with Susan to get these out.

So, we just wanted you to be aware of this, that this all exists and you should just feel free to share it with your groups if you want them to have a sense of where the group stands. I hope this helps.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Any comments or questions? Hearing none, seeing none, I'll turn it over to Jean-Baptiste to confirm action items and any decisions reached. I don't believe we did any at this meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, [inaudible] again. I just actually tried [inaudible] action items for you. So, in terms of decisions [inaudible] tools for the WHOIS 1 implementation assessment, in terms of action items we do have an action item for the outreach subgroup to discuss who the targets for outreach are and how well was each target's needs met. We have another action item for ICANN Org to ask Erika and Thomas whether they would be willing to volunteer for data accuracy group, which is Lily's group. That's all we have for today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We obviously have a number of action items on individuals behalf to continue to work on their documents. Is there any other business? Then we will end the meeting a few minutes early. The next meeting will be slightly over a week from now. That is not next Monday, but a week from this coming Monday. Nine days from now. Hopefully, we'll see you all on the list and see a lot of action between now and then. If there are no further comments, then I'll ask the recording to be stopped and the meeting ended. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]